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INTRODUCTION

As society becomes more complex and with the tremendous growth of mechanical power, man lives increasingly regulated by machines. Furthermore, as man becomes more mechanically regulated, he becomes more and more detached from former traditions. He has become, in sociological terms, alienated, alienated from his own self, from others, from nature, and from the spiritual world. By alienation, it is meant a sense of rootlessness, a lack of concrete feeling, and anxiety due to the depersonalizing forces in modern society. Man has entered into what many have termed the age of secularization; traditional culture has disintegrated and the ideas and beliefs upon which social and individual lives have been organized have decayed. Man, with his scientific knowledge and great technical achievements, has gained much power, but this power has also stripped nature of its sacred forms so that man feels homeless, and he is left with a world that is neutral and alien.

Confused as to his place in the scheme of a world growing each day closer yet more impersonal, more densely populated yet in face-to-face relations more dehumanized; a world appealing ever more widely for his concern and sympathy with unknown masses of men, yet fundamentally alienating him even from his next neighbor, today Western man has become mechanized, routinized, made comfor-
table as an object; but in the profound sense
displaced and thrown off balance as a subject
creator and power.¹

The individual is caught in social confusion. His
conduct and ethics are no longer socially tolerable. He
has become self-centered, and in striving to be an indi-
vidual he has broken down the culture of commonly shared
beliefs and activities. Material values have gained pre-
eminence, and proportionate to this, spiritual values have
decreased. Before this stage of secularization had set
in, religion

...had been a structure that encompassed man's
life, providing him with a system of images and
symbols by which he could express his own aspira-
tions toward psychic wholeness. With the loss
of this containing framework man became not only
a dispossessed but a fragmentary being.²

Human communities have been shattered and replaced
by collectivities which fragment the whole, unique per-
sonality. The modern developments of science and technol-
ogy have led to this collectivization and deindividuali-
zation which standardize, specialize, and functionalize
the individual. The business of everyday life is trans-
acted virtually between strangers. These are depersonal-
ized relations, creating a sense of isolation and aliena-
tion from society. The result of all this is that the
individual is being destroyed. Traditional group life
is disappearing, and nothing is taking its place. Man
must realize that hope and salvation will come from spiri-
tual renewal, and from this renewal, cultural and social
reorganization will follow.
With the fading of a common language of values and the feeling of an inner human community, there has been a decrease of human responsibilities. Specialized and functionalized responsibilities have replaced human responsibilities and responsibility to the human community. Functional responsibility is an objective and impersonal obligation.

The most frightening aspect of our present world is not the horrors in themselves, the atrocities, the technological exterminations, but the one fact at the root of it all: the fading away of any human criterion, the disruption of the contents and substrate of human responsibility.

In former times, there evolved from religion and tradition certain values which determined man's behavior, producing an inner coherence and human community. To be a value, a concept must have some degree of permanence; furthermore it must be beyond the purely personal and subjective. But today, values have disintegrated into meaningless conventions. Men

...have lost values and the faculty of valuation; their lives are harassed and breathless, their consciousness filled with a tumult of incoherent facts. Temptations and pressures, sensations and fears, the fight for jobs, the whip of competition, the lure of money, the supreme standard of success - this is what drives them day by day.

There can be no doubt that traditional norms and values are disintegrating. One can just look at the increasing divorce rate to see that the institution of marriage is no longer as strong nor as meaningful as it used to be. The major problem is not so much the discarding
of these traditional values but that nothing is taking their place. Furthermore, it is obvious that this lack of any value system is growing increasingly dangerous because man is left in a vacuum.

Modern man who is alienated from nature, others, his self, and his god, has lost the sense of his own value and worth. He has lost the experience of community and the meaning of life.

The spiritual disintegration of our day consists in the loss of an ultimate meaning of life by the people of Western civilization. And with the loss of the meaning of life they have lost personality and community. They have become, whether they know it or not, parts of an objective process that determines their life in every respect, from their economic situation to their spiritual form. The insecurities and vicissitudes involved in this process have produced feelings of fear, anxiety, loneliness, abandonment, uncertainty, and emptiness. Their spiritual life oscillates between a cynical and fanatical surrender to powers the nature of which nobody can fully grasp or control, and the end of which nobody can see.16

Viktor E. Frankl, in his book *Man's Search for Meaning*, is deeply concerned with the contemporary problem of alienation and the lack of meaning in life. He believes that the solution to this problem lies in the approach of logotherapy. Logotherapy enters the spiritual dimension of human existence. It is concerned with spiritual realities and the potential meaning of existence to be fulfilled. The goal of man is viewed to consist in the fulfillment of meaning and the actualization of values.

Logotherapy focuses on the future. It is less retrospective and introspective than psychoanalysis. It is
concerned with the meaning of human existence as well as man's search for meaning. The motivating force in life is the striving to find meaning. Meaning can be fulfilled only by the individual man himself. The meaning that is to be fulfilled is more than an expression of ego, more than a projection of wishful thinking. Furthermore, there is always a sense of freedom involved, in that of fulfilling or forfeiting that which has potential meaning for a man.

The approach of logotherapy views suffering as an integral and definite part of life. If there is meaning in life, there must be a meaning in suffering. Life is not complete without suffering and death. It is the way in which man accepts his 'fate' and suffering and not what actually happens to him that counts. Even in the most bitter struggle for living man can still find meaning in his life.

We need to have faith in the future during moments of suffering; we need hope, direction, and purpose. Nietzsche's words hold true: "He who has a why to live for can bear with almost any how." If there is no purpose to life, if there is no goal or no sense in living, in other words, if there is no why, then no matter how glorious or materially comfortable the how, life is lost and of little value.

Religion is man's attempt to achieve lasting meaning and satisfaction. It is concerned with the immediate
factors of everyday life and also with something deeper and enduring, e.g., man's salvation. The existence of man as the goal of religion is to enable man to realize that his life is worthwhile and meaningful.

The primary concern of man is to invest life with as much meaning as is possible. The basis of human existence is a consciousness of responsibility and the attainment of meaning. Logotherapy's concern is in making man aware of this consciousness.

Man is more than the result of biological, psychological, and sociological factors. Even though man is finite and his freedom is limited, man is not fully conditioned and determined. Man is ultimately self-determining. Man does more than exist; he decides what his existence will be. Man has many potentialities within himself. He is both creator and creature, beautiful and ugly, the most glorious and the most base. He can be better than the best of all living creatures or worse than the worst. What potentialities are actualized ultimately depend on man himself.

The tasks of life vary according to each individual and so does the meaning of life. Life's meaning cannot be answered in a general way. Every situation is unique and so is the meaning which it imparts to the individual involved or the meaning the individual imparts to it. Man's opportunity, his unique opportunity, lies in the way he faces each situation and bears his burden. It is up
to the individual to give to life the degree and quality of meaning which it can have for him.

Man needs to feel that he is an individual with inner freedom and personal value, to be able to choose his attitude even within a given set of circumstances. Even under given circumstances man can still decide what will become of him, both mentally and spiritually. "It is this spiritual freedom - which cannot be taken away - that makes life meaningful and purposeful."? It is man's attitude towards his life which counts even if his existence is restricted and limited by external forces. Ultimately, satisfaction with and salvation in life depend on man's attitude.

Existential logotherapy enables man to see the possibilities and relevance of values for his life. Values are either creative, experiential, or attitudinal. Creative values are the result of man's own actions. Experiential values are the result of man being receptive to the world in which he lives and being sensitive to the beauty, truth, and goodness therein. But it is in the area of attitudinal values that logotherapy comes to the fore because these are values that are realized when externals limit one's life and man can only make a very limited choice in his actions. Then it is his own attitude which will determine whether or not such an act will be meaningful. The life in concentration camps is a good example and especially relevant here because in such a situation man
was definitely limited as to his actions, and it was his attitude in these circumstances that decided whether he would spiritually survive or truly die a spiritual death, not being able to find meaning in life and therefore lose all will to live. In the life of a concentration camp, there could be no experiential or creative values, but "A man can still find life purposive, and can demonstrate this by the way or manner in which he faces the inevitable or the way in which he handles suffering." It is the attitude which counts. Death, no matter how it is experienced, can always be faced in a dignified manner; this is what life demands.

The existential act of man is his rising spiritually above his own psychophysical existence. The essence of man entails this spiritual dimension; it is this which separates him from the rest of the animal kingdom.

Existence means...being, a certain kind of being, specifically and intrinsically human, which man, and man alone, is capable of attaining; it is characterized by the ability of man to transcend himself, to emerge above himself, above the level of his own physical and psychic determinants, such as his heredity and environment. The being, man, can grapple with these determinants and shape them even as they seek to shape him, or he can supinely submit to them. Man, therefore does not merely exist, but rather, a portentous characteristic of his existence is precisely his personal influence upon successive stages of his existence.... Man continually decides what he is becoming.

Only man has the ability to transcend himself, and man must recognize this potential within himself in order to find meaning.
Existential frustration is the frustration of man's will to meaning, to find concrete meaning in his personal existence. It is despair over the lack of a life of significance and import. Man's existential vacuum is characterized by inner emptiness, where there is no meaning worth living for. Man has lost much; tradition is no longer the operative force in life that it used to be. In a "free" and "democratic" society nothing tells him what he has to do or ought to do, and it is a moot point as to whether man knows what he wants to do.

Man's search for meaning in life might often bring tensions. But such tensions are an indispensable prerequisite for mental health, that is the tensions between what has been achieved and what has yet to be accomplished. Man needs more than equilibrium and homeostasis to achieve truly inner peace. He needs not a tensionless state but one of struggling and striving for some worthy goal. He needs a spiritual dynamics where there is meaning waiting to be fulfilled and where it is man's goal to fulfill such potential meaning.

The meaning of life varies among men. There is no abstract meaning of life. Each man is questioned by life, and every individual must answer for his own life, in his own way, with his own sense of responsibility. Responsibility is the essence of human existence. Man needs to be made aware of his own responsibility, either to what and/or to whom. Man is a responsible creature who
must actualize the potential meaning of his existence. The true meaning of life is to be found in the world, in living, in encounters and relationships with others, and not in what is only within man. It is not so much a process of self-actualization as it is a process of self-transcendence. Self-actualization is not an aim but more of a by-product realized when man commits himself to the fulfillment of life’s meaning. Life is not something to be endured. Life involves more than passive resistance; it demands an active participation.

Man is both a responsible and a free being. He is capable of real decisions and responsible acts. Freedom and responsibility are inextricably related. Man is responsible to himself in realizing his freedom and finding the utmost meaning in life. Man is also responsible to that which is other than himself, but to whom and/or to what is ultimately left up to the individual. To find ultimate fulfillment man must take an active part in his surroundings. Man must relate himself to a purpose and function larger and greater than himself.

The concept of responsibility in existential analysis means that man is responsible for the actualization of values in his life, and responsible to others, conscience, family, society or God. Self-realization...must still be related to a larger purpose or function: vocation and responsibility. For...man is seen as not responsible for self-fulfillment or self-actualization primarily, but for the fulfillment of his own unique life’s tasks. Then self-realization follows as a side effect.10
In some way, the abstractness of life in this technological and bureaucratic age, which fragments and alienates man, must be dealt with. Perhaps, it is the philosophy behind existentialism which offers a solution to this problem for existentialism "seeks to bring the whole man - the concrete individual in the whole content of his everyday life and in his total mystery and questionableness - into philosophy." The important aspect here is the concept of "wholeness". Contemporary society has standardized, functionalized, specialized, segmented, and fragmented man, and what we must now do is put man back together into a substantial, consistent, and coherent whole.

Frankl is deeply concerned with man's spiritual needs and sense of values. He looks on man's search for meaning as inborn and innate. Furthermore, it is an unending search for a higher and ultimate meaning. The realization of meaning is man's salvation. It is essential for the fulfillment of life.

Man must not become provincial and narrow-minded in his quest for meaning. There is no one way to the "True", the "Good", and the "Beautiful". Man must be broadminded and realize that that which may be significant and the means of salvation for one is not necessarily so for another. The "Good Life" can be found in many different realms of life; it may be music for one person, art for another, literature for a third and so on. And, there are further divisions within these categories. Who is to judge what is, in
Tillichian terms, the ultimate "ultimate concern" of man? Man's quest for meaning is an individual affair. There can be no general and conclusive statement in this area, in the sense that there cannot be one thing that will bring meaning to all men. For some Jesus is the Christ while for others Mohammed is the savior. What must be realized is that there is not only one savior or redeemer for all mankind. We must recognize that our environment, our heredity and culture demand different modes of salvation. The problem is not in the definitive prescription of the means of salvation for mankind but in the recognition that the realization of meaning is the ever ongoing search which brings fulfillment to life.

The change in society from a tightly bound and well-structured organization to one that is loosely knit and amorphous has had a definite effect upon man. The subsequent result of the massification and mechanization of society has led to the fragmentation and alienation of contemporary man. In the true sense of the word, man has lost the sense of community. Frankl states a possible solution, but his is a highly theoretical one and one that seems impractical to man today. He does not tell us exactly what it is that we should do. He does not tell us because he cannot; he cannot because there is no exact answer. And for this very reason, he may be highly unsatisfactory to those who want a concrete solution and definitive answer. And yet, this is the essence of our problem and what makes
the discussion and analyzation of such necessary and relevant, namely that something is definitely the matter with us, with our society, and with our lives in general. Something has been lost; there is something missing in our lives. We, or perhaps it is better to say, a definite segment of the population, lack that inner something to make life meaningful, to take it above the superficial level of clothing, cars, and money, and to give to it a value which can transcend the minutia of everyday existence.

I mention Frankl and his approach of logotherapy here because in the discussion of the thought of Martin Buber and Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan in the pages that follow, it will be shown that Frankl is the one who poses the questions which Buber and Radhakrishnan answer. Both Buber and Radhakrishnan deal with the problem with which Frankl is so deeply concerned: namely, that it is not so much that traditional group life is disappearing but that nothing is taking its place and that there is an excessive use of the scientific method, excessive because the method of science deals only with part of man and Buber and Radhakrishnan are concerned with the whole of man. Buber and Radhakrishnan both recognize the need for a spiritual renewal because this is where man's hope and salvation lie.

In a sense, Buber and Radhakrishnan utilize Frankl's approach because they both view the actualization of
meaning as a basic goal for man's life. As does Frankl, they see man as being ultimately self-determining, with the power within himself either to make his life meaningful or not. Furthermore, they see the need for man to relate himself to a purpose and function larger than himself; they see the need for true human community where there is an active participation in and sharing with others, where there is constant communication and a sense of relation between man and God, man and nature, and man and man.


### Marriages and Divorces, 1910-1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Marriages</th>
<th>Divorces</th>
<th>Rate Marriages</th>
<th>Rate Divorces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: numbers in thousands, rate per 1,000. NA means not available.


9. Ibid., p. 18.
10. Ibid., p. 133.
There are three stages in Buber's philosophy: The early period of mysticism, the middle period of religious existentialism, and the last and mature period of dialogue or "I-Thou" philosophy. Buber was strongly influenced by Hasidism which was a popular mystical movement that swept through eastern Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Hasidism is a mysticism which hallows community and everyday life. It rejects both asceticism and denial of the senses; it cultivates joy. In Hasidism, everything is just waiting to be hallowed by man.

Buber found in Hasidism the communal embodiment of the major emphasis of his early philosophy of Judaism—creativity, concern for personal wholeness, the realization of truth in life, and the joining of spirit and of basic life energies.

The second stage of Buber's philosophy is religious existentialism. Buber is an existentialist because he makes existence rather than essence the starting point of his ontological reflections, of his quest for true being and reality. At the center of his existentialism is the Biblical emuna, unconditional trust in the relationship with God, where true reality of living consists in meeting, where transcendence addresses man in the events of everyday life, where man's ultimate concern is partnership with God and not the unravelling of divine mysteries.
This concept of relationship and meeting leads to Buber's final stage, namely the philosophy of dialogue, which Buber calls the I-Thou relationship. I and Thou is the give and take of genuine conversation between men in existential confrontation. It is the philosophy of dialogue directed towards what Buber calls real questions rather than philosophical problems. Buber says that philosophical problems emerge when men reflect on real questions, on questions not engaging merely the intellect but the entire person. Real questions arise from man's self-awareness. They are questions not necessarily capable of being answered, but ones which must be asked as part of being man.

Actually Buber is neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but a philosophical anthropologist investigating the problem of man. There is a close relation between Buber's philosophical anthropology and his dialogical theory of knowledge.

He is concerned...not with deducing man's place from some over-all concept of being or the cosmos but with that twofold attitude that make man man. Man becomes man with the other self. He would not be man at all without the I-Thou relationship. And man becomes more fully human through moving from the separateness of the man who is no longer a child to the mature I-Thou relationship.... The genuineness of man's existence is seen as dependent upon his bringing all his separate spheres of activity into the 'life of dialogue' a life in which one does not necessarily have much to do with others, but really has to do with those with whom one has to do.

Buber's emphasis is on the meeting between man and man, between man and what is over against him. It is a meeting which can never become an identifiable object, nor can it ever become stagnant and rigid; rather it is an active life.
Buber was influenced by Kierkegaard and his belief of total involvement, absolute commitment, the priority of subjective thinking, truth as existential or lived truth, and the stress on the centrality of the individual. Buber insisted on the action of the whole man and not just the mind, the conscience or the emotions. He greatly emphasized the warmth of community and the utter necessity of religion as a this-worldly faith where devotion transforms all aspects of common life together. Buber's goal is to bring all mankind into genuine community.

Buber is opposed to European intellectualism and deeply disturbed by modern man's plight of over-commercialism and super-intellectualism. Buber believes that the crisis of man today is the crisis of what is between man and man.

There has been an increasing decay of old organic forms. Society is becoming larger and larger and man's solitude is at the same time intensified. Man no longer feels at home in the world; he has lost his cosmological security. Outwardly, the old forms have remained fairly much the same, but actually they have lost their inner meaning and spiritual power.

...The increased sense of solitude is dulled and suppressed by bustling activities; but wherever a man enters the stillness, the actual reality of his life, he experiences the depth of solitude, and confronted with the ground of his existence experiences the depth of the human problematic.

There has been an increasing rise of technology but man is no longer in control of the world of science which he has helped to create. In a sense, this technological world is independent of man; it is stronger than he is. It is as if the
machines that man has created are no longer tools for man but that man is the extension of these machines. Man is in the grip of an incomprehensible power. In former times, the incomprehensible power was God, but now it is the advances of science and machines. There is both a feeling of power and powerlessness within man, the power of creating these fantastic machines, bombs, and the like, and the ultimate powerlessness of not being really able to control them; they are the master of him instead of vice-versa. Man has become a problem to himself; ours is a homeless age.

The problem of our technological age is that the method of science does not investigate man as a whole but only in selective aspects. The scientific method is the development of the I-It way of knowing, that of subject-object. It cannot discover the wholeness of man nor can it discover the uniqueness of man as man. It is becoming increasingly difficult to perceive 'the other' as a whole, as a unity, and as unique because we are characterized by our analytic methods of pulling apart and putting back together, of grasping the other as an object, of destroying the mystery of the universe and of man with man. This analytical method of science is necessary and good in its place, but we must recognize its limits and realize its bounds.

Modern man is insecure and repressed, isolated and estranged, incapable of direct relations and genuine dialogue with both individuals and the community as a whole. Man's life is,
...a sterile alternation between universal war and armed peace. The modern crisis is thus a crisis both of the individual and of society at large. 

The crisis cannot be solved either through individualism or collectivism, but through the relation between man and man, taking place in direct encounter between individuals and the community at large. Buber's concern here is not only with the wholeness of the individual but also with the restructuring of society at large.

The structure of modern society makes true dialogue difficult if not almost impossible. Society has become so massified and of such an impersonal nature that genuine dialogue is most difficult. There is a vital need for the restructuring of society to enable true dialogue to take place.

The result of this progressive decline of dialogue and the growth of universal mistrust is that man's need for confirmation no longer finds any natural satisfaction. Man seeks confirmation either through himself or through membership in a collective, but both of these confirmations are illusory. Confirmation is by its very nature a reciprocal process; the man who does not confirm his fellow-man will not only receive no confirmation from others but will find it increasingly difficult to confirm himself.

Neither the individualist nor the collectivist knows true personal wholeness or true responsibility. Collectivism is more characteristic of our age, and it is also the more dangerous of the two. It represents an escape from any personal responsibility into the security of massive group formations and subsequently the loss of self. It is the desire for belonging, giving the appearance but not the reality of relation.

"At the core of the social problems of our time lies the need for the resumption of genuine dialogue between individuals
and between peoples... Hope depends on renewal of the
dialogical principle, namely that all real living is meeting.

Modern man is insecure; he questions not only the univer­
verse and his relation to it, but also himself. There is no
longer even the social security of former times that man gained
by living in a small organic community. Man is homeless; he
is experiencing social and cosmic insecurity, a loss of con­
fidence in human existence and also a loss of trust in God.

The crisis of man which has become apparent in our
day announces itself most clearly as a crisis of trust.... You ask, trust in whom? But the quest­
ion already contains a limitation not admissible here. It is simply trust that is increasingly lost
to men of our time.... This lack of trust in Being, this incapacity for unreserved intercourse with the
other, points to an innermost sickness of the sense
of existence. 7

And yet, we must not give up hope. Genuine dialogue between
peoples is by no means impossible; we must dare to trust.

In the study of the problem of man, Buber's concern is
with the wholeness of man. He is not concerned with man in
relation to a particular philosophical discipline but is dealing
with the concrete, existential characteristics of man.
The essence of man is not his reason but his relation to others.
The wholeness of man is realized in partnership. It is through
knowledge of the I-Thou relation that conception of the whole­
ness of man is possible.

Only I-Thou sees this wholeness as the whole person
in unreserved relation with what is over against him
rather than as a sum of parts, some of which are la­
belled objective and hence oriented around the thing
known, and some subjective and hence oriented around
the knower.
Buber upheld a two-fold principle of human life. The first he calls setting at a distance whereby the object becomes an independent opposite. The second principle is that of entering into relation. Man can only enter into relation with that which has been set at a distance. Genuine conversation means the acceptance of otherness, of the independent opposite who has been set at a distance.

The growth of the self is achieved through man's relation to others, not to himself. Self-realization is not a goal but the by-product.

The inmost growth of the self is not accomplished, as people like to suppose today, in man's relation to himself, but in the making present of another self and in the knowledge that one is made present in his own self by the other. Man sets man at a distance, realizes the distinct otherness and uniqueness of the other, and still enters into relation with him, accepting and more importantly, confirming the other as he is. It is through confirmation of an other that man becomes a self with the other. The goal, which is not self-realization, is the completion of the act of setting at a distance by entering into relation. It is by entering into relation that man is constituted as human; it is the way in which man truly becomes man.

Only man is the creature capable of entering into relations with others and the world and able to experience the mystery and depth of the world and others. Life is not to be lived in private subjective experience but in meeting, in the realities that occur when men come into relation with one another. What happens between men is more important than what man does with...
his solitariness. Meaning comes from what transpires between people. The self truly exists as it takes its stand in relation to others. Personal intercourse is vital; ideas, concepts, and intellectual intercourse cannot be substituted for it.

The essence of man is found in community and not in isolated individuals. An individualistic anthropology, that is, concerned with the relation of man only to himself, can never lead to the complete and full knowledge of man’s being. Collectivism offers no better solution because it does not see man at all but only society. In individualism, man glorifies his solitary state and his isolation while in collectivism, man tries to escape from his solitariness by contemporary massive formations; in this way he tries to free himself from his feeling of homelessness. In a collectivity it is not man with man because man does not truly communicate with others. Man’s isolation is not so much overcome as it is overpowered by the massiveness of society.

Only when the individual knows the other in all his otherness as himself, as man, and from there breaks through to the other, has he broken through his soli­tude in a strict and transforming meeting.10

This can only happen when man is a genuine person, and in individualism and collectivism there are no genuine persons, nor are there any genuine relations. Neither in individualism nor in collectivism is man realized in his wholeness. Furthermore, there is no sense of community in either individualism or collectivism, even though there is a semblance of such in collectivism. In actuality, though, a collectivity is the organized
atrophy and degeneration of personal existence.

The question of what man is can only be answered when based on the wholeness of man and on the consideration of his relation to others. We cannot prove the reality of a person except by the risk or commitment of living with him and truly experiencing him. Man can never be fully conceptualized; he cannot be reduced to the level of an object. It is only through sharing with another that man can fully and actually know him. Man is man only as he is with man.

The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man. What is peculiarly characteristic of the human world is above all that something takes place between one being and another the like of which can be found nowhere in nature.

This is the essential and primal category of human reality; it is what happens between men is existential confrontation.

Man is characterized by his potentiality, his inherent possibilities. He is the crystallized potentiality of existence. Man is neither good nor evil by nature but polar; the worst and the best in man are dependent upon one another. Man is good and evil together; he is the creature of the between, with the potentiality of being the most glorious of all creatures or of being the most base.

Man is the only creature with the unique potentiality of transcending his own psychophysical existence.

Human life possesses absolute meaning through transcending in practice its own conditioned nature, that is, through man's seeing that which he confronts, and with which he can enter into a real relation of being to being, as not less real than himself, and through taking it not less seriously than himself. Human life touches on absoluteness in virtue of its dialogical character, for in spite of his uniqueness man can never find, when he
plunges to the depth of his life, a being that is whole in itself and as such touches on the absolute. Man can become whole not in virtue of a relation to himself, but only in virtue of a relation to another self. This other self may be just as limited and conditioned as he is; in being together the unlimited and the unconditioned is experienced. 12

According to the philosophy of dialogue, man has two primary attitudes, symbolized by the two primary words, "I-Thou" and "I-It." These two attitudes are the ways by which man confronts the external world. In the I-It posture, man looks at things as tools capable of being used to further his own personal interests. This attitude is characteristic of common sense and physical science, enabling man to construct an ordered view of the world. In this attitude man places things in the context of time, space, and causality. The I-It relationship is a subject-object relation. It is always indirect, not occurring between man and man or man and the world, but within the individual man. The I-It relation is necessary though, because it enables man to comprehend and order the universe.

The I-Thou relation contains the deeper meaning of existence, but this must not lead one to think that the I-It is a negative relationship. "...Human life neither can nor ought to overcome the connection with It...." 13 The It relation is a needed one. Man needs knowledge acquired in detachment in order to achieve an objective perspective of the world and somewhat of a control over nature. The It posture becomes evil only when it oversteps its bounds and claims to encompass
the entire truth because then it closes the possibility of response to deeper levels of meaning gained from I-Thou encounters. Buber realized that man could not live only in the realm of I-Thou. However it is possible to live only in the realm of I-It, but if a man does so then he is not really living because, as Buber says, "all real living is meeting."

And yet, the world of It is necessary.

As individuals and as a society we must know, analyze, appropriate, use, and objectify the other human beings if we are to maintain our civilization. This is precisely the tragic and broken character of human life that it cannot go on without I-It relationships.14

It and Thou do not signify two different things but two different relations between the same self and the same object. The difference between the two is not in the object to which one relates, but in the posture of the 'I', in the attitude, and in the actual encounter itself. The I differs in I-Thou and in I-It. The I of I-It is appropriating, using, observing. The I-It is the typical subject-object relationship. The I of I-It appears as individuality, conscious of itself as subject in experiencing and using. In the I-It posture, the I holds back, measuring, using, and controlling the object of attention while in the I-Thou posture the I affirms the other just as it is in itself. I-Thou is characterized by openness, directness, and mutuality. Dialogue is not merely the interchange of words; it is more than just verbal. Genuine dialogue is the response of the whole being. The I of I-Thou is a matter of wholeness, a total and essential relation. Both are needed for human existence; it is just a question of which one is in command. If
the I-Thou does not command it disappears. The problem is that in our age the I-It has usurped this power and has gained mastery.

In the I-Thou relationship, time, space, and causality are all irrelevant. The I-Thou relationship is characterized by: (1) Wholeness: the whole of one's being is taken up; it is a total involvement and not simply either intellectual or sensual. (2) Exclusiveness: the Thou as well as one's self is conceived of as a whole; it is more than a unity because anything that is not part of the self must belong to the Thou. (3) Presentness: the present belongs only to the Thou relation, that which is continually enduring. (4) Centrality: the I-Thou relationship endures about a center where time and space fade from one's consciousness. (5) Freedom: the Thou is free from causality, from arbitrary self-will, and yet it is connected with a sense of responsibility. (6) Directness: the I-Thou relation is direct; there is no mediation. Man meeting his Thou is not conscious of any physical or mental intervention. What is felt is reality. (7) Non-orderability: The Thou has no definite order; each moment is unique. (8) Love: love accompanies the I-Thou relation; it is the responsibility of an I for a Thou because they are needed by each other. "... It is of the essence of love to feel that one's entire individuality is caught up in the sway of a larger relationship."15 (9) Effect of the relation: the relation leaves a residue of creative energy. (10) Antinomies: the I-Thou relationship is characterized by certain contradictions, e.g.: God comprises man's self, and yet the self remains distinct, and man is both
in God and outside of him.

An important aspect of the I-Thou encounter is its spontaneity; it is not something that can be planned. "The Thou meets me through grace—it is not found by seeking."\(^{16}\) It is a finding without seeking. Furthermore, the Thou is not limited to time and space while the It is. During the actual Thou encounter, the time is the real present, an instant between past and future, the time filled with the duration of the encounter itself. The present of the I-Thou relationship exists in so far as meeting and relation exist. The I-It experiences a moment, but with no present content since it is filled with experience and using. Such actions have meaning only when completed because they are always means to some further ends and never ends in themselves. In the I-It encounter there is no interest in the uniqueness of objects which is so vital to the I-Thou relation, but only interest in objects in connection with their relations to other things through which man can use them.

Experiencing the It is planned and purposeful, unlike the Thou which is spontaneous. The It does not respond but just allows itself to be experienced. There is no mutuality. Although the Thou cannot be sought, one must go out to meet the Thou and enter into direct relation with it. Then the Thou responds to the meeting. Man can only enter into genuine relation with his whole being and it is through speaking the Thou that the fusion of the whole being takes place. When part of the self, such as the intelligence becomes conscious of the great experience, then the Thou vanishes and what is present is
only the It. Eventually, the Thou experience must end; the encounter with the Thou is only momentary. Every Thou must at one time become an It. "This is the exalted melancholy of our fate, that every Thou in our world must become an It." It is possible for the It to again become a Thou but it cannot remain so forever.

The fact that a person says 'Thou' is not vital. What is, is the fact that the whole self is engaged by another who stands over against the other as a concrete individual. It is not a mystical or ecstatic union of the self and the other but the encounter between man and the active self of things. It is not mystic because it is not a surrender of identity; rather, it is only as each person remains fully present that the relationship can exist. It is a retention of self and actually a realization of self, and yet it is also a full participation in the relationship. The I-Thou relation is in no sense mystical or ecstatic because the encounter starts where humanity begins. It is a part of everyday life, not something to be reserved for special occasions. Furthermore, there are no special institutions needed to consummate an I-Thou relation nor is any individual incapable of having such an encounter.

The I-Thou relation must be mutual. Mutuality does not mean unity, identity, or entity. The I-Thou is a world of relation and togetherness where each member remains himself. The Thou is not another I because the man who treats a person as another I is not seeing the other person in his uniqueness, but only a projected image of himself. It is only as man enters into essential reciprocity that he becomes revealed as man.
It is the only way for man to become man. Man is the unity of I and Thou. It is by becoming aware of the unique otherness of the other that man becomes truly man.

I-Thou gives meaning to the world of It. I-Thou is not an end reached in time but is there from the very beginning. In I-Thou the means and the ends are one. It is the free man who acts in response to the concrete external events; only he can see what is new and unique in each situation. The man who is not free sees only its resemblance to other things; he neither believes nor meets.

Individuality, the I of I-It, has no reality because it has no sharing. It appropriates only unto itself. Person, the I of I-Thou appears through entering into relation with other persons, and it is through relation that the person shares in reality which cannot be appropriated but only shared. The more direct the contact with the Thou the fuller the sharing and the more real the I. Basic reality is the sphere between man and man. The participation of both partners is indispensable and vital. The unfolding of this sphere is the dialogical and the meaning of this dialogical is not found in one or even both of the partners but in their interchange. It is only through relation that the man becomes whole and is able to share in absolute meaning.

The chief presupposition for the rise of genuine dialogue is that each should regard his partner as the very one he is. I become aware of him, aware that he is different, essentially different from myself in the definite, unique way which is peculiar to him, and I accept whom I thus see, so that in full earnestness I can direct what I say to him as the person he is. Perhaps from time to time, I must offer strict opposition to his view about the subject of our conversation. But
I accept this person, the personal bearer of a conviction, in his definite being out of which his conviction has grown.... I affirm the person I struggle with; I struggle with him as his partner, I confirm him as creature and as creation; I confirm him who is opposed to me as him who is over against me. It is true that it now depends on the other whether genuine dialogue, mutuality in speech arises between us. But if I thus give to the other who confronts me his legitimate standing as a man with whom I am ready to enter into dialogue, then I may trust him and suppose him to be also ready to deal with me as his partner.18

True confirmation is confirming the other even as an opposing being. It is to experience him as a whole, in his concreteness and actuality; it is to perceive man's wholeness as determined by spirit, that is, his dynamic center of uniqueness.

The I-Thou relation is most fully realized between husband and wife where two people are revealing the Thou to one another. Love involves recognition and confirmation of the other in his uniqueness. Love is the unique quality of the I-Thou relationship. It characterizes the nature of the relation between Thou and Thou and the I as it participates in that which is the constituting relation of all. Love is concerned with the whole, and it is the nature of mutual relation. Love is not a feeling but the "...responsibility of an I for a Thou."19 Love, in order to be complete, needs the I-Thou posture, but the I-Thou encounter does not necessarily mean love. Pure relation is the love between an I and a Thou. "To the man who loves, people are set from their qualities as good or evil, wise or foolish, and confront him in the singleness as Thou."20

Buber states that there are three forms of dialogue: genuine, technical, and monologue. In genuine dialogue it does not matter whether the dialogue is spoken or silent. What does
matter is that each person has in mind the other in his present and particular being and turns towards him to establish a living mutual relation. Technical dialogue can be equated with objective understanding. Monologue, when it is disguised as dialogue, consists of at least two men speaking but only with their own selves.

What Buber is concerned with is genuine dialogue, the true I-Thou relation. The basic movement is 'turning towards the other.' The purpose of genuine dialogue is not to lead to one religion for all mankind. It could not do so even if it was so desired, but it can lead to a better understanding and greater sharing of various religious beliefs. It can help men to remain sensitive and responsive creatures because it is only in the I-Thou encounter that man cares for another as the other is in his own particular and peculiar being.

The essence of genuine dialogue is that each of the participants has in mind the other and turns to him to establish a mutual relation. Therefore a vital element is 'making the other present' and 'experiencing the other side.' To meet another, one must be genuinely concerned with him. He is usually someone different from oneself and yet one with whom one can enter into a direct relation. The response to the person one meets is neither subjective nor objective interests. What is important is the mutual reality existing between partners, not what goes on within the individual person. One must care for another for his sake, not for one's own. When one treats another as an object, it is an 'It' relationship, regarding him for personal use and not as a person of unique value in himself. "If we relate only
to others in terms of how we may know and use them, we are not really human...." 21 Man does not become a real person by being concerned with himself but by entering into genuine relations with others. Man must realize and confirm the differences in others, thereby helping others to realize themselves.

Buber divides the world of relation into three spheres: the relation between man and nature, between man and man, and between man and spiritual beings. An I-Thou encounter can occur between man and nature or art as well as between man and man. Here, the relationship is not fully reciprocal, yet the relationship does say something to man, and in that sense, man has a dialogue with them.

All things address us and speak to us of themselves if we receive them in their uniqueness and not merely in terms of their relations to other things—how they fit into our categories of knowledge and how we may make use of them. Artistic creation and appreciation does not, like genuine dialogue, mean an answering with one’s personal existence of what addresses one, but it does mean a genuine response to nature and to works of art which retains the betweenness, the presentness, and uniqueness of the 'I-Thou' relation. 22

Buber states that I-Thou encounters can occur with mineral fragments, animals, and trees, as well as with human beings. For example, man can have an I-Thou relation with a tree if he is able to affirm the tree as existing just as it is, in its own right, independently of man's own purposes. Of course, there is a difference in the encounter between man and man and man and other beings and things. Buber thinks of the human sphere as being the main gate while relations in the other two spheres, nature and spiritual beings, as being side gates. The encounters between man and man are valued more highly than those with
nature because in man there is a greater degree of mutuality.

Buber's theory of knowing is an existential epistemology. There are two ways of knowing, corresponding to man's two basic attitudes: namely, that of I-Thou and I-It. The I-It relation gives us knowledge of objects. It is used all of the time, and it is that on which our everyday lives are built. Things are comprehended by meing measured, taken apart, and put back together again. It yields a precise observation, where there is a definite distinction between subject and object. It is the basis of modern science and the manner in which men usually relate to things and persons. It is a needed and important kind of knowing. It is an objective way of facing the world and meeting and dealing with the world intelligently. Difficulty arises when the I-It relation oversteps its bounds and claims to be the only valid means of knowing. The I-It's claim to sovereignty and the exclusive means of relating to the environment and those within it is its weakness. Men ought not always to be known as are objects, and the I-It relation is inadequate in knowing a person as a person and a unique individual.

Science and the scientific method, as represented in the I-It relation, is inadequate in gaining true knowledge of man. The tremendous prestige of the scientific method has led many to forget that science investigates man not as a whole but in selective aspects and as part of the natural world. Scientific method is man's most highly perfected development of the I-It, or subject-object, way of knowing. Its methods of abstracting from the concrete actuality and of largely ignoring the inevitable difference between observers and reduce the I in so far as possible to the abstract knowing subject and the It in so far as possible to the passive and abstract object of thought. Just for these reasons scientific method is not qualified to discover the essence of man. It can compare men with each other.
and man with animals, but from such comparison and contrast there can only emerge an expanding and contracting scale of similarities and differences. This scale, consequently, can be of aid in categorizing men and animals as differing objects in a world of objects but not in discovering the uniqueness of man as man. 23

We must break through to a humanly realistic account in the means of knowing by means of the I-Thou relation. It is an entirely different way of knowing from the subject-object relation derived from the I-It relation. It is only through the conception of I-Thou that the wholeness of man can be known because it is only in this way that man can be seen as more than the sum of his parts.

The I-Thou relation demands participation and not distance, not objectivity but a giving of the self. To truly know a person you cannot give but one part of yourself, not even one part can be held back. True knowledge of a person entails wholeness, totality.

Knowledge gleaned from the I-Thou encounter far surpasses that of the I-It. Knowledge through I-Thou is ultimate and more real than that of I-It. And yet precision is impossible in the I-Thou relation; even communication is most difficult and one cannot adequately convey this personal experience. It is in this sense that the I-Thou relation can be likened to the religious or mystic experience. The I-Thou encounter is ineffable because the whole person is involved in the relation so that there is nothing left over to watch and observe what is going on so that it can later be recorded and communicated. But the I-Thou relation, like the mystical or religious experience, carries its own justification, and it cannot be proven by logical arguments and detailed analysis.
Intellect operates where we know in order to act with some purpose; instinct operates where we act purposefully without needing knowledge; intuition where our whole being becomes one in the act of knowing. Intellect holds us apart from the world which it helps us to use; instinct joins us with the world but not as persons; intuition binds us as persons to the world which is over against us without being able to make us one with it. The vision which intuition gives us is, like all our perceptions, a limited one, yet it affords us an intimate glimpse into hidden depths.24

The intellect which orders and controls the world and yet keeps us apart from it is part of the I-It manner of knowing. It is necessary and good in its place but is limited in a way which the intuitive faculties are not. Intuition most closely approximates the I-Thou way of knowing and is the best way of apprehending the nature of man and his relation to others, the world of nature and spirit, and to himself.

The supreme dialogue, into which all other dialogues enter, is the one between man and God. Buber regards monotheism as bringing every aspect of life into this dialogue. In order to believe in God, one must stand in personal relationship to Him. God is the "Eternal Thou", obtained through the meeting with man and nature. As the true God, He can never simply be an object of thought. All people at one time or another become an It, an object, for another, but God can never become an It. He is always Thou. He is always present; it is only man who is absent.

Contemporary thought which is I-It in character, is overcome by the power and control of objective thinking. All other approaches to life and to God are looked upon as anything but modern. In the search for God men have:
...asked for the reasoning or proof that demonstrated his existence. They felt they should at least have a definition or concept of him before they were asked to commit themselves to believing in him. Thus they wanted to think of God in I-It terms as if he were an object. But that is precisely idolatry...though modern images are mental, not stone or wood.

If man remains open and ready to receive and responds with his whole self, then he becomes aware of the address of God in everything that he encounters. Man must open himself up to God. There is no special time for Him just as there is no special place. Everytime and every place is the right time and place. It is the everyday that is of importance, the here-and-now. There is no special realm for God where He may be kept and hence confined. His presence is in every area of existence. God enters the world through man's loving relation with people, nature, and art. If man meets the world with the fullness of his being, then he will meet God.

God, the Eternal Thou, is addressed in each Thou. He is the underlying power of all I-Thou encounters, the supreme partner of dialogue, absolute relation. God is not merely the sum-total of all I-Thou encounters. Encounters with the Eternal Thou are like all other I-Thou relations in that the presence of the other is the bearer of meaning. Man cannot remain permanently in the realm of I-Thou, and this is so of his relation to God. God's presence invariably gives way to his absence in that He cannot always be found when sought. But man must not give up faith.

It is a living relationship, found and renewed, waited for and lived with, in a continual alternation of knowing and wondering, seeing and
suspecting, believing and fretting, and believing once again.\textsuperscript{26}

God, the Eternal Thou, is an imageless and sometimes hidden God. He is not limited to any one manifestation and therefore is not to be understood as having become incarnate in Jesus as the Christ. The Holy is not a separate and secluded sphere of being but is one open to all spheres of being, through which they find their fulfillment. God cannot be limited to one form or manifestation, nor can He be restricted to any place or endowed with any natural characteristics. God is the Wholly Other, the Wholly Same, the Wholly Present. Man does not know God in Himself, but as a person, as He is encountered in relation. "Buber uses the term 'Eternal Thou' in order to emphasize the non-objective character of the divine-human encounter and to stress its continuity with the encounters of everyday life."\textsuperscript{27} The personality of God is not His nature but His relationship with man. Man knows God only in relationship. Yet, God is not a person; that would ascribe to God an objective essence. All that can be said is that God lets Himself be known. There is a close connection and relation between man's knowing man and man's knowing God. Real meeting between men entails the presence of God in some sense. In relation to man, the personal quality of God is central, but it is not to be taken literally.

Each particular Thou is a glimpse of the Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou is addressed by means of the particular Thou. When man speaks the word "God" and has Thou in mind then he is addressing the true Thou of his life. God is found only by going out
with one's whole being to meet the Thou. He is not found by staying in the world or leaving it. He is met by hallowing this life. He cannot be sought because there is nothing in which He cannot be found. It is absolutely foolish to attempt to meet God by turning aside from this world and life in order to seek God; God is a finding without seeking.

God cannot be inferred in anything... Something else is not 'given' and God then elicited from it, but God is the Being that is directly, most nearly and lastingly, over against us, that may properly only be addressed, not expressed.28

The Eternal Thou is never known objectively; certitude comes through the domain of action. He is known only in dialogue.

God does not arise out of the striving for unity. God does not arise; only the image and the idea of God can arise and not out of the human but out of the meeting of the divine and the human. The meeting with God does not arise from experience but from life, not from religious experience but from religious life, which is the entire life of man in relation to God and the world. God is not an idea which through man becomes a reality but the Eternal Thou whom man meets outside as well as within the soul.

The Thou can be expressed and realized in each relation but only consummated in direct relation with the Eternal Thou, the Thou that by its very nature cannot become an It. The Eternal Thou is met by each man who addresses God, by whatever name, and even by those who do not believe in God and yet address the unlimited Thou of their lives. Man must not merely wait for His grace to descend upon him but must go forth and meet God. To meet with the Eternal Thou a man must become a whole being, fully accepting the present and destroying the separate.
I is not given up, but what is, is the self-asserting instinct.

Buber characterized God as "Absolute Person", as Being which becomes Person, to know and be known, to love and be loved. The Eternal Thou does not symbolize God but man's relation with God, and therefore the Eternal Thou is not a symbol for God, but God himself. Not only does man need God, but God needs man. Man needs God in order to exist, to be, and God needs man for the very meaning of man's life.

Genuine responsibility exists with actual responding, responding with the whole self to what is asked in the concrete situation. Responsibility exists only when response is to some one, a Thou not an It. Man is ultimately responsible to the Eternal Thou, the Thou which by its nature can never become an It. The Thou for whom man responds is not an idea but the "Voice" speaking to man in the present through the concrete events of life.

By means of the philosophy of dialogue Buber offers modern man an understanding of real relation with the Eternal Thou, not to be reduced to objective fact nor subjective ideal. God can only be known in relation; He can only be addressed, not expressed.

The dialogue with God demands a religious realism, a will to realization of one's beliefs in the whole of one's existence, that makes it impossible to allow any part of one's life to remain a sphere separated from God.29

The act of creation is central in the understanding of the I-Thou philosophy. Man is here given the ground on which to stand, and he is able to go out and meet God, the world, and his fellow men from that ground. Buber's belief in man's
spontaneity which cannot be lessened by any doctrine of original sin and in man's responsibility which cannot be modified by any doctrine of fate are both based on the notion of creation. This also causes Buber's belief in God as the Absolute Person, a paradox of an unlimited God who enters into direct relation with man.

There is a definite paradox in the Biblical creation because God sets man at a distance and yet remains in relation with him. Man can only enter into relation with a being that is set at a distance and thereby has become an independent opposite. Through the act of setting at a distance, man has a world through which he can enter into relation as an individual self. Entering into relation is an act of the whole being, the act by which man constitutes himself as human. Reality, consists in the meeting of man and God, of man responding to the address of all creation. What man knows of God when addressed by the signs of life is never accessible apart from that address.

Buber combines the meeting of I and Thou with the notion of "momentary Gods." God arises from a fusion of a number of momentary Gods, a number of I-Thou encounters.

From a succession of such 'moment Gods' there may arise for us with a single identity 'the Lord of the Voice.' Each new Thou renews in all presentness the past experiences of Thou so that the moments of the past and the moment of the present become simultaneously present and joined in living unity.30

The world of It experiences new creation through the flaming forth of the "Thou" and each new Thou renews past experiences of the Thou, which is the present recalling the past to life
so that past and present become simultaneously present in
the essence of faith.

The potentiality of being a Thou prevents man from treating
his fellow man as an It. This "potential Thou" rests not
only on the "actual Thou" of remembered I-Thou relationships
but on the "actual Thou" of Present Reality, the relation to
Eternal Thou where potential being is actual being. Trust in
the Eternal Thou gives actuality to merely potential relations
with the human Thou.

Buber is representative of the "New Thinking" whereby
the meaning of religion is found in the dialogue between man
and man and man and God. He proceeds from the personal stand-
point of the thinker and views truth as being confirmed by
the whole being in relation to the concrete reality of per-
sonal existence.

Only if we see a human in his concrete otherness
is there any possibility of our confirming him
in his uniqueness as the person he must become,
and we can only see him in this concrete way if
we stand in direct, reciprocal relationship to
him; holding our own ground and yet experiencing
the relationship to some extent from his side
and through his eyes.31

Buber believes that meaning is to be found in dialogical
living. He goes on to say:

That meaning is open and accessible in the actual
living concrete does not mean it is to be won and
possessed through any type of analytical or synthe-
tic investigation or through any type of reflection
upon the lived concrete. Meaning is to be experi-
enced in living action and suffering itself, in the
unreduced immediacy of the moment. Of course, he
who aims at the experiencing of the experience will
necessarily miss the meaning, for he destroys the
spontaneity of the mystery. Only he reaches the
meaning who stands firm, without holding back or reservation before the whole might of reality and answers it in a living way.\textsuperscript{32}

Buber's whole life was dominated by the motif that true life can only be found by entering into personal relations with the environment. True life is a system of intimate relationships where the central fact of life is love and orientation of one's will towards the need of others. In dialogical living one must be ready to fully receive the other into one's being.

There are two tasks for man: the formation of new community and the education of man. The "formation of community" is a rather misleading phrase because community is not founded but is the response of human beings in their confrontation of the challenges of life.

What binds them together is not the mere concern to resolve a contingent dilemma, but a concern which unites them through a common centre in which they take their stand. The dialectic weaves between the concretion of their task...and the centre which defines the spirit in which the work is pursued. Community is therefore always religious for it is centred not in leaders nor in committees nor in multiple individual relations that fortuitously weld, but in the divine centre whose manifest presence interpenetrates and transforms the living members.\textsuperscript{33}

Community is therefore called into being.

By the education of man, Buber means that we need a goal-defining world-view, \textit{(Weltanschauung)}, which is more than a standpoint or an individual station. It must be a real and primal ground that guides man on the way to his goal. Man's world view ought to further man's living relationships with the world.
Our world views will invariably differ because no two interpretations can ever be exactly alike. Our heredity, prejudices, environment, and culture vary, and correspondingly, so do our beliefs about life and the world in which we live. But individuals cannot, or ought not, remain divided and in separate bands. They must communicate with one another. What is called for is lived togetherness, experienced communality. It is the only way for man to realize the nature of the whole.

Our world view must not just dwell in the head but in the whole of man; nor is it something meant to last just during the hour when it was proclaimed, but rather for all time. It is a living reality that the whole man must live. The education of man about which Buber is talking is that which is a guiding toward reality and realization; it is man's "life-attitude." It is the task of the education of man to realize the community. The task of education is to structure the possibility of communion and lead man to unity with his fellow man.

There is a vital need of our age to find a way of life and thought which will preserve the truth of human existence and which will recognize that this truth is neither subjective nor objective; it is not to be reduced to individual mood nor to objective absolute. For Buber, this truth can only be found in the life of dialogue; it is a life where there is no absolute sureness of knowledge that can be expressed but only the certainty of meeting and entering into relation with the whole
of one's being. Man, the actual reality of man, is not found or contained within the individual man, but in the community, in the meeting of man with man, resting on the differences between I and Thou. Reality, effective and mutual action, can only be found in the whole of man, in the hallowing of the everyday, in the united I and the boundless Thou. This is reality, and this is the truth.

For Buber, the I-Thou relationship is the most important fact of existence. It must be learned, accepted, and confirmed by modern man if civilization is not to disintegrate. It is more than a way of finding God; it is the only way for man to find himself.
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Radhakrishnan's philosophy has often been interpreted as an intuitional absolute idealism. Radhakrishnan believes that the ideal world alone is real; it lies beyond the phenomenal world of appearance and yet dominates it. The center of the universe is the transcendent, the Absolute, Brahman. The way to integral apprehension of ultimate reality is through intuition, transcending the distinctions between subject and object.

Radhakrishnan stresses an internal religious approach. He views the materialistic atmosphere of technology as our greatest enemy. The fault lies in our industrial and utilitarian attitudes and not in the mastery of nature per se. Science is to be accepted, but it has its limits. Radhakrishnan believes in a source of insight of a higher order than reason, but nothing can be true by faith unless it is in accord with reason.

The contemporary movements of atheistic naturalism, humanism, pragmatism, and modernism lack something of the spiritual; there is in them a certain lack of profundity. The positive position of Radhakrishnan is that religious experience is factual in its own right. Religion is not a form of knowledge; rather, it is closer to feeling. It is inward and personal, the response of the whole man in an integral way to reality, expressing discontent with the finite and seeking the transcendent.
For Radhakrishnan an idea is a particular mental image peculiar to each individual, a self-contained existence and not the means by which to apprehend the world. An idea as a principle, an aim, or a value, is an operative, creative force.

An idealist view finds that the universe has meaning, has value. Ideal values are the dynamic forces, the driving power of the universe. The world is intelligible only as a system of ends.... Idealism...concerns the ultimate nature of reality, whatever may be its relation to the knowing mind. It is an answer to the problem of the idea, the meaning or the purpose of it all.... It finds life significant and purposeful. It endows man with a destiny that is not limited to the sensible world.

The variations within an idealist view of life, are not limited to either the East or the West. The idealist view as the ultimate connection of value and reality leads to the belief in an ideal world beyond the phenomenal.

Radhakrishnan's appeal to the spiritual within each and every man as the means of solving the world's problems is indicative of his idealist view of life. He looks on spirit as the creative principle within man. It has been the main objective of almost all of Radhakrishnan's work to proclaim the oneness and universality of spirit.

Radhakrishnan believes that the problem today is not so much with the rejection of a particular religion but with the indifference to religion in general. "Our modern intellectuals sum up the situation thus: Some think God exists, some think not; it is impossible to tell, but it does not matter." In relation to this problem is the question of whether or not there is behind the phenomena of nature a spiritual power,
whether the universe is meaningful or meaningless. It is not with the dogmas of a specific religion that we are concerned but with the basic problems that apply to all religions and all men.

The present day is a time of inward crisis and loss of faith. Man is searching for meaning in life, and his bewilderment only seems to be increasing. He is constantly looking for peace. Some are resigned to an eternal ignorance. Many of those who turn to Christianity, for example, are baffled by the conflict between the simplicity of the actual words of Jesus and the complexity and seemingly corruption of church doctrine. The same holds true with other organized religions. Some people try to live separate from all spiritual life until they feel a barrenness which overwhelms them so that all that they are left with is despair and fear.

There can be no doubt about the period of uncertainty and spiritual chaos in which we live. It is almost as if many people want to believe in something, that is, in something which is in accord with scientific fact, but they just cannot find that something in which to believe.

Our concern...is with those who find themselves while willing, yet incapable of belief. Their souls have grown more sensitive and so their difficulties are deeper and their questions more insistent. Their doubt is an expression of piety, their protest a kind of loyalty. In the depths of the human soul lies something which we rationalize as the search for truth, a demand for justice, a passion for righteousness. This striving for truth and justice is an essential part of our life.... The disorders due to the disturbance of our minds are preferable to the bondage of the human spirit.
Concerning this question of the desire to believe and yet the incapacity to believe, Radhakrishnan goes on to say:

Millions of people wish to believe, but they cannot, even though these orphaned children make use of the outer framework of religions. We are christened, or baptised, married, buried or cremated according to our religious rites, but all the time we are victims of an involuntary hypocrisy. We live in an age which is numbed and disillusioned. Our values are blurred, our thought is confused and our aims are wavering.

In the life of spirit which is the vital secret of all civilization which intellect may foster and develop but cannot create or even keep alive, we are uprooted. When the roots are destroyed, a tree may continue to live and even seem to flourish for a time, but its days are numbered.

The dissatisfaction with the forms of traditional religions breeds a definite danger in that at times people will cling to a belief either for security or in order to escape from questions that they do not know how to answer. It is the rare person who is willing and able to do any substantial thought, to ponder, to truly think things out for himself. Most people would prefer someone or thing to give them straightforwardly all of the answers to their questions and problems, to answer those unanswerable questions of the how and the why of life. They want their religion to be one of comfort where they can escape from their problems and be absolved from all sin and guilt by performing the proper ritual instead of facing up to reality with the courage that life demands of them. They prefer to accept a religion with some authority or no religion at all to a strenuous and often a disillusioning life.

It is impossible for man to live without faith; man fears emptiness, and he needs to believe.

To those who suffer from spiritual starvation, even a rotten fruit may taste like bread from heaven....
The soul knows its terrible bondage. There is no God and there must be God. Men insist on believing in something for we can not submit to an unknown fear. The spiritual homelessness of modern man cannot last long.... We must win back our lost security.

Our position is one of uncertainty, it is a fundamental agnosticism with unknown ends, where the future is incalculable. Man does not know what he wants and all that he is aware of is the emptiness of his life. And yet he does not know how to escape from it. Neither pure reason, nor fate, nor dogma are good explanations. It is as if the world were in search of its soul, and man can find nothing to give it meaning. All that seems certain to man is his own uncertainty, his own bewilderment. It is precisely because of man's advanced knowledge that the dogmas and doctrines of traditional organized religions are no longer applicable to him because they can no longer serve the function that they used to, that of answering his questions and overcoming his doubts. It seems that man has the potential for greatness, for the peace that he so much desires. What is lacking is the integration, the organic consciousness, the universal world view which binds everything together and can bring all elements together into a strong cohering unity.

But the problem is that we do not have this strong collective purpose which can bind everything together. And so, the individual is losing his sense of uniqueness and also of unity with others due to the advances in science and technology. Society is becoming more and more impersonal; personal relationships are diminishing. Man is becoming estranged and isolated from nature, from his fellow men, from his gods, and
even from his own self. He is turning into a depersonalized unit.

In a sense man can never return to the "state of nature" and become truly integrated with his environment. He has gone too far; he has become too dependent on scientific achievements for his daily existence to be able to ever live without them again.

The chaos in the world originates in the chaos in our minds. Man's soul is divided. The common assumption is that the world can be structured on scientific or secular humanism and that the intellectual and moral exhaust the nature of man. The accepted belief is that whatever is not scientifically verifiable is unreal. There is a contemporary need for tangible results. However, these "indisputable facts" on which the world is supposedly built are in themselves not ultimately verifiable, for in actuality, life itself is merely an accident and how it arises from inert matter is not known. Even the mind of man is a chance product. The evolutionary process will go on and on. "Man need not be so presumptuous as to think that he alone is fated to go on for all time. He is but an episode in terrestrial evolution and his existence on earth will come to an end." There is no sense of finality about man.

Religion has often been used as an escape from the reality of the world, as a defense for maintaining the status quo, and as a means to reconcile suffering men to their condition in life. Religion has produced magnificent achievements in civilization but concomitant with this there has been unbelievable corruption and degradation.
Religion offers some compensation for the natural defects of the human spirit in the world and is an escape from the transiency, the uncertainty, the meaningless of a world to one where these defects are overcome by the presence of God. In essence and actuality religion is the attempt of man to express his notion of a perfect being, a perfect world and the means by which he can be redeemed from the fact to experience of pure ideality.

Religion is formed by the finite mind, by the fallible and imperfect human being, and as long as it is living, it must change. When religion becomes rigid, closed, and confined, it is inevitably incompatible with science and the whole contemporary outlook on life which is one of constant intellectual questioning and the reluctance to accept anything on faith. For religion to survive, it must be capable of satisfying the scientific mood, of sympathizing with social aspirations, and of fostering world unity.

We cannot deny the inadequacy of religion as it now exists. There is no evident disparity between the appearance of allegiance and the actual inward betrayal. All that we have now are the forms of religions. We must do more than profess our religion; we must live it. Religion should be a way of life and a process of seeking the eternal. It ought to be an operative force in living, but it is not. We cannot rationalize nor can we absolve ourselves from guilt by praying once a week or by observing only the ceremonies and ritual of a religion. Rather, religion is an every day and every minute affair. If religion does not penetrate all parts of our lives, and if it does not influence us in every way, if it is not dynamic and growing, then it is only a facade. For religion to be an operative force we must revive it. It must be founded on verifiable
truths, not on externals but in personal and inward experience. We must replace the religion of dogma with the religion of life. If we can thus transform religion then it will become invaluable for the improvement of the individual and society.

The contemporary criticism of religion, (and there is no doubt that a constructive criticism of organized religions is needed) has yielded a world of rationalist prophets and selfish individualists, a world of vast technical achievements and external conquests, a continual craving for comforts and luxury, and always an insatiable desire for more and more, a world where nothing is certain and an utter demoralization. But with the denial of the divine within man, there has resulted a sickness of the soul. Man has denied himself even of the goal of peace of mind, even of a possibility of perfection. He believes that his increasing mastery over nature will suffice and ultimately bring him happiness and the salvation he so desires, but nature can never be completely tamed; she is too capricious and at times will inevitably shatter man's efforts through storms, earthquakes, and the like. Nor can man depend on his relationships with other men in bringing him his salvation for interference from pride, jealousy, selfishness, and disloyalty will occur and destroy man's efforts there.

Today we are suffering from an imperfection of the soul, not the mind. What we need is a harmony of body, mind, and spirit, while what we are doing is emphasizing the mind and neglecting the spirit. Our present problems are due to the
tendency to emphasize the intellect and gloss over the spiritual. The purpose of the intellect is to dispel the mystery of life, while actually what it does is to strip the soul of everything, of inner life, making this world all. But man cannot live that way, where life means nothing and leads nowhere.

The problem lies in individualism, the rational self-conscious ego, acutely aware of its separation from other centers of consciousness. It is presumptuous regarding its potentiality to arrive at truth by a process of logical reasoning. This is not the basic element in the personality of man, rather only the refined aspect of a transient and relative organism.

Man's unhappiness is due to an excess of intellectuality, a reverence of intellect to the exclusion of spirit. The intellect is the cause of separatist individuality, the cause of isolation. And all this has led to a deep sense of dissatisfaction in contemporary man, a dissatisfaction with self and its pursuits. There is no more the former gladness of life, no hopes, no faith to live by. Minds are distracted, actions are fragmentary and futile. Man lives a superficial and surface existence. He is afraid to think because of the resulting confusion and disorder. Man is cut off from his real nature, the universal, by egoistic impulses and separatist tendencies.

In Hinduism, avidyā, ignorance is the source of man's basic problem, that of anguish. Salvation is to be attained
by vidyā (wisdom) or bodhi (enlightenment). Vidyā is intellectual knowledge, producing self-consciousness and self-will. Man's anxieties are rooted in the intellect, the way man knows and distinguishes himself from others. Man feels isolated from others which breeds inner division, so that man becomes fragmented. Fear becomes the pervasive element of consciousness. Life is lived on the defensive. Man has lost his sense of community with nature and man; in other words he has died a spiritual death. There has been a transition from the unitive life to a separate self-centered one.

Man is rooted in the invisible but his life belongs to the visible, the tangible and yet also belongs to the intangible world. Man's life is the relation to a larger spiritual world. The goal of man is a constant process of self-transcending, limited by self-consciousness. The goal is not to abolish individuality but rather to transform it into universal being, a process of unification and harmonization of body and mind, instinct and intellect.

The uniqueness of man among all the products of nature lies in this, that in him nature seeks to exceed itself consciously, no longer by an automatic or unconscious activity, but by a mental and spiritual effort. Man is...a thinking and spiritual being set to shape his nature for higher purposes. He seeks to establish order and harmony among the different parts of his nature and strives after an integrated life. He is unhappy so long as he does not succeed in his attempts at reaching an organic wholeness of life. There is always a mental and moral ferment in him, a tension between what he is and what he wishes to become, between the matter which offers the possibility of existence and the spirit which molds it into significant being.
Man is a paradoxical being, both creature and creator, full of contradictions and extremes. He can rise to the greatest heights, and yet he can also sink to the lowest depths. He is the best and the worst of all living organisms. He is both beautiful and ugly, glorious and scandalous.

Man as he is is a bundle of contradictions. The ideals which he cherishes and the actualities... conflict with each other. 'The good that I would, I do not; the evil that I would not, that I do.' That's the contradiction of man. It shows his incompleteness, it shows the need for him to pass through a kind of a discipline, a kind of a churning of his mind by which he is able to get rid of the destructive impulses which are there and begin to integrate his nature... He has realized his inwardness, his freedom, his pure subjectivity, which is superior to the objective world of things that happen.

The two impulses conflicting with each other in man, that of creature and creator, must be integrated. This contradiction in human nature must be overcome if humanity is to achieve salvation. The divine must dominate the whole of life.

Man is in conflict with himself. When he is at one with himself, it is because he is at one with God.

Man, as he exists today, is not capable of survival. He must change or perish. Man, as he is, is not the last word of creation. If he does not, if he cannot, adapt himself and his institutions to the new world, he will yield his place to a species more sensitive and less gross in its nature. If man cannot do the work demanded of him, another creature who can will arise.

But we need not lose hope for man is by nature a sensitive and not a savage being. What must be done is to preserve the natural characteristics, recover and maintain the sense of reality and fellowship with the universe.

In the attempt of defining "man" we must not overlook the spirit within him. We must not overlook the creative side of
man's nature. We must not make ourselves a fraction of nature or objects in the world, for if we do we become mere instruments with no personal will. Man is more than that which he comprehends himself to be. Man is always transcending himself; he is a mystery even to himself and cannot understand himself as he really is.

For man, to live means to give existence to the possible.... Whenever we live creatively we overcome the force of non-being and affirm the Being in us. In every act of creative freedom we try to become what we potentially are, to actualize the Being in us.

The highest wisdom is to know the self. The self is the primal spirit, pure awareness as distinct from bodily states and mental occurrences. The self remains identical throughout all experiences in life. It alone persists unchanged; this is not so of the body, nor the mind, nor the emotions. The self is the source of the sense of identity through numerous transformations. It remains constant and permanent and not transient. It persists; it is the basis of knowledge and yet it is incapable of proof. Self-knowledge is the only true knowledge. Self-discovery is a process, not due to intellectual analysis but rather to the attainment of human integrity. Mere knowledge does not free the mind, nor does it necessarily and inevitably lead to self-discovery. Spiritual attainment is not the perfection of the intellect, but rather an energy pouring into it from beyond it.

Man is an individual who is a solitary creature, with his own emotions, desires, interests, and ideals. But he also is an individual who is a member of a community which he shares
with others. Man's acts are not only for himself but also for the community and mankind at large, for the universal self. "The meaning of human existence is in a larger consciousness which man does not enter so long as he remains confined in his individuality."\(^{12}\)

Man naturally feels a sense of community, a natural kinship with the whole universe, a feeling of fellowship. This fellowship, this feeling for all living beings, is the natural result of and is further intensified by the spiritual life.

And yet, man is more than individual; he is conditioned by his relation to and with others and the environment. Man is constantly struggling to achieve harmony between himself and his environment. He must realize that fullness of life and integration consists in service and devotion to the whole. This is the only way in which fragmentation can be overcome. Man must strive to build a world of unity and harmony, where uniqueness and universality merge together. The individual fulfills his function in the whole; there he finds value. The self must be widened into universal spirit because it is the only way in which man can find meaning.

There is no doubt in the minds of most that something must be done because we cannot continue living in the manner in which we do and ever achieve the salvation and inward peace that we desire. We must remake our religion and our lives. A reborn faith in spiritual values is our deepest need. We need an increase of depth in all phases of our lives. What we are leading now is a life of double standards of morality, one for
the world of business and one for the world of religion. The two should be the same but they are not. Religion has compromised with the world and it needs to be reborn. We live in a world of force and violence that rationalizes brutality and claims it is not in conflict with religion. There has been a decadence in the moral sense of mankind. It is the individual who is the cause of the world's condition, and it is within his nature as to whether he exalts or defiles man.

Yet, we must not be without hope because man cannot live without the hope that humanity is able to rise to a higher moral plane. Man's destiny is to become more human and to be reconciled with all men. Human societies live by faith and hope, and these must be recovered in order for society to grow and improve.

Our society is not sick beyond saving for it suffers from divided loyalties, from conflicting urges, from alternating moods of exaltation and despair. This condition of anguish is our reason for hope. Religion is more than feeling, emotion, sentiment, instinct, ritual, perception, and faith. It is not a mere social phenomenon; neither is it an apology for the social order, nor merely an instrument for social salvation. The essence of religion is not social reform but spiritual redemption. Religion is the attempt to discover the ideal possibilities and potentialities of life.

It is not true religion unless it ceases to be a traditional view and becomes personal experience. It is an independent functioning of the human mind, something unique, possessing an autonomous character. It is something inward and personal which unifies all values and organizes all experiences. It is the reaction of the whole man to the whole of reality.
The religious sense is the instinct for the real, an insatiable desire accompanied by a total dissatisfaction with the limitations of the finite and the transient.

Religious consciousness is not simply intellectual and/or ethical and/or aesthetic. It includes these elements and yet transcends them. The object of religion is not the True, the Good, or the Beautiful, but God as universal consciousness who includes and yet transcends these values. These values are not known by the senses or by reason but by intuition or faith. They are dynamic values possessed by divine consciousness. The religious includes the cognitive, the aesthetic, and the ethical sides of our lives. The realization of life is in seeing an underlying harmony through all conflict, of seeing the universality of scientific laws, the beauty in the universe, and the goodness the universe is striving to achieve.

Religion is the attempt to bridge the gap between God and man and to create unity. Religion tries to restore the unity that has been lost between man and nature. Religion insists on an organic connection between the world of nature and the world of values. It makes man more than a transient and isolated being. It is through the teaching of science and religion that we see the organic nature and the unity of the universe. Religion shows us that we are more than products of merely physical forces. It is the progressive attempt at self-realization. It is the endeavor to abstract from the definite manifestations of life, to cultivate the interior life, and to attain salvation by transforming our being. It is a process of self-discovery through meditation.
"True religion means the unmaking of your lower self and the remaking of your higher self. It is putting yourself into conformity with the spirit of the divine." The purpose of religion, which is spiritual awakening, is the ideal, and is much different from actual life. Religion is more than a personal spiritual awakening. It is more than an individual affair; it must end in fellowship. Furthermore the sacred ought to penetrate the secular. The spiritual life of contemplation must be able to care for the practical life. Religion is not the life of resignation; rather it is one of courage and adventure.

The truth of a religion consists not in what is singular to it but in what can be shared with others. For the most, past ideals are similar among religions. The goal is the furthering of universal life. It is the realization of the whole and complete man involving a process of self-discovery, self-knowledge, and self-fulfillment.

The aim of religious discipline is the unitive life; it is the integration with the self. "It is the function of religion to reaffirm the intuitive loyalty to life and solidarity of human nature, to lift us out of the illusion of isolation and take us back to reality." Religion is not, or should not merely be, a release from suffering, but a transition from the unreal to the real, from falsehood to truth, from slavery to liberty.

The Supreme "is not an idea that is conceived but a reality that is experienced." The Supreme is not an object of knowledge but the very condition of knowledge. The Supreme is the ultimate and can only be expressed in negatives. However:
There is a danger in these negative descriptions. By denying all attributes and relations we expose ourselves to the charge of reducing the ultimate being to bare existence which is absolute vacuity. The negative account is intended to express the soul's sense of the transcendence of God, the "wholly other," of whom naught may be predicted save in negations, and not to deprive God of his positive being. It is the inexhaustible positivity of God that bursts through all conceptual forms. When we call it nothing we mean that it is nothing which created beings can conceive or name and not that it is nothing absolutely.

The Divine eludes definitive statement; he is a 'that of which nothing can be said.' Through the use of negatives we bring out the sense of otherness of the divine. But man needs something more definite and positive, such as the category of self-conscious personality, i.e., God. Each interpretation of the divine reveals an aspect and a clue to the nature of the divine, but not one of them gives the whole truth. Each is only partially true. In order to understand the divine we must put Him in human terms. The varying representations and ways of addressing the divine do not tell us about what God is in himself but only what He is to us.

Hinduism is a matter of man's encounter with the ultimate mystery of the world. Doctrines, dogmas, and rituals are instruments which help the individual see the Absolute face-to-face, to see the Absolute manifested in space and time, i.e., a personal God. "This world has meaning and value only in so far as it realizes in time and existence that which transcends time and existence." The Supreme is sometimes viewed as super-personal Absolute and sometimes as personal God. "The Supreme in its non-relational aspect is the Absolute; in its active aspect it is God."
The Supreme is neither completely transcendent nor completely immanent; He is both. The unity of God and man is found in the immanental aspect while in the transcendental view there is an attitude of otherness, a feeling that there is always something unknown and unspoken. This is not a fundamental contradiction but two ways of viewing one and the same thing. The Supreme as impersonal is the Absolute; as personal and self-aware the Supreme is God.

Pure apprehension of the Absolute is extremely rare. Symbols and images are forced on man by his very nature; it is nearly impossible for man not to give concrete form to intuitions that are unseen. Symbolism is basic to human life, but symbols are only and can never be more than symbols. All sincere religious worship is that of the Supreme though it may take many varied forms. We need these mental images of the Absolute so that He will be intelligible to man. But these appellations of the Absolute are purely man-made distinctions.

The great problem of the philosophy of religion has been in the reconciliation of the character of the Absolute as in a sense eternally complete with the character of God as a self-determining principle manifested in a temporal development which includes nature and man.21

It has often been said that the worship of a personal God is a sign of our spiritual infancy. We look on Absolute Spirit as the ultimate truth of the eternal and personal God as the relative truth of mortal existence.

A 'Personal God' had meaning only for the practical religious consciousness and not for the highest insight. To the finite individual blinded by the veils, the Absolute seems to be determinate and exclusive of himself. ... 22
Man has three kinds of awareness: the logical, the perceptual, and the intuitive. All three belong to human consciousness. The human mind does not function in fractions. Intuition is integral knowledge; it is direct and immediate. Intellectual knowledge is that of scientific procedure; it measures, limits and divides. It is objective knowledge, independent of he who holds it. It is impersonal; it is the separation of the mind from the object. It gives the formal structure of existence but does not give inner truth; it fails to give unitary and dynamic characteristics of the processes it discovers and explains. In intuitive knowledge, man is no longer an impartial observer; rather, he is thoroughly involved. Perception gives us outward qualities of an object. Intellect discerns the law of which the object is an example. But it is intuition which gives depth and meaning to the object.

There are varieties of cognitive experience which result in knowledge of the real. Some are produced by sense experience, others by discursive reasoning, and others by intuitive apprehension. Through sense experience we learn about the external world. Logical knowledge is obtained by analyzing data supplied by perception. It is a process of synthesis. Logical knowledge is conceptual knowledge, symbolic and indirect. Through sense experience and logical knowledge, man is able to gain somewhat of a control over his environment. But "both these kinds of knowledge are recognized as inadequate to the real which they attempt to apprehend."[23] The reality of the world is not revealed in logical or sense knowledge.
The nature of reality is comprehended by the creative effort of the whole man and not just the intellectual or the sensual. We need sense experience to know the externals and intellect to understand logical connections. But it is only through the intuitive faculties that we can know the spirit, the inner nature of things. We must not become totally absorbed in the details of the sense and the intellect for then the inner nature of things is lost, and we cannot see into the life of things.

Throughout history, the major philosophers have stressed the importance of intuition. Plato believed that the major convictions of life were derived from intuition. Descartes said that the truth of intuitive thought and ideas is their clear intelligibility and perceptibility. Spinoza stated that only intuition can give man the true reality of life; reason gives merely systematic knowledge of the man of science. Leibniz believed that knowledge was more than perceptual or conceptual. Pascal once stated that 'The heart has its reasons which are quite unknown to the head' and that reason itself admits of an infinite region beyond reason. Kant said that any pure logical demonstrability of God was impossible. The capacities of knowledge were limited to the phenomenal world. We cannot give a completely integrated account of experience because human knowledge is conditioned by the senses. There must be something more which he called the ideas of pure reason, i.e., intuition. We must go beyond the intellect. Hegel held a monistic view of the universe. He believed that reality was a single spiritual organism, a unity that is not arrived at by the process of the dialectic.
The sense of the One is realized in the mind before it is conceptually determined; it is an intuition and not a demonstration.

The great philosophers admit that the root principles are articles of faith, and not attained by argument. They are not arrived at through the senses, or by the ordinary processes of logical reasoning. Convictions arise only through our realizing them as the common ground of all our knowledge.

Religious intuition is all encompassing and totally fulfilling. Intuitive insight is the realization of the undivided unitary life from which intellect and emotion, imagination and interest, are derived. It is the essence of the spiritual life. Intellectual skill does not necessarily lead to intuitive experience. This life of spirit is of a creative character which cannot be gained through the exercise of the intellect.

We must not confuse the spiritual life with the instinctive or unconscious. Instinct is the source of vitality, the feeling for unity, the desire for oneness. The scope of instinct as unconscious is limited though it adds much to our lives. Unconscious unity of life has made instinctive knowledge possible, but it has been destroyed by the intellect which enables man to know himself and control his environment. Yet it is this intellectual knowledge which alienates man from nature. To bring the intellect into closer contact with life itself, we must combine it with instinctive knowledge. This combination is intuition, the directness and unity of the instinctive together with the consciousness of intellectual knowledge. Intellectual consciousness has destroyed the
wholeness of man's being and his spontaneity. Knowledge and being have become divorced from one another, and they must be reunited.

The intellect cannot fully synthesize the whole of reality. The intellect gives mere abstraction. The intellect binds life to concepts; it is not dynamic but static. It is intuitive knowledge which gives insight. Absolute knowledge is non-sensuous immediate knowledge, arising from the fusion of the mind with reality. It is knowledge by being and not by senses or symbols. It is the means of knowing through identity; we become one with truth, one with the object of knowledge. The object is not outside of the self but part of it. There is no distinction between the knower and the known.

Hinduism illustrates intuitive knowledge by the knowledge of the self: man becomes aware of his own self by an identity with it. "Self-knowledge is inseparable from self-existence. It seems to be the only true and direct knowledge we have: all else is inferential."25 It is the basis of all proof, so that it, itself, cannot be proven. The self is implicit in all awareness. It is the whole of man where thought and existence become fused in self-consciousness.

The intellect is useful for action; it is the means of organizing inanimate matter into tools for our use. But the intellect is only part of the whole personality, and we need the whole of it in order to know the inner nature of reality. Intuitions are expressive of life and are not mere logical analyses. They are transmitted not by precise scientific statements but by myth. The true test of knowledge is certainty
and non-communicability as in an intuitive experience. Intuition needs no proof; it is existence aware of itself. It is certainty not through logical validity but rather as self-evident.

Both intellectual and intuitive kinds of knowledge are justified and have their own rights. Each is useful for its own specific purposes. Logical knowledge enables us to know the conditions of the world in which we live and to control them for our ends. We cannot act successfully without knowing properly. But if we want to know things in their uniqueness, in their indefeasible reality, we must transcend discursive thinking. Direct perception or simple and steady looking upon an object is intuition. It is not a mystic process, but the most direct and penetrating examination possible to the human mind. Intuition is not opposed to the intellect but lies beyond it. It is perfect knowledge, not a-logical but supra-logical. The intellect is only a fragment while intuition is the whole.

Intuition is dynamic thinking controlled by grasping the situation as a whole. It is a process of deep rationality, of thinking more profoundly, feeling more deeply, seeing more clearly. We think, feel, and see with the whole of our nature and not just with a part of ourselves such as the intellect. Intuition is not abstract thought; it has intellectual content.

Intuitive knowledge is characterized by a relation which is direct, personal, simple, and intimate. It is often criticized as that which is subjective and incommunicable, which does not give universal truth and therefore is incapable of verification. Actually, Intuitive knowledge is verified by its capacity to bring coherence and harmony into systems framed by the intellect. The immediacy of intuitive knowledge can be mediated through intellectual definition and analysis.... Intuition and intellect are complementary.
Intuition is direct experience, transcending conceptual expressions. The intellect is needed to support and clarify intuitive experience, but perceptual experience or logical knowledge are not the basic principles from which man gains his deepest convictions.

It is through intuition that man becomes aware of the harmony of the universe. The intellect supplies the necessary tools while the intuitive faculties provide the spark for true creative genius and the means for bringing about the integration of the whole man.

Intuition is the spiritual apprehension or awareness of real values which are neither objects in space and time nor universals of thought. The objects of intuition are not created but recognized by us. Ours is an age of rationalism, and we ought to recognize the need for intuition, that which cannot be demonstrated but only experienced. Man's mind is not creative of reality but merely receptive to it. We obtain reality outwardly by perception, inwardly by intuition, and through the intellect we interpret and understand it. Intuition gives us a sense of organic wholeness. The intellect can only go so far; it cannot give us the full understanding of, say, the beauty of holiness or the wonder of love, that the intuitive faculties can give.

However, we must be careful not to confuse the insistence on intuition with anti-intellectualism. If intuition ignores the intellect, it is of no value. Intuition involves reason and the intellect because it is the response of the whole man to reality. Intuition is dependent upon and continuous with
thought. It reveals the living reality underlying the con­ceptual context of knowledge. Intuition is not an excuse or apology for what cannot be grounded on or justified by the intellect. It is not to be confused with trances or ecsta­tic moments.

Indian thought requires us to abstract from sense life and discursive thinking in order to surrender to the deepest self where we get into immediate con­tact with reality. To know better, we must become different, our thoughts and feelings must be deeply harmonized. Intuition is not only perfect knowledge but also perfect living. The consecration of the self and the knowledge of reality grow together. The fully real can be known only by one who is him­self fully real.

Religion is an attempt to account for our experiences as a whole. Interpretations of our experiences need to be guided by reason; it is the only way to attain the truth. Religion and reason cannot contradict one another. We must realize that science and reason cannot unveil all of the mysteries of the universe, that there is something beyond finite man, which is in no sense contradictory but complementary to him.

We need to realize that there is only so much that sci­ence can do for us. We must recapture the intuitive powers that have disappeared from our lives; it is up to the intui­tive faculties to show us the beauty, splendor and coherence of the universe. It is empathy and not just sympathy. In other words, it is more than feeling with; it is feeling into. It is projection into that which is contemplated and actually becoming involved in its being.

Until we have the inevitable fusion of the divine and the temporal, the subtle interpenetration of the spirit through the whole man, we will not have the quiet fire that burns, the lightning flash of
vision that illuminates the darkness of the earth and the virgin apprehensions that take away the sting from the pains of mortality. 29

Our problem is that we are too intellectual. What we need in order to be great is inspiration and not only intellect.

Life is a struggle against doubt and despair, and it often seems that the contemporary situation leaves us without hope. But we must not sink to nihilistic despair. We need direction and hope if the state of indecision in which we live is not to lead us to chaos. Belief is often difficult, but the need for believing is a necessity. What we need is a collective rational purpose, direction, and hope; we cannot continue in the aimless and haphazard state in which we live.

The need of the world today is for a religion of the spirit, which will give a purpose to life, which will not demand any evasion or ambiguity, which will reconcile the ideal and the real, the poetry and the prose of life, which will speak to the profound realities of our nature and satisfy the whole of our being, our critical intelligence and our active desire. 30

It is the spirit in man which is supreme. Spirit cannot be proven to be real for it cannot be conceived of as objective reality and cannot be compared to subjective or objective substance; rather, spirit is life, energy, and real in itself. Spirit gives us constant contact with the creative principle of which life is a manifestation. Spirit exists in every soul, though it is often not expressed. Spirit is within the man, and there is no need to destroy and deny man in order to find it. Spiritual salvation is a gradual process. It does not come abruptly, but it is the development and ultimate maturation of what is already within man. Spiritual salvation is a slow process of bringing life to fruition.
Spiritual insight is the integration of personal life, a fusing of finite and infinite. Spirit is not without mind or body. The spiritual does not belong to the realm of the abstract but to the realm of the concrete and the actual; it needs all of man's being. The health of the body and the mind are essential but not the primary aims of life. We must not suppress the instinctual, intellectual, emotional or aesthetic aspects of man, for their development helps satisfy and enable man to express the spirit within him. Man is caught in the finite world and yet is aspiring for the infinite. The peak of human evolution is the development from materialized to spiritualized being, living in the immortality of spirit though attached to the mortal body. It is a process of self-finding and self-becoming.

Though the spiritual transcends human categories, the best in man is somewhat close to it. It is the very center of man's being that best approximates that of the spiritual. Through self-contemplation and the process of internalization, the self becomes aware of its own existence, but more importantly, the existence of spirit of which the particular self is a focus point. The spirit is mirrored in the individual self. This is the 'tat tvam asi' (that art thou) of the Upanisads. This is the same as the biblical statement in Genesis 1.27 that man was created in the image of God, and therefore the essence of man is within the true revelation of God. This is the ultimate binding of every self to God, not peculiar to any particular individual.
The spiritual within man is his underlying unity, sustaining his body, mind, and will. In the minutia of everyday life we lose consciousness of the vast mystery of our being and become so absorbed in the petty details and trivialities of life that we forget the deepness and beauty within us. We must transcend, get out of our everyday self; we must truly lose our self to find it.

The need for religion persists. This is a self-conscious age, and yet man cannot find himself. Man cannot find that which will bring him peace; he cannot unveil the spirit within himself. Man's need to come to an understanding with life is urgent.

Life is fragmentary and futile. Nothing means much or matters much. Anxious and enquiring minds are doubting and discussing, groping and seeking for the more precious meaning of life, its profounder reality, for the synthetic view which will comprehend the scepticisms and the certainties, the doubts and the realities of contemporary life. Our division is profound and no organized religion is able to restore the lost unity. We are waiting for a vital religion, a live philosophy, which will reconstruct the bases of conviction and devise a scheme of life which men can follow with self-respect and creative joy. Salvation is self-recovery....

It is through the religion of spirit that the freedom of the human individual and the unity of mankind can be realized. These are the fundamental truths of the major religions. The religion of spirit is the eternal religion, transcending race and creed, applicable to all but not one particular religion or individual. It is through the religion of spirit that we can create a human consciousness of community and a sense of personal relationships which are needed to create a universal human community.
The world is a single co-operative group. There can be no religious unity and peace as long as any particular religion claims to be the only one in possession of the truth. We must seek a unity of religions not in common creed but in common quest, a unity of spirit and not just organization. Unity does not consist in uniformity. Not uniformity but a rich harmony is what is desired. The various religions are not incompatible but complementary to one another and therefore indispensable to each other in order to realize the common end of a richly harmonized spiritual world philosophy.

We need to rise to a conception of God above all gods, beyond the prejudices of our own nature. The One who is the truly ultimate is the common element of all religions and religious experiences. It is just our frame of reference and hence our interpretations which differ. And yet, the experience is unique to the individual involved. It is this variety of religious experiences which add to and make for spiritual richness. The unity of different religions can only be achieved in an inward and spiritual way.

Religion is the awareness of our real nature in God. This is a universal need. The unity of religions is based not in what is temporary and local in them but in that which is divine and universal. There is a diversity between religions, but diversity does not necessarily entail discord.
We are desirous of a fellowship of religions and not a fusion; this fellowship is based on the foundational character of man's religious experience. Religions ought to retain their individualities, their distinctive characteristics as long as they are not a hindrance to the sense of spiritual fellowship.

Religion is living in contact with ultimate reality. It is not a subjective phenomena, nor is it just the cultivation of the inner life. Rather, religion is the apprehension of that which stands over against the individual. The reality of religion is known as something experienced and not as the conclusion of a logical argument.

Religion is the experience of reality. It is more concerned with life than with doctrine. It is a matter of the whole self in the context of human relations and not just a matter of belief. Religion ought to be a part of our everyday lives. The emphasis should be on conduct and not creed, righteous living and not correct belief. There should not be such a sharp bifurcation between the sacred and the secular. We must not separate to such a great degree the sacred from the secular; we should not reject but synthesize the two. The spiritual is not apart but part of the everyday; it pervades all of life. Religion ought to be a means for social regeneration among other things, and it cannot be so if one's salvation can only be found beyond this life. If the end of man is spiritual salvation, it cannot be found in the separation
of this-worldly and other-worldly affairs; rather it is a hallowing of the everyday. Spiritual values ought to be a part of our lives. Intuition, experience, and inward realization are superior to intellect, dogma, and outer expression.

Religion is not the acceptance of academic abstractions or the celebration of ceremonies, but a kind of life or experience. It is the insight into the nature of reality, or experience of reality. This experience is not an emotional thrill, or a subjective fancy, but is the response of the whole personality, the integrated self to the central reality.32

Religious experience engages the whole person. It is a state of ecstasy or complete absorption of the whole being. It is a contemplative insight into the source of all life and not merely an escape into the subjective. Religious experience is not characterized by a subject-object state. It involves the wholeness of man, man as a totality. "It is a condition of consciousness in which feelings are fused, ideas melt into one another, boundaries broken and ordinary distinctions transcended."33 During the experience there is a sense of timeless being, where there is no past or present, where consciousness becomes synonymous with being, and where there is a fusion of subject with object and object with reality. There is no distinction between knower and known; rather, there is a feeling of universal self. The experience is felt to be sufficient and complete in itself. It needs no more, but finds meaning and value in itself. It is a positive feel-
ing of peace, oneness, inner unity with the self and outer unity with the universe.

It is very rare for a person to feel this totally; it is often felt only in part. The "average" man often catches a glimpse of this mood, of this mystic feeling, as in beholding a sunset or in the relation of human love. It is usually a transient experience and its permanency is quite uncommon. These experiences are like a revelation since they occur only at intervals. They cannot be continued at will, and sometimes they occur even against will. "So long as the experience lasts, the individual remains rapt in contemplation, but no man can rest in that state for all time. Life is a restless surge."34 The experience is transitory and intermittent.

The experience cannot be totally comprehended. During the experience itself, man is so overwhelmed he could not analyze what was going on, and actually he has no desire to do so until the experience is over. Later he tries to recapture it and remember it, but it cannot be realized. Then the process of reflection begins. He cannot forget that he has experienced something beautiful and magnificent, but what it was is now inexpressible and beyond communication and logical analysis. The experience is truly ineffable and transcends the experiences of the senses and the boundaries of logical constructions.

The person who has undergone such an experience has envisioned a different world, not more real than the con-
ventional world but more resplendent. He has an immediate and intuitive certainty of reality, and nothing can weaken or destroy this feeling of certainty that he has. Reason is needed along with this intuitive insight but does not by itself suffice.

Actually nothing positive can be said about its content. The attempt to describe its content falsifies it. Religious experience defies intellectual description. It is the infinite and hence beyond the bounds of finite expression; there are no words to explain it. It can only be communicated or described in some sense symbolically through the creative imagination, described through that which has no fixed or static meaning. It must be interpreted dynamically as life requires it to be. There can be no literal translation. Like myths, it is not important as scientific truth but in relation to what it means as a whole for the person involved.

The Hindu thinker did not rush to the conclusion that in religious experience we ascribe objective existence to subjective suggestions.... Religious experience is not the pure unvarnished presentment of the real in itself, but is the presentment of the real already influenced by the ideas and prepossessions of the perceiving mind. The mind of man does not function in fractions. It cannot be split up into a few sharply defined elements, as the intellect, the emotions, and the will. The intellect of man is not so utterly naked and undefiled as to justify the view that it is one and the same in all men.35

The Divine is one, but interpretations of it vary according to our own personal conditions, the environment, our prejudices, and all that has influenced our lives.
Our frame of reference is determined by our heredity and culture. The individual interprets the experience in terms of his frame of reference. There is no such thing as a pure experience. Mediation and interpretation may be unconscious but they are still there. Strictly speaking, there are no experiences which man does not interpret; it is only a question of degree.

The origin of religion is in the awareness that there is a greater life than what we are experiencing right now; it is a search for the greater self, and it is an evolutionary process. It is a spiritual and not a dogmatic view of life. Spirituality is the core and inward essence of religion. Mysticism emphasizes this aspect of religion. It affirms the mystery in the universe and realizes that the mystery cannot be abolished. It is opposed to that which categorically denies the existence of God and to that which talks as if it knew all about God because both of these points of view destroy all of the mystery in the world.

Religion would be petty and small were it not for the sense of the unknown and mystery in the universe. "In mystic religion, God is not a logical concept or the conclusion of a syllogism but a real presence, the ground and possibility of all knowledge and values." Mysticism emphasizes the personal experience of God, contact with the creative spirit. It stresses the supreme mystery of the universe as that which must be experienced inwardly and not that to which you pay mere lip-service.
There is a definite inability of the finite human mind to solve the mystery of the relationship between God and the world. Furthermore, we cannot and should not try to eliminate the mystery in the world. We cannot measure the infinite by finite standards. The attempt to make religion completely rational is in itself wrong. Humanity cannot be saved by a religion which closes man's mind or is bound and limited by man's mind. It is only by the religion which demands man to think and enter into spiritual creativity that humanity can be saved.

Mysticism is not to be confused with the instinctive or the irrational because it cannot be contrary to reason. It assumes the indivisible oneness of life. The mystical concerns the whole self and aims at the integration, not the fragmentation of man. The mystical is a testimony of spiritual experience. It is the creative act of power and strength of the soul. It is opposed to all the puts authority above truth and so revolts against institutionalism and stereotyped forms of religious life.

The mystic experience is more than feeling; it is perfect insight. It is the "Super-spirit" living in man, giving him a transcendent personality, an illimitable independence. It is a constant unity with the divine, a spiritual union. Mystical experiences are similar at all times no matter what race or age. This does not mean an absolute identity of mystic experiences but that there are only individual variations within a large framework. Due
to the universality of mystic experiences, they are able to transcend the differences between the various religions. It is our intellectual representations and interpretations which vary because they bring out different aspects of the one central reality. The mystic experience, with its universal character, offers a way to transcend the differences between organized religions. It is a possible solution to the contemporary problem of the fragmentary nature of man.

The integral elements of Hindu religious thought are the supremacy of Absolute spirit, the reality of mystic consciousness, the distinction between the intellect contemplating the intelligible in detached fashion and as thoroughly rapt in enthusiasm and transcended above itself, the non-ultimateness of this world, and the belief that salvation is possible for all because the divine is within all. Hinduism believes that all religions are a varied expression of a single truth, and therefore Hinduism adopted an attitude of tolerance. It is a mosaic of all types and stages of religious aspiration. It has adapted itself to all human needs and yet has a unified form. It has remained so by interpreting all as different aspects of the Supreme.

Hinduism starts from and returns to an experimental basis in contrast to other religions which begin with a particular event or person, e.g., Christianity - Jesus, Judaism - Abraham, Islam - Mohammed. Hinduism has no definite creed. It is a coherent unity of spiritual thought
and realization, constantly growing and changing. Reli-
gions usually owe their inspirations to their prophets.
Hinduism differs markedly in this respect. It never leaned
on authority to the extent other religions did and do, nor
does it center around an historical event. "Its distinctive
characteristic has been its insistence on the inward life of
spirit."37

The epoch of founders for Hinduism is the Vedic peri-
od. Veda (the wisdom) is the highest spiritual truth for
finite man; it is the result of rsis or seers; it is divine
intuition and not a product of logical reasoning. The rsis
are not the authors of this truth but those able to see the
eternal truths.

Hindu religion is not a revelation through faith but
the attempt to reveal and unveil the deepest layers of man's
self. It is concerned with the facts of life's depths.
Hinduism insists on experience. As salvation it is more
of a transforming experience than a notion of God. The
essence of religion is not the existence of deity but its
power to transform men. The ultimate aim of the individual
is salvation where faith and ritual have subordinate posi-
tions. The destiny of the Hindu is to change body into
soul, to realize the world's potential for virtue and to
derive happiness from it. The goal is the development of
the individual, of the real self, not what man often mis-
takes his self to be but spiritual freedom. It is not to
be enclosed in one's ego but to aspire to universality. Perfection of the self entails transformation from an individual, narrow life to a free, spiritual one; it consists in harmonizing life with reality. This does not mean abstinence from the world. It is not inactivity; rather it is the need of surrendering the individual claim and identifying with the universal life. It is a denial of individual desires. Hinduism emphasizes not inaction but inward action. This is consistent with normal living. There is no schism with ordinary life, but rather an integration of man's whole being and never denying the need for emotional expression, material well-being, and a right and just law or code for living.

Like all religions, Hinduism has been criticized on various points. One of the major aspects that is susceptible to criticism is that the emphasis on ecstasy in Hinduism leads to world and life negation. It is often believed that Hindu thought is essentially otherworldly, and that humanist ethics and otherworldliness are incompatible, where salvation as a process of self-discovery is non-ethical. It is believed that Hinduism is a refuge from life, an escape rather than a reconciliation; it is freeing the soul from the finite and not transforming it into the infinite.

By taking an overall view of history we realize that Eastern and Western views of life are not contradictory.
"Both of them are tackling the same problem, the reconciliation of the values of mind with those of spirit." The tension between mind and spirit must be resolved. Human life demands co-existence and co-operation, a dynamic process of action and interaction.

The terms East and West are general concepts that are often misleading. Distinctions between the two are difficult to make for neither one is a single corporate entity; each has a variety of sub-divisions. There are numerous religious beliefs and practices, and yet, there also are many similarities between their religious systems. Furthermore, we can achieve an increasingly greater apprehension of truth through an appreciation of other ideas. The division is mainly in outward forms of life, the external way of approaching things. In actuality, a better comprehension of the various forms can lead to an understanding of the universal truth of spiritual life. The ultimate questions are the same everywhere; it is only the approaches and emphases which differ.

In relation to the West, the East is more concerned with religion as basically other-worldly, where this world is a mere stepping stone, a preparation for a much more beautiful and fuller life, and yet not denying the importance of this life. While the Western tradition is more concerned with humanism, the two however are not mutually exclusive. It is fallacious reasoning to identify religion
with world and life negation and humanism with ethics and social progress. The two are not contradictory to each other but complementary, for religion cannot raise the inner man to a higher level until his external existence (i.e., his ethics) has been raised.

Radhakrishnan takes a universal stand. He is in sympathy with all creative forms of religious life. He is concerned with a synthesis between Eastern and Western thought as representative of two complementary poles of spiritual experience. He believes that the problem of world religions can be solved through a co-ordination of Eastern inwardness and Western activism. Radhakrishnan is intensely aware of the rationalism so characteristic of Western thought which needs to be balanced by an Eastern understanding of inwardness. What is needed is a combined philosophy of Western humanism and Eastern religion, one that is more profound and more alive than either, with a greater spiritual and ethical force.

Radhakrishnan lauds the activism of the West, but he still upholds the Eastern preference for quietism, viewing contemplation as the surest road to reality. The West regards nature not as something only external to which we must accommodate ourselves, but rather adopts a scientific attitude and views nature as something to be controlled and mastered. Radhakrishnan would rather leave things as they are, thereby making no great demands on life. To the
extent that Radhakrishnan leaves what he views to be the external world, i.e., Nature, alone, the Western view insists on exploring it. This has led to an appalling abuse of knowledge to the point where we can destroy ourselves at the touch of a button, and yet it has also opened up vast areas and seemingly limitless possibilities that are closed to the Eastern point of view.

Radhakrishnan's integral experience points the way, even if it misconstrues the goal. It needs to be purged of its inconsistencies and shorn of its extravagances, and to become more genuinely integral, inclusive of more facts, more science, more naturalism. Sometimes he is vague and indefinite, or in his attempts to be definitive, he is inconsistent. Again, sometimes he is otherworldly, or in his attempts to be practical, he is too Oriental to serve planetary culture without further crystallization. But, if, in any way, within the limitations proper to thinking, India can naturalize its spiritualism and the West can spiritualize its naturalism, there may be a profound and moving integration in philosophies.39
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Both Buber and Radhakrishnan would say that we must rid ourselves of the excessive use of science because the scientific method abstracts and theorizes and therefore cannot teach us about the concrete individual. The method of science deals with only part of man, and our concern is with the whole of man. The individual is becoming of diminishing importance in relation to our complex mass society. He is becoming more and more a function of society, a merely marginal phenomenon.

Radhakrishnan's emphasis is that of an internal religious approach. He believes that there is a source of insight of a higher order than reason and views our scientific attitude which excludes intuitive insight as the greatest obstacle in achieving harmony in the world and a coherent unity between men.

We now seem to live in a period of scientific self-sufficiency when we dismiss ultimate questions as absurd and unanswerable, when we look upon human beings as complicated machines and disregard their agonies and ecstasies as survivals of a prescientific age. We pretend that the world we comprehend in sterilized sobriety is the only world there is. Religion is being slowly edged out of existence.
Radhakrishnan believes that religion today is unscientific and unsocial. Much of humanity are victims of unwilling disbelief due to the inconsistencies in traditional religion. The issue for religion now is not concerning doctrinal or ritual discord but the very existence of religion itself.

Buber, like Radhakrishnan, also views intellectualism and the scientific attitude as the major hindrance to world harmony and a significant cause of man's increased sense of solitude. Man is no longer in control of the machines that he has created for his own use. Furthermore, Buber says, as does Radhakrishnan, that the scientific method does not grasp the whole man; it excludes the intuitive insight which is an essential part of man.

Buber believes that the old forms of religion and tradition are decaying. He would agree with Tillich's view that:

The anxiety of emptiness is aroused by the threat of non-being to the special contents of the spiritual life. A belief breaks down through external events or inner processes: one is cut off from creative participation in a sphere of culture, one feels frustrated about something which one has passionately affirmed, one is driven from devotion to one object to devotion to another and again to another because the meaning of each of them vanishes.... Everything is tried and nothing satisfies. The contents of tradition however excellent, however praised, however loved once, lose their power to give content today.2

Both Radhakrishnan and Buber believe that religious feeling is an addition to a person's life that cannot be
added by mere desire or will. It is what the theologian calls "grace". Religion is an added dimension, a certain rapturousness. Religion, in general terms, refers to the belief in an unseen order and where supreme good consists in harmonious adjustment to it. In religion, we feel as if there were something there, adding new depths of meaning to what otherwise is a seemingly futile existence; and yet this something cannot be defined. "It is as if there were in the human consciousness a sense of reality, a feeling of objective presence, a perception of what we may call 'something there'..." a sense of reality greater than what our senses give us. This "something" cannot be defined precisely because there is something within the individual which absolutely is certain that there is more to life than conclusions reached by pure rationalistic logic; "...something in you absolutely knows that the result must be truer than any logic-chopping rationalistic talk...".

Religion, as it is man's total reaction upon life, is the means of unifying the total individual, of bringing about a strong coherence, and of remedying the inner incompleteness and discord within man into one harmonious unit.

Both Radhakrishnan and Buber view the crisis of contemporary man as a result of our technological and massified society which fragments and functionalizes the individual man. Both men see that the individual becomes
morally and spiritually inferior in the mass. There is a definite need for a rebirth of spirit, a spiritual re-awakening, a recovery of faith.

The world is undergoing changes so vast that they are hardly comparable to the changes which occurred in the past. The contemporary situation is pregnant with great possibilities, immense dangers or immeasurable rewards. It may be the end or a new beginning. The human race may end by destroying itself or its spiritual vitality may revive and a new age may dawn when this earth will become a real home for humanity.

If the individual is not regenerated in spirit then society cannot be either. Salvation of the world consists in salvation of the individual. Therefore, there is a need for a change of the inner man; the individual needs a directing and ordering principle in his dissociated state.

Buber's concern is with the wholeness of man which can be realized only in relation, partnership, dialogue. This is a crucial difference between Radhakrishnan and Buber, as well as between the Indian and Semitic traditions in general: the former is individualist, (with the concept of the ātman and all that follows), while the latter is communal, (e.g., a holy people).

Buber is not concerned with a particular philosophical system or ideology but with the concrete and existential characteristics of man. It is this philosophy of dialogue which is the essence of Buber's thought because it is, Buber believes, through relating with others that the individual truly comes alive and is able to experience
the fulness and depth of life. Buber believes that man is revealed in community and to understand the nature of man one must not merely study the individual man but how he relates to others, nature, and the spiritual world.

Radhakrishnan would agree with Buber when he says that man is neither good nor evil but both together. To use Buber's terminology, he says that man is the creature of the between with the potentiality of being the best or the worst of all living creatures. Radhakrishnan parallels this thought when he says that man is a paradoxical being, full of contradictions and capable of rising to the greatest of heights or of sinking to the lowest of depths.

It is important to note in the philosophies of both of these men that man is by nature neither good nor evil but both together. Contemporary man is no more "evil" than were his brothers of antiquity. He has the same inclination for evil as he does for good.

It is not that present-day man is capable of greater evil than the man of antiquity or the primitive. He merely has incomparably more effective means with which to realize his proclivity to evil. As his consciousness has broadened and differentiated, so his moral nature has lagged behind.

Radhakrishnan's thought concurs with Buber's when he says that man is more than an individual and that he is conditioned by his relation to and with others and the environment. This aspect of Radhakrishnan's thought, namely the concept of relation and meeting, is an impor-
tant aspect of his philosophy though it does not play the role to the extent that it does in Buber's philosophy.

Both Radhakrishnan and Buber realize that the distance between man and man is becoming increasingly greater and that this bridge must be gapped if modern man is ever to live in a harmonious world and achieve salvation.

The question of human relationship and of the inner cohesion of our society is an urgent one in view of the atomization of the pent-up mass man, whose personal relationships are undermined by general mistrust.7

It is also important to note in the philosophies of each of these men, that neither one wants to disregard the scientific method. It is just that science has its place and it is limited; it does not encompass the whole of reality. Buber discusses this question when he talks about the I-It relation. He says that although the I-Thou encounter contains the deeper meaning of reality and existence, the I-It relation must not be looked on as a negative one. Rather it is a needed relation because man requires scientific knowledge in order to gain an objective perspective of the world. The I-It relationship becomes evil when it claims to be the only valid means of apprehending reality. It is, Buber states, in the I-Thou encounter that man truly becomes man because it is where man becomes whole and is able to experience absolute meaning by sharing with others.
Radhakrishnan parallels this aspect of Buber's thought in his discussion of the relationship existing between intuition and intellect. Radhakrishnan states that the intellect is necessary because it is the means by which man is able to control the environment. However man must go beyond the intellect. It is by means of the intuitive faculties that man is able to grasp the whole of reality. Intuition is able to bring the intellect into closer contact with life. Intuition is not devoid of intellect but rather is the combination of the instinctual and rationalistic elements of man. It reveals the whole man because it is concerned with man as a totality and is able to give penetrating insights into the nature of reality. While the intellect concerns itself with only part of man, intuition involves the whole personality. And yet, intuition, as the response of the whole man to reality, is of no value unless it involves the intellect.

Buber also realizes the necessity and yet the limits of the intellect. The intellect is valuable in that it helps man to order and control the world, but its weakness lies in that it keeps us apart from the world. Although Buber does not believe in the supremacy of intuition as does Radhakrishnan, he does say that it is the best means of apprehending the nature of man in his relation to others and his environment and that it most closely approximates the I-Thou way of knowing.

It is mainly in the area of what the West terms "God" and Buber calls the "Eternal Thou" and what the East
designates as the "Absolute" and Radhakrishnan the "Supreme" that the two men differ. In the Indian tradition, ...it matters little whether you like to think of the eternal as God or deity, as personal or impersonal, possessed of qualities or devoid of them. Whatever He may be, you must find it in yourself.

According to the Western view, God is apprehended in personal form. The personal is necessary for the experience of God. It is a personal relationship with a personal God. However, according to the Eastern point of view, denial of the ego and personality is essential for salvation, and therefore it is illogical to project personality on the Absolute because personality itself is illusory. Unlike Old Testament literature and Western religions in general, in Indian religions there is no mention made of a personal God manifesting Himself and operating in and through history.

For Buber, the relationship between God and man is an extremely personal confrontation of an I and a Thou. The Eternal Thou is truly the Lord of heaven and earth. God reveals Himself to man as Lord, and as Lord He demands strict obedience. The personal relationship existing between man and God is fundamental; it is a reciprocal relation between an I and a Thou, and yet each remains distinct. Buber was wary of falling into the trap of identifying the human soul with God.

According to Buber, who is speaking from personal experience, this feeling of absolute oneness which induces the monist to claim that in trance...he is God, means nothing more than
that he is himself; he has experienced the deepest ground of his own creaturely being....

Buber sees God as the Eternal Thou who is met and recognized only in relationship. He can never be an object of thought or a logical construction, and He is also more than a subjective expression or emotion. The Eternal Thou is a living relationship who is part of everyday encounters and experiences.

The Eastern point of view of Radhakrishnan's philosophy can be easily seen in his discussion of the Supreme as experienced reality which can only be expressed in negatives. The use of negatives, namely that the Supreme is a 'that of which nothing can be said,' pervades much of Eastern philosophy and Radhakrishnan is no exception here. However, he does realize the inherent dangers in negative descriptions, namely in that of reducing the Supreme to nothingness. But Radhakrishnan says that it is only through the use of negatives that the sense of the otherness of the divine can be brought out. While Buber also realizes the "Wholly Other" nature of the Divine he in no sense stresses it to the extent that Radhakrishnan does.

Where Buber confirms the Divine as "Absolute Person", Radhakrishnan says that man needs the category of self-conscious personality, (God), in order to understand the nature of the Divine. Radhakrishnan looks on this category as a weakness in man, as a sign of his spiritual infancy, while the category of the personal is, for Buber, essential in a positive sense.
Yet, Radhakrishnan definitely does think that this negative aspect has been carried too far by many Indian philosophers, and he would say:

At our best moments we are conscious that we are in communion with something or somebody above ourselves. We often say, "with a Person," and though God is certainly not "such a one as ourselves" it seems to be true that the "I and thou" relation is never transcended. 10

Both Buber and Radhakrishnan realize the need for a spiritual revival and reawakening. Man needs a meaningful life; he cannot be governed by a static philosophy but only guided by one which is dynamic and moving. Although the contemporary situation might leave us in a state of despair, neither man would advocate sinking into nihilistic despair. Belief is difficult in modern times, but it is a definite necessity.

For Radhakrishnan, it is what he terms the "religion of spirit" that is the solution to our problems; it is what can bring meaning and purpose to our lives. Radhakrishnan believes that it is the spirit in man which is supreme because spirit brings man into constant contact with the creative principle of life. The spirit within man is concerned with the whole of man; it is a function of the total individual. It is the spirit within man which unifies all the different aspects of man; it is what brings body and mind, instinct and intellect, and desire and will all together into a coherent and cohesive whole. It is what enables man to transcend the minuteness of everyday life and to overcome the fragmentary and
futile nature of the contemporary world. The spirit within man, once actualized, is what frees the human individual and enables him to participate in sharing and living with others; it enables him to appreciate the beauty around him and to experience true community with his fellow man. The life of spirit will allow man to form personal relationships which are so vital in this distrusting and tension-loaded world, to experience those relationships which are a pre-requisite for the creation of a universal human community.

Buber parallels Radhakrishnan's concept of the religion of spirit as the solution to the contemporary crisis with his principle of dialogical living. For Buber, the meaning of religion, and ultimately of life itself, is found in the encounter between man and man and man and God. It is in dialogical living, in the act of experiencing that which is other, that man finds meaning.

Relationship...is not a category but an experience shared by two human beings.... [We must not] use people as things but see man always in his wholeness of being which cannot be understood except in relationship to other being.... The twentieth century has analyzed man, but some psychologies have all but fragmentized him. A synthesis must be effected before nuclear physics atomizes him and his civilization. 'The proper study of man' will accord him the dignity of treatment as subject, not as an object. It will address him, not as it, but as 'thou.'

Buber believes that it is only through dialogical living, through the meeting of I and Thou, that true human community can ever be achieved. Like Radhakrishnan,
he regards the experience of relationship as essential in the formation of a universal human community, and also in accord with Radhakrishnan's thought he realizes the need for a goal-defining world view that does not inhibit man but, rather, frees man and enables him to experience meaning in his life.

Both Buber and Radhakrishnan believe that man as a social animal cannot exist without a tie to the community. For the individual to find ultimate justification for his existence, for his individual and moral autonomy, he needs an:

...extramundane principle capable of relativizing the overpowering influence of external factors.... He needs the evidence of inner transcendent experience which alone can protect him from the otherwise inevitable submersion in the mass.\(^{12}\)

Man needs more than intellectual insight, and this is all that our technological age, as characterized by the scientific method is capable of giving to man. We must go beyond strictly rational and logical constructions. For fulfillment, man needs community in the sense of personal encounter between man and man and between man and God. Our philosophy must be more than an intellectual and academic matter; it must be a way of life, a living in constant contact with ultimate reality.

Both Buber and Radhakrishnan propose a religion which is the experience of reality, a religion that is a way of life, that is of everyday life and not something which is to be saved for a designated time or place. They advocate
a religion which deals with the whole man in his relation to others because it is only in his relation to others that man is able to realize himself. It is by means of the I-Thou relation for Buber and the religious experience for Radhakrishnan, that man becomes aware of a greater life than the one he is experiencing now. Man has become caught up and totally involved with himself and the minutiae of everyday life, and the religious experience and the I-Thou encounter can free him from this and enable him to participate in that which is greater than himself. They enable him to experience the mystery of the world and bring him into contact with the creative spirit of life. Most importantly, the religious experience and the I-Thou encounter enable man to transcend the differences between men and help lead to human community which both Radhakrishnan and Buber so strongly advocate.
FOOTNOTES


4. Ibid., p. 72.

5. Radhakrishnan, *op. cit.*, p. 3.


7. Ibid., p. 117.


9. Ibid., p. 92.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Braden, Charles Samuel, Man's Quest for Salvation, W.111ett, Clark, & Company, Chicago, 1941.


———, "Martin Buber's Challenge to Jewish Philosophy," Judaism, XIV/3(Summer 1965), 257-277.


Noveck, Simon, Great Jewish Thinkers of the Twentieth Century, Clinton, Massachusetts, 1963.


———, Eastern Religions and Western Thought, Oxford University Press, London, 1940.


ABSTRACT:

My Senior Scholars paper is mainly concerned with man's quest for meaning. As its title states, it is a study in the philosophies of Martin Buber and Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan in relation to man's search to find meaning in his life. It is in no way exhaustive of the thought of either of these men but only discusses their views as they relate to man's quest for meaning.

The paper is divided into four general areas: (1) Introduction: the introduction states the problem, namely, that there has been a breakdown of traditional values and norms and with this disintegration man has become alienated and has lost much meaning in his life. Here I take the approach of Viktor E. Frankl and state that the search for meaning is essential to life. Man must invest his life with as much meaning as is possible in order to live in a worthwhile manner.

(2) Buber: The second chapter of my paper deals with the thought of Martin Buber. It traces the evolution of Buber's thought from his early period of mysticism to his middle period of religious existentialism, and finally to his last and mature period of dialogical philosophy. This chapter focuses on Buber's philosophy of dialogue as the means of overcoming the contemporary crisis which Buber believes to be the homelessness of our age. It is through constant
dialogue or encounter that true communication can be achieved and the human community can be established. It is not, Buber believes, man alone, the individual man, that is important, but it is man in his relation to others, nature, and spirit that is vital.

(3) Radhakrishnan: The third chapter of my paper is concerned with the philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and focuses on what he considers to be the problem of our age, namely, the need for religious renewal where the goal is integration, an integration of man with man, man with nature, and man with the divine. Radhakrishnan sees the contemporary crisis as being one of modern man's disaffection and unrest, mainly caused by the overuse of the scientific method. Radhakrishnan views man as basically a spiritual being who can best overcome this problem and achieve the life of Spirit by means of intuitive insight.

(4) Conclusion: The final chapter of my paper is a comparison of the thoughts of Buber and Radhakrishnan for I found that both men hold many essential views that are similar. They both think that man must rid himself of the excessive use of science. Radhakrishnan's emphasis is that of an internal religious approach where intuitive insight is vital in order to achieve an harmonious and unified world and Buber's approach is that of the philosophy of dialogue or I-Thou relationship. Both men propose a religion which is the experience of reality, which is a definite part of everyday life, and which enables man to transcend the differences between men and lead to true human community.