

Varga Csaba

THE NEW WORLD VIEW

Theory and Programme of the Knowledge Society¹

**„The task of our science is
to shape the richness of senses
into thoughts and ideas.”**

Hegel

¹ This essay is a shortened version of the author's new book, due to be published in 2002.

The Prospects of the Scientific Theory

If we try to *scientifically analyse* the information society paradigm, suppose from an analytical point of view requirements for hands-on development of the information society are considered as secondary, we face a *dual* intellectual assignment. First of all we need to formulate the theory of information society, or knowledge society, and in doing so we are forced to reconsider *virtually all* scientific paradigms. On the other hand, we cannot possibly escape the theoretical dilemma, raised by the question, whether or not in the new century we are already in a position to integrate old and new scientific results into *socio-human processes* on a higher level.

Knowledge society probably may be defined in many ways. One of those certainly is the view that knowledge society is to *mate knowledge with society*, that is to integrate new knowledge in general and new scientific results in particular with society and with humanity at large. This is an accurate proposal, even though we are unable to sharply, substantially define the notions of knowledge and new knowledge, society and new society, given that we would like to concentrate upon the essence of that interaction between two poles (knowledge and society), wondering what type of *new society* may emerge from this “wedlock” – that correlation in itself posing a theoretical problem.

This way of looking at the problem requires a historical approach towards a grasp of those two poles. A 21st century liaison of knowledge and society does not occur in a historic vacuum, or in a time-space dimension void of history. By this approach we are actually closing a circle, leaving behind purely theoretical questions in favour of the *world of practice theory*, investigating shapes and contents of information society’s global, European and domestic movements.

One of the first hypotheses in any case holds that the knowledge society paradigm does not only represent a *new theory*, even though we consider approximate definition of new theories a top priority, but also a privileged theoretical and experimental lesson in view of factual examination of the theory’s practice. Global information society is not some kind of inconceivable tangle of processes, but in any case it completely overturns and scatters knowledge at the turn of the millennium, and by *integrating* theories of this new age *in new ways* into the world’s practice, in one way or another human civilisation and culture is radically organised into *a new order, or chaos*.

Science and global reality are equally creating a *new theory*, or a *new reality*, which inevitably becomes a focus of human reflection. This global task may seem as a threat to many, although we would prefer to perceive it as a reassuring lesson, in fact a theoretical and a theory-practical problem at once. Not surprisingly, the new century at the same time appears as the *feast of knowledge* and as the *shock of knowledge*. A feast, because an unprecedented measure of knowledge is about to reach just about every member of the human race, a shock, because almost all peoples and all inhabitants of this globalised

new-old world are exposed to some kind of fundamental intellectual challenge – and knowledge rushing may cause a shock-like reaction, before it even can be interpreted.

The 21st century is a *new reality superseding utopias* in more than one way. Preceding centuries in some way have been theory-practical trial runs of several utopias that organised political power. For now we do not care for the fact that those utopias may at once be described as inhuman and as benevolent to humanity. When utopian trial runs came to an end, this automatically meant that the utopia in question became outdated, regardless whether it was about the rule of democracy, communism, or fascism. Karl Mannheim's new theory of utopias² is already concerned with the 21st century, because according to him *utopia is true and practicable*, just as ideologies of all ages are false and impracticable. Therefore the 19th and 20th centuries are the age of ideological fake utopias, imitating the saving utopia, but in themselves false and impractical. An exception confirming the rule is e.g. Tocqueville's theory and standard of democracy³, even though that quality of democracy is still amongst the utopias interpreted by Mannheim.

In any case, the new century is the age following utopias, which is particularly valued if seen from Central Europe. No matter which past-century period or political structure is examined, thought-producing and knowledge-accumulating intellectuals in this region of the world only came up with *utopian "dreams"*, which even without support from the educated society soon were hopelessly outdated and left behind by "dull" history. If we parse the evolution of 20th century thought, including its vision for the future, we come up with negative utopias incorporating visions of fear, and only meet a few if any thinkers who anticipated the venue of the information age or of knowledge society.

The avenue of information society may be experienced as a nightmare, as a *dreadful vision*. If you take a scientific theory and make it subject to senseless, or even to reasonable visions of dread, soon the scientific theory will *lose all touch* with science and theory – which does not mean that all scientific hypotheses and theoretical thought structures are per se automatically leading towards some kind of *better world*. The better world by the way has been present for thousands of years, although at different ages it has not been perceived, or even we cannot see it. The future may *appear invisible* not only if anticipated, but also from retrospective, think of yesterday as perceived from the long-distant past. Integrating a theory of information society with a *global, utopian-based theory of the future* truly is a worthwhile enterprise.

² Karl Mannheim: Ideológia és utópia. (Atlantisz, Budapest, 1996)

³ Alexis de Tocqueville: Az amerikai demokrácia (Európa, Budapest, 1993)

Theory of the Super-Paradigm

The question of the super-paradigm has now become part of the agenda, because recently many observers feel or realise that the known world of the past two millennia is rapidly dissolving, while a space-time type history quickly becomes a reality ready to be described. Recent advances, stagnation and regression have created the impression of a global *system of relationships*, a *network of change*, which if examined reveals that time-space is a tangible reality not just within theoretical physics or in cosmology, but it may be experienced and reflected upon in historical terms on one planet of this solar system, called earth.

At the very least this means that we are not just talking of a substantial vision “only”, but of an equivalent, substantially different perception of the past also. Due to the birth of those fresh visions of past and future, the present is transformed definitely – and within the present the notion of space, time, and time-space. The existing substance, a complex reality, probably remains constant, even if not the same, but our knowledge and our discourse concerning “existing reality” and “wholeness” gain new shapes and contents.

There is no beginning to the process of history, if viewed backwards it runs into eternity; neither can we determine its end, even though on the grounds of our present knowledge a modern hypothesis was created concerning the astronomical ending and re-structuring of our solar system, and even though our solar system itself can't be examined as an isolated interstellar structure, but – according to the latest cosmological paradigm – solely in terms of a rather regular manifestation of quantum vacuum and within it of the cosmos. Cosmological space-time may be perceived as a *super-global* network of dimensions, and within that intellectual-material space-time we are able to interpret earthly change series, the latest blend and concentration of which we may call *super-paradigm*.

The word creation itself signals that a super-paradigm means a mix of present and future, evolving paradigms, a *new type of integration*. Space-time in terms of this world not only is a historical process lacking a beginning and an end, not only a military and political give-and-take of economical and political spheres of influence, but it lends a new, universal meaning to all which exists. The scientific description of those new denominations of meaning is called the *new theory*, or rather a system of theories.

The super-paradigm is new in *two respects*: once as a *sequence* of new paradigms, as a development of old paradigms, or simply as the occurrence of completely new paradigms; secondly as the innovative integration of several new paradigms, which on themselves also require substantial reconsideration – less of a hierarchical, single-centred system, but rather a network-type system. Amongst the more important *old-new paradigms we might list the following*: the new reality, or rather the new image of reality, the global-local alternative, the

new past (or interpretation of the past), the age of high-tech, spiritual matter, knowledge economy and the new role of economy, network society, the new anthropology, the new awareness, a unified society, the new future as a new form of existence, a new theology and regeneration into spiritual existence, and – within the ocean of new paradigms – the theory of information society and knowledge society. If we tempt to view those paradigms as a unity, we realise that those elements are intertwined, they depend upon each other. Another observation will be that no one single paradigm dominates without restrictions, and that *new characteristics* in common with all or most new paradigms (such as blurred borders between matter and spirit, interdependence of objectivity and subjectivity, cessation of the gulf between science and religion, partial transformation of hierarchies into networks, domination of mind, knowledge and information, etc.) together may be defined as *new leading denominations of meaning*.

The essence of super-paradigm may be understood as an experiment in *re-capturing the meaning* of things.

New Reality, Or Reality's New Hypothesis?

Knowledge is a vision of *Wholeness* (of reality, if you please). Reality is all *mentally and materially existing, or not existing* taken together. Super-paradigm is the new *essence and meaning* comprising reality. Within global civilisation, finally, reality's *present form of existence* is nothing less than globalisation and localisation. (That is why change in paradigm does not equal change in form of existence.)

Given that we are reflecting in terms of traditional parallel notions, we might state that neither objective nor subjective existence, neither the historical nor the supra-historical dimension, neither material reality nor divine reality may be *excluded* from reality at large. Reality not only refers to ontology, but also to metaphysics, it is concerned at the same time with factual-historical and with metaphysical existence. When examining the two supreme, most fundamental aspects of philosophical reflection, the material approach by Aristotle, and the metaphysical by Plato, we realise that both are interpreting (or refraining from interpreting) existence, forms of existence, existing elements in fundamentally different ways, that frequently exclude each other. The fact that every significant thinker relates differently to equal and similar realities, parts or dimensions thereof, does not prevent us from gaining an overview, it simply makes our task a *more complex one*.

One fundamental theoretical question is whether reality exists *without* us looking on, or interpreting it in a meaningful way? Let me put it that way, is reality *always the same*, and does it remain the same within endless and defined space-time? Does the present image of reality only change if a given age or a given reality-maker assigns a definition label to it, or will reflected hypotheses

always remain a sequence of characteristics, interrelations and dimensions, taken from the “eternally whole”, holistically-complete picture of reality? Is there any reality at all – or do we only adhere to *some kind of mirrored reality illusion*? Is there no constant reality – or does reality exist, *but we will never quite take hold of it and understand it*?

If we continue tracking this problem, it becomes even more pressing. Assume the question itself, whether any reality exists or not, is intrinsically senseless and useless – what happens? Say reality *at the same time exists and does not exist* – in Hungarian I’d say *vannincs* - there is nothing, or *nincsvan* - nothing is. Those terms slightly differ in their approach, they bear different connotations, so I am going to use one single term: *vannincs* – there is nothing.

I am taking the stance that, according to our present knowledge, the fundamental nature of reality is – *vannincs*. (We could name this statement the *first fundamental law*.) Werner Heisenberg already noted that quantum theory does not prove anything else but the fact that elementary particles may “only” be seized to the point our present knowledge extends to. That is why elementary particles, for instance, at the same time exist independently from awareness, and within the borders of the reality we are aware of.

Say we continue to search reality – perhaps we will be able to formulate the *second fundamental law*, given that the one and only reality existing within space-time always has *two dimensions* to it. This property perfectly matches reality’s *vannincs* nature, considering that one of the two – external reality experienced directly, described in terms of physical and biological manifestations – *has characteristics*, whilst its counterpart – internal reality, which may be conceived only indirectly – *lacks characteristics altogether*. Both dimensions are inseparable, and according to David Bohm⁴ the external dimension, or the world of material particles is constantly controlled by the *internal dimension* (called inner movement or chaos).

The *third fundamental law* may rightly be called the greatest secret: *who/what is in control* of co-operation between the two dimensions? How on earth does the inner dimension manage to exert influence upon the outer dimension? According to Bohm’s theory, the quantum potential Q, behaving as a steering wave, is responsible for penetrating space-time reality. His proposition sounds like if quantum potential Q stems from outer quantum reality, from outside space-time, from something called “final” internal order. This proposition only intensifies our fundamental dilemma, namely the question whether this quantum reality from outside, or above our (traditional) cosmological reality is a reality completely outside *Wholeness*, or still an integral part of an *extended quantum universe*?

Or perhaps quantum reality (or even a postulated quantum universe) belongs to *divine, absolute reality*? The question naturally is independent of any

⁴ David Bohm és B.J.Hiley: The Undivided Universe (Routledge, London, 1993), Arnold Benz: Az univerzum jövője (Kálvin Kiadó, 2001)

stance we may hold, presently or later, on the subject of a “reality” outside known cosmic reality, and independent of any terms we might use to communicate our stance.

Personally I accept the hypothesis that Wholeness, holistic reality *cannot be void* of quantum universe, even of divine reality. Of equal importance is the question whether quantum universe within a given structure of Wholeness should be fitted in all above, within divine reality, or lower within the structure of Wholeness, next to cosmic reality? The fitting question is a rough one, and the only thing I dare say is that quantum universe, according to my preliminary assumption, is *one dimension* of pleroma (of divine reality).

Analysis of quantum potential has led us towards a definition of reality’s internal structure. The most important levels responsible for forming the structure of reality’s mode of existence are: 1. divine reality (pleroma), 2. cosmic reality, 3. earthly (material) reality, 4. human reality, 5. reality as we are aware of it. The collective unity of those levels represents entire Reality in all its spiritual and material, existing and non-existing dimensions. All three fundamental laws presumably refer to all levels of reality.

Therefore New Reality is equivalent to the *new image* of reality. Both cannot be separated. The new image of reality *actually means new reality*, and at the same time new reality represents the *new image* of reality. If there is a new image of reality, is that to say that this *is* new reality, only that new reality is *by no means more* than a fresh vision of an always-constant-reality? Theory excludes a perfect match, what is more, always constant reality and its present vision may represent *awareness reality* at the same time, whilst always constant reality may equally be perceived of as *reality apart from awareness*. Finally, awareness reality may be defined as existing apart from personal awareness. That is why it is reasonable to speak of a *vannincs nature* of reality.

The New Model of Globalisation

Present globalisation (and localisation) is nothing else than the way of life presently typical for our planet’s civilisation. This is *not identical* with the planned *strategic mode of life* fostering the unification of this globalised world. The presently typical way of life, however, is *apt to support* efforts towards a strategic mode of life, or is already supporting it.

The strategic mode of life equals *Age of Unity*⁵, or *society of unity*, conceivable at the very earliest for the second half of the 21st century. Unity does not mean uniformity. This is not about a global uniform, and especially not about forcefully exporting Western Euro-Atlantic patterns of civilisation. What we are talking of is a *co-operation* of various differing entities in order to reduce

⁵ Francis Fukuyama rightly names the recent past and the present the age of the great disintegration (A nagy szétbomlás, Európa, Budapest, 2000). Age of Unity is the opposite of great disintegration (and also an entirely new quality), and it is not identical with Fukuyama’s programme of Great Reconstruction.

and cure decomposition, to continue differentiation and the dialogue of individual entities, and Age of Unity even means *institutionalisation* of unity and unities.

Globalisation of our time or of times past cannot be described by a one-dimensional formula. Within (a) complex process(es) *negative and positive globalisation* may be distinguished, what is more, one given global trend may generate good and bad consequences. Thus the present global way of life carries functional and substantial processes, and that is why we see there *quantity and quality globalisation* – the latter of which pointing towards a strategic mode of life. This does not mean that all quantitative globalisation automatically becomes *negative globalisation*.

On the grounds of a wide-ranging and fine-tuned analysis⁶ known characteristics of present globalisation are as follows – but those are not the only contents: *comprehensive expansion, interdependence, reduction of distances, greater effectiveness, inevitability, reproducibility, and systemic character*. Well, when it comes to globalisation, many are talking of the extent and intensity of expansion (or, say, of the growth in effectiveness). Those limited globalisation processes we were able to witness to in past centuries (and millenniums) precisely mean that expansion rather was a limited one, compared to the entire global civilisation, given that those processes were limited to one continent or world empire. Globalisation at the end of the 20th century bears a new characteristics, namely that is not only concerned with western civilisation, but also closed in upon the majority of second and third world countries. *Even now* globalisation, however, does *not* extend to every country, nation and tribe of this world.

Besides rapid and comprehensive extension, perhaps the most stunning manifestation of present globalisation is *effectiveness* – although it never hurts to ask, precisely what process of globalisation we are aiming at, given that it is not all that simple to tell whether intensity of globalisation processes may be measured by the introduction of (virtual) financial trade, by the expansion of multinational companies, or perhaps in terms of acceptance of the democratic model, or with regard to the popularity of global television networks. Up to this point there has not been formulated any *normative system* on the grounds of which we would be able to describe as global or less than global a given, more or less comprehensive process. For example, may a process be called global,

⁶ When discussing globalisation, frequently factual, balanced and scientific thought is not taken into account. Many a volume is published on this topic, which does not even define globalisation, or which generalises a given manifestation of globalisation. An example is, Hans-Peter Martin and Harald Schumann, *The Globalisation Trap*. At the same time, a number of correct and balanced analyses also has been published, such as, Manuel Castells, *The Information Age: economy, society and culture*. I-III. (Blackwell, 1996); Globalization (Vedanta Kesari, Chennai, India 2000); Kiss Endre: *A tudástársadalom filozófiája* (Kiss-Varga: A legutolsó utolsó esély, Stratégiakutató Intézet, 2001.) Granasztói György: *Három megjegyzés a globalizációval kapcsolatban* (Magyar Szemle, Budapest, June 2001); etc.

which basically extends to the developed world only, or at the utmost to some groups of countries of the second world?

This is why we think reproducibility is a key term, given that a group of globalisation effects only becomes interesting, if it may be reproduced independent of the continent, of culture, civilisation level, and place – that is, if it becomes a general phenomenon. *Interdependence*, too, only becomes interesting, if *systematically* extending to globally received processes on a global scale, if for example interdependence not only applies to information science or to communication networks, but if as a result of interdependence most of the world will be able to communicate – say – in English, and if commercial legislation in most countries provide for the conclusion of a contract, for instance, under largely identical conditions.

If we investigate global processes factually and painstakingly, contrary to what may seem to happen, globalisation indeed appears as a very *disjointed, fragmentary, restrained and incidental* manifestation. A great number of partially global event sequences presently do not represent such a revolutionary current, which embraces *all* regions and nations.

Meanwhile we are just able to ask, does modernity necessarily globalise? (Answer: Ages before modernity did they not globalise also?) Does global mean that absolutes are becoming immediate? (Answer: Is not an age distinguished from other ages, just by what it does take for an absolute? In earlier times, were other global contents and forms not grown refined into absolutes?) Is an economically unified world the essence of globalisation? (Answer: Have preceding empires not at all been unified economically, from ancient times up to modernity?) Does globalisation equal universal poverty? (Answer: Does it really create poverty? Has universal poverty been unknown to earlier civilisations?) Does globalisation increase the material and social gap between the rich and the poor? (Answer: Has there not been a similar difference between the rich and the poor before?) Does globalisation deny the difference between cultures? (Answer: Does it really deny cultural difference? Did not Christianity contest the difference between cultures?) Due to new globalisation, is the influence of religion and ethical values clearly diminished? (Answer: Did not the complaints of Egyptians of old sound similar?) Did globalisation only achieve a change in measure, effectiveness, and intensity? (Answer: Did the value and measure of things not vary in every age? Bigger, smaller, better, worse – but compared to what? Different – from what?)

Perhaps the global feeling is nothing else but some type of exteriorised collective anxiety, a new experience and a new denomination of the satanic? Or is it an experienced manifestation of hope and utopia? Is globalisation first of all new terminology and a new way of rhetoric, which communicates changing public awareness? Is the term “globalisation” just another characteristic example of incomprehension?

With what shall we compare globalisation? Is it that something is spreading *everywhere, anywhere, perfectly reproducible, systematically*? What would this actually mean? Does the whole world speak English? Is there a comparable system of market economics in place in every country? Are multinational companies economically dominating every continent, region, country, and state? Has unemployment been erased from the face of this world, is there a comparable welfare system in place everywhere? Do people watch the same three or four international TV channels all over the world? Is incarnation accepted within every culture? No matter what question we pose with the entire world in mind, at once we experience that we are still a far shot away from *total globalisation* – and we are forced to realise that total globalisation probably will never occur at all.

So what about globalisation? What *is* it? We cannot even say that *money of some kind* (or any type of paper money) is the generally accepted form of transaction, given that even within the developed world local, non-financial exchange economy is alive and kicking. Similarly, it is a generalisation to state that following the age of dictatorship, political democracy has become typical within the entire global civilisation – it is a known fact that differences between allegedly democratic systems are *just as big* as between a traditionally democratic system and dictatorship.

We are returning to the point that the *present way of live* of global civilisation is called globalisation – a state quite far away from total globalisation. So the most we can claim is that within that way of existence some large processes are gaining globally validity (*more so than before, but still partially*), and are beginning to function globally (*more effectively, but still constrained*). Which goes to say that globalisation as such does not mean anything at all, or at the very best it means that the number and intensity of global manifestations is on the rise. This statement appears particularly valid, if perceived isolated from localisation, the process parallel to globalisation – either because we are unable to apprehend localisation, or because we treat it as secondary. Finally, globalisation today has grown into a generality almost as large as reality itself, or terms like the world, mankind, etc. Within this setting, defining the *present state, nature and type* of globalisation inevitably becomes a crucial theoretical and practical task.

Are we frequently using the term globalisation, *without actually knowing* what it means? Do we apprehend its essence without being able to define it properly? Isn't the term globalisation a typical expression of *vannincs type reality*?

The Localisation Paradigm

The localisation paradigm is *the renaissance of the idea of localisation*. According to this paradigm, here and now we have a chance to globally realise

the autonomy of local entities. This idea *at once contains* the realisation of the high civilisation level of localisation, the equal value of localisation within new type globalisation, and systematic construction of local knowledge societies and knowledge economies. All three goals are *closely related* to each other. Localisation will be at equal terms with globalisation, provided it becomes a comprehensive knowledge cosmos. The prerequisite of knowledge localisation is a comparatively high level of civilisation, and within that the realisation of a developed infrastructure.

A local cosmos behaves somewhat like the *universe* – similarly to the global cosmos. In many ways similarly to the astronomic universe, it may be known. It may sound perplexing, but a local cosmos is just as laden with uncertainties and *secrets* as, for instance, the galaxy of the Milky Way. *Borders* within a local cosmos are just as difficult to define as, for instance, the border regions of a spiritual cosmos. Today it is a scientifically accepted criterion of interpretation to state that one local entity is a holistic cosmos within the universe of nation states, the upper level of which is the region, the middle level the canton or micro-region, and the ground level the settlement (megapolis, city, town, village).

A local entity, to the contrary, is different from a country or a statistical region, the political borders of which are well-defined. Between a local cosmos and another *there are intersections*, which at times go across national borders – and, in fact, we only can speak of *moving borders*, because the relationship between neighbouring local entities is an ever-changing give and take. That is why a given local entity is not simply defined geographically or historically, but also from the point of view of economy, society and social science, and even viewed in spiritual terms, or in terms of local identity. Local entities have a *multiple structure*, just as the global universe. Internal entities within the local entity, such as cantons and micro-regions therefore may be outlined within a variety of geographical and functional borders.

Local entities, understood as a local cosmos incarnates the presently existing, *local way of life*. Localisation means that an existing local cosmos grows into a complete, structured, *complex local entity*. A local entity therefore, as a local form of existing and its present state of realisation, is the result of localisation, a complex process describing the direction a local cosmos moves along, in the better case its positive development. Naturally, the present notion of purpose applied to localisation is called the paradigm of localisation – which, if realised, becomes the local *strategic mode of life*.

Thus the most important manifestation of the *present way of life* not only is called globalisation, but also localisation. Localisation equally may become not only present way of life, but also strategic mode of life. This process also measures the *realisation* of the localisation super-paradigm. The practice theory is the science of the *track* extending between two points (such as present way and strategic mode of life) – how is the track like, to what extent are its

processes controlled and organised by a vision, i.e. the notion of purpose defined as a paradigm, and within the transition process what sort of characteristic conflicts or co-operations are taking effect? At the same time we may assume on the grounds of concrete events that under conditions of the information age that track between the two points substantially differs from what was experienced under conditions of new monetary capitalism.

The precise name of information age's super-paradigm is the *globlocal world*⁷. This means organic *unification* of globalisation and localisation. By creating a new term out of global and local we are signalling that taken by itself, neither globalisation nor localisation represents salvation. This is difficult to accept for both followers of globalisation and localisation. Personally all my life I have been preaching the existence of local cosmos, of local realities, the *crucial importance* of local intimacy. We would be mentally and sociologically blind, should we not appreciate that a strictly isolated, self-sufficient, introverted local cosmos is *not viable*, as it would *collapse* as a universe. The future of local cosmos is a *unified world systematically structured globlocally*. We can't step back to the locally isolated cosmos of natural tribal society, where frequently existence is dominated by a lethal war between one cosmos and another. Neither can we move back into the first half of the Middle Ages, when "we introduced" the concept of a universal divinity into the society and the cosmic notion of village culture.

If viewed from close up, a local cosmos is an *unbelievably complex system* – at once a network and a hierarchy. Similarly to global cosmos, only passing by long processes of understanding are we able to tell how the track between the initial position and an intermediate position looks like, *what alternative positions and tracks do exist, and just what it is that inspires and drives change*. Local cosmos always has been subject to central powers, or to the government. They had enough time to adapt, and they learnt how to obey external pressure and, at the same time, if necessary, to steer and transform external intervention, to return and develop it. Even today local cosmos is *dependent upon national government*, or at least *sensitive* to government. Government intervention therefore is quickly achieved, although it is often constrained to the dimension of local politics and self-government. What is going on, however, on the level *underneath* institutional networks and official structures?

The *structure* of a local cosmos is made up of *four elements*. The first one – immediately underneath national government – is the region and the

⁷ Even within the developed world examination of local entities in general and joint research in globalisation and localisation is still in its very beginnings. A good example is Georges Benko: *Regionális tudomány* (Dialóg Campus, 1999). Another recent sign of progress is that finally, an international conference on globlocal processes is organised. Another example is a consultation held by the Goethe Institut and by the Council of Europe at Munich, called Local and Global (Library legislation in federal and regional systems).

department, or canton. This we could call *upper sphere of life*⁸. This one is followed by an intermediate, *lower sphere of life* made up of two elements, namely the *surrounding environment*⁹ (micro-region and settlement), and the *world at hand*¹⁰ (family and other immediate social structures). The border between the two intermediate elements vividly and tangibly extends between public and private existence. The forth element is the *inner sphere of life*, which is nothing less than the sublime ego of individuals – or, within individual persons, the image of every-day life.

The hot dimension of reality, so to speak sublime reality is the lower intermediate element, the “world at hand”, because this represents the private, non-public microcosm of a local cosmos. This is the place where the question is decided, whether or not we can talk of a *quality local entity*. Global world may be characterised as qualitative and quantitative globalisation processes *intervening* into local entities, and even into private intimacy of individuals, into the “world at hand”. A stringent conclusion out of this observation is that information society’s paradigm only becomes fruitful and effective to human society, if its realisation bears significant *qualitative results* within the “world at hand”. At this point we are able to speak of qualitative localisation.

Characteristics of local entities are, that they are the *time and space of our every-day existence*, the *hot spot of our present reality*, rendering possible only a limited epokhé (creation of distance). That is why the four elements of the local way of life represent a process rarely explored and understood, which is particularly true for *informal local entities*, such as local society of individual settlements, families and their immediate surroundings.

Are we using the term localisation, *without actually knowing* what it means? Do we apprehend its essence without being able to define it properly? Isn’t the term localisation a typical expression of *vannincs type reality*?

The Structure of the World, or the Novelty of Space Structure

The structure of the world cannot be simply reduced to *space structure*, yet space structure in any case is the most important characteristic of the structure of the world. The structure of the world at once is time structure, knowledge structure, and society structure for instance. Now we are only

⁸ Husserl has elaborated the term life world, or life sphere, cf. Edmund Husserl works published in Hungarian: Válogatott tanulmányok (Gondolat, Budapest, 1972), Az európai tudományok válsága I-II. (Atlantisz, Budapest, 1998), Kartezianus elmékedések (Atlantisz, Budapest, 2000).

⁹ From Martin Heidegger we have borrowed the term surrounding world, or surrounding environment, who has defined this as follows, „Surrounding world is the world closest to every-day present existence.” Martin Heidegger: Lét és idő (Gondolat, Budapest, 1989, 174.o.) The term configuration surrounding world was deducted from this, partially carrying different contents.

¹⁰ The idea of the world “at hand” equally stems from one of Martin Heidegger’s philosophical categories. „A kézhezállóság a létező ontológiai-kategoriális meghatározása, ahogy az ’magánvalóan’ van. De hát a kézhezálló mégiscsak a kéznéllevő alapján ’van’.” Heidegger: i.m. 181-182.

investigating space structure, but every space structure also represents a society structure, or the differences within space become *differences within society*. The focus of space theory cannot be reduced, at the time of developed globalisation, to the space structure within a given nation state, although it is evident for the analysts of society that the nature-settlement-society space of a nation state characteristically represents a hierarchical system: On top of the structure there are the big elite municipal areas, and, typical for Hungary, on the bottom of that areal and social ladder there is the agricultural world of homesteads.

Local entity within that framework is nothing else than the *bottom half* of a nation state-type space structure (partially the traditional one inherited from industrial society). That is why within that half we are distinguishing the life worlds within a local entity, and within the bottom of the local entity we are clearly distinguishing between the surrounding world and the world at hand. At this point we must understand that *status and characteristics* of the surrounding world and of the world at hand are entirely *different*, depending whether we are speaking of elite districts of a megalopolis, of suburban agglomerations, of industrial townships, or perhaps of a small mountaineer mining town. Within all of them there exists an informal, immediate “world at hand”, and there is a surrounding world serving as a social and intellectual backdrop. The point is that they radically differ from each other, and that difference may be like heaven and earth, because life situation and life prospects are differing radically.

Globalisation makes a difference by creating a space structure *above* nation states. The past twenty years has seen human civilisation grow into a unique, but structured *space element* occupying the place on top of this earth’s space structure. Another question is that globalisation-localisation advances on a different pace within various continents, nations, or even tribes, which results in differing spatial and social formations within the global world. Should we only concentrate upon space conditions, we may rightly propose that within the global space structure continents follow just underneath the global level. By their history and their shape, continents are distinctive space structural elements. No need to explain the difference between a European, an Asian, a North American, or a South American space structural model.

Within global space structure we distinguish, from top to bottom: the entire *global* world, the world of the *continents*, the world of *country groups* within a given continent, the world of nation states (nations and/or states), and finally the *local* worlds, which in turn may be divided in upper and lower *life worlds*, the lower being sub-divided into *surrounding* world and “*world at hand*”. According to this the immediate global (earthly) space structure is a globlocal structure composed of at least *nine spheres*.

Space, or space time does not end at the outer borders of planet earth. This means the nine spheres continue upwards, too – first of all comes the solar system, then the galaxy called Milky Way, then the universe, and “finally” – according to present knowledge – *quantum space, and/or divine reality*. Neither

does time-space structure end at the sphere of local earthly worlds, as they continue *downwards*, departing from “world at hand” to the world of *individuals*, and – kind of inner quantum space – to the world of *minds*. The theoretical novelty of this countdown is that we may distinguish within universal space (time) structure at least *fifteen different structural spheres*. (As we know according to Einstein, that time-space is bent, no need to mention that this sequence of spheres equally appears “bent”, which shows the spheroid nature of the time-space structure.)

The *groups of countries* deserve our particular interest. We used to talk, within Europe, of Northern or Southern Europe (or of Mediterranean Europe for that matter), and – which is of significance from a Hungarian point of view – of Eastern Europe and/or Central Europe. The problem to be raised obviously is whether *in which respect and to what extent* did the situation and the prospects of groups of countries change within the age of developed globalisation? The first huge difference is that for instance in the past century the world of country groups was virtually perceived of as the peak of a fragile, global world – particularly at times when empires of various extent were organised within a *certain region* of a continent. Within a global space structure even the Soviet sphere of interest may only be described as the limited, partial globalisation of a – particularly comprehensive – group of countries extending to the Eurasian continent. In the early-mid 20th century the regional power spheres dominating a continent seemed to be the *peak* of the global space structure.

Meantime we have come a long way from this. The world of country groups has become the intermediate dimension of a global space structure. This is even signalled by language, as groups of countries are increasingly referred to as regions. The term group of countries might as well be replaced by a new category of *region of countries*¹¹, given that in the 21st century every group of countries is not more and not less than a region composed of several countries. This term is apt to describe the actual situation and movement forms. The international scientific literature has for a long time distinguished between regions of countries by calling them *first and third world*, or developed world and world in way of development. In a preceding analysis¹² we have attained the point where we tried to fill in the gap of reality and of equivalent terms between the first and third (and indeed: fourth) world, and we have particularly analysed the term. This was of interest due to the circumstance that Hungary, too, as a halfway-developed country belongs to the group of countries called second world. (The terms first, second and third [+ fourth] world are already characteristic for the actual system of a *global social and space structure*.)

Naturally we would be foolish to think that we understand everything clearly. There are no *distinct borders* between the spheres composing the

¹¹ The term ‘region of countries’ is first used within the present study.

¹² Varga Csaba: Magyar megatrendek az új globális erőtérben (A mai világ és a jövő forgatókönyvei, Budapest 1997)

universal space structure. Speaking metaphorically we might say, spheres are not regular, they are like steps that have not been carved precisely, and the tooth of “time” constantly scars the surface of those steps. Those space structures are equally *more or less regular* systems of vinnincs reality.

Well, another new question remains to be posed. Within the age of information, and indeed following that age, presume that space structures are changing their shape and function: *in which way* do universal, global, regional and local *intelligent space structures change*, and *in what respect are they functioning differently?*

Theory of Intelligent Space-time

In Central-Eastern Europe, regional scientific analysis¹³ still holds that industrial (post-industrial) social space structure essentially is a *Fordian space structure*. (The term originally stems from Alain Lipietz¹⁴, and first of all it proposed that during the age of vibrant economical growth following World War II, developed countries formed the Fordian economic region.) In Hungary this development was *delayed*, or interrupted soon after World War II, that is why the development appears *compacted*. Fordian economic regions firstly developed during and immediately after the war, and secondly from the mid-eighties onwards. It comes to no surprise that during the nineties a majority of Hungarian regionalists used to think in terms of *Fordian space structure*, even though it is evident that from their very inception the seven (partially artificial) Hungarian regions were more than sheer economic – industrial and agricultural – Fordian regions. Space theory in this country therefore remained a *captive* to the interrupted traditionalist-type regional development, and it was not sufficiently taken into account that the freshly accomplished Fordian space structure without delay moved towards an *intelligent space structure*.

In spite of the delay in space development, a sequence of *European space(-time) structure types* may be clearly defined, at least in theory. Those would be the following: 1. Fordian industrial-capitalist space structure {partially time structure}, 2. Post-Fordian, post-industrial and post-capitalist time {and partially space} structure, 3. information space-time structure (financial-economic, social and information), 4. knowledge-centred (knowledge society) space-time structure, 5. quantum space-time/time-space structure.

Let’s examine them one by one. 1. Fordian space structure has been the dominating space structure of the 19th century and mostly of the 20th century also. During that development period space predominately refers to space economy, to space structured by industrial and post-industrial economy. During

¹³ Georges Benko: *Regionális tudomány* (Dialóg-Campus, Pécs-Budapest, 1999)

¹⁴ Alain Lipietz: *Le national et le régional*, 1990 (in G. Benko, *La dynamique spatiale de l’économie contemporaine*, La Garenne-Colombes, EEE, 71-103.)

the second half of the 20th century it increasingly became obvious that Fordian space structure also structures Fordian society structures within space, or put otherwise, space-structural disadvantages always mean social disadvantages as well. It necessary consequence of this development process that medieval and modern-time space organisation gradually adapts itself to Fordian development. At this point it becomes generally valid that regions touched by the industrial revolution and by strong central political power concentration loose their former relative independence. Its theory is the Fordian space theory.

2. *Post-Fordian time structure.* Radical or under-cover modification of Fordian space structure has resulted in ever-changing development variations of continental (European) and, later on, globalising capitalism, beginning with early evolving capitalism up to the development of a global financial economy. At that point it became obvious that those variations as they followed each other in time became dominant space-organising forces.

2. *Post-Fordian time structure.* Radical or under-cover modifications of the Fordian space structure resulted in ever-changing development variations of continental (European), and later on globalising capitalism, beginning with early capitalism up to the development of a global financial economy. At that point it became obvious that those variations following each other in time had become space-structuring forces themselves. Space history had created distinctive *historical spaces*. Within a given nation state and at a given time post-feudal and early capitalist regions have been and still are present, next to regions that are already integrated into world economy. (Of particular interest is that due to time acceleration new-type structures are evolving within an ever shorter period of time.) Its theory is the Post-Fordian time(-space) theory.

3. *Information space structure.* The age of information society developed in the Europe of the nineties. It quickly became obvious that in the framework of a global and Pan-European economy and society those Fordian and Post-Fordian space structures only had the air of stability and unchangeability, in fact they drastically changed, a process which has been a more or less visible one. One of the big surprises was that entire regions rose and sank into oblivion within the global space structure (and please note that for the first time we are witnessing to a truly global space structure), depending upon their success or failure to adapt to a global economy and society. Within Europe, a host of innovation and information regions, tele-cities, intelligent townships is being established. Different levels of space structure become competitors not within nation state, but within a global space structure. Its theory is the global information space.

4. *Knowledge-centred space-time structure.* We are presently able to observe, within the developed world, this evolving new-type space-time structure. We are talking of a present development and of the near future. Those space-structural elements, for the first time particularly represent space-time levels of knowledge development, integrated knowledge-based economy and society as opposed to traditional economics and governance. The particularity of

this model is that next to globalisation, intensified localisation results in globlocal space structures. Regions, cantons, micro-regions no longer counter-balance globalisation, as they become organic agents of localisation. In front of our very eyes globlocal space structures are born, and they grow more and more structured internally. Its theory is integrated knowledge space-time.

Near and more distant future points towards a fifth station, *quantum space-time structure*. This is the end of that "happy" state when space-time structures were more or less uniform, clear-cut, single-directed structures that could be well defined in reality and in theory. As space itself, just as space-time and time-space structures, increasingly becomes complex, mobile, interactive, with regard to both external and internal power fields and forms of movement, it grows into real and virtual space-time networks. Those networks develop according to typical condition of chaotic space-time systems, resulting in particular energy fields, time spaces and fields of movement. They are likely to become independent with regard to global, local and (restricted) nation-state dominions. They unite and divorce - this is the world of *stable instability*. Its driving forces characteristically are individual and collective common awareness, high knowledge, individual and collective states of mind (ranging from the local to the global at the very least, if not further). Its theory (probably) will be quantum space-time within the world of a universal space structure.

Those five models taken together may be called theory of *intelligent space structure*. Given that in the beginning of the 21st century networks - and new hierarchical forms - of global and local knowledge societies are evolving, it will be a primary task of Hungarian intelligent regions, cantons, micro-regions and settlements to develop and consequently, systematically introduce *strategy*¹⁵.

New Knowledge Towards the New Role of Knowledge

Addict to our happy or not-so-happy state of mind, we have come a long way thinking that there is in fact a *very distinct border* between the objective and the subjective. We have been thinking that within material and spiritual processes *primarily* (even though not exclusively) the material dimension is at work. Now we peacefully realise that new knowledge, new thought *primarily* (even though not exclusively) is the driving force behind a developed globalisation and localisation. Within that new age the role of *knowledge is crucial* - only now, or has it been that way up to now also?

We cannot develop here the *theory of knowledge* we hold, but since present and future of the knowledge society can hardly be interpreted lacking an interpretation of *knowledge and ignorance*, we need to signal at least some of its

¹⁵ See: *Intelligens régiók Magyarországon 1.* Edited by: Pócs Gyula. (Agroinform Kiadóház és Stratégiakutató Intézet, Budapest, 2001)

important elements and consequences. First of all we are going to point out interrelations between various types of awareness and knowledge, without immediately pronouncing what was first, awareness or knowledge. For the time being it is sufficient to know that awareness and knowledge are incredibly *interdependent*, even though new knowledge may only be generated by awareness, and that without the inspiration of knowledge, awareness is less creative. That is, awareness is not strictly dependent upon the state and quality of knowledge. An analogy of our structural and functional model is presented by the subatomic, sub-microscopic world: Awareness is like the unpredictable, ever-changing movement of particles, and the kernel in turn represents the incredibly complex and stable system of knowledge¹⁶. Within this chapter we only discuss a *sketch of knowledge theory*, independently of an answer to the question, whether knowledge is good and helpful.

When discussing the area of knowledge and the role of knowledge we definitely have to answer a few *fundamental problems*.

First of all: What is knowledge, and what is the structure of universal and global systems of knowledge?

Here we need to dissolve two dilemmas at once, namely the definition of *knowledge*¹⁷, and clarifying *what type* of knowledge are we talking of¹⁸? Our point of depart won't be traditional subdivisions of knowledge (religious knowledge, scientific knowledge, artistic knowledge etc.), and not even merely the media of knowledge (individual knowledge, society's collective knowledge,¹⁹ etc.), and we would not like to restrict ourselves to one single school of knowledge sociology (such as system theory, scientific theory, post-modern theory, discourse theory²⁰ etc.). Our approach is based upon Karl Mannheim's²¹ approach to knowledge sociology, but neither will we stick to the four forms of utopian awareness (the orgiastic chiasm of Anabaptists, the liberal-humanitarian ideal, the conservative ideal, and the socialist-communist

¹⁶ Fritjof Capra: A fizika taója (Tercium kiadó, Budapest)

¹⁷ We would not like to get lost in the definition of knowledge (or of data, information, signal, knowledge). Many different specialists have tried to do so. Our colleague, Czeglédi János has summarised his findings in a booklet: According to him, data is the document of individual recognition, and information arises from the definition of a relationship of two kinds of data, the structure of information constitutes knowledge, which is the conscious pillar of the ability to decide, and finally, with the help of a physical phenomenon, the signal information is placed on a material data carrier independent from human brain, and thus humans are extending their working capacity and their capacity to recognise (Czeglédi János: Iberianicum (Tekintet Könyvek, 2000)

¹⁸ Karl Popper's theory of objective and subjective knowledge is very inspiring. (Karl Popper: Test és elme, Typotex Kiadó, 1998.)

¹⁹ Some more important works to be read in Hungarian: Polányi Mihály: Személyes tudás I-II. Atlantisz 1994); Karl R. Popper: Három nézet az emberi tudásról (Tudományfilozófia, Áron Kiadó, 1999); Lakatos Imre: Tudományfilozófiai írásai (Atlantisz, 1997); Paul Feyerabend: Három dialógus a tudásról (Osiris-Gond, 1999)

²⁰ A choice of Hungarian and international literature: Karácsony András: Bevezetés a tudásszociológiába (Osiris-Száadvég, 1995); poszt-posztmodern (chosen and edited by> Pethő Bertalan, Platon, 1997); Philippe Breton: A manipulált beszéd (Helikon, 2000)

²¹ Mannheim Károly: A konzervativizmus (Cserépfalvi, 1994)

utopia²²). Our aim is an *integrated, multiple-view* analyse of knowledge systems and networks.

We are forced to specify the terms of knowledge and ignorance, and to divide them into *super-formal, formal and sub-formal* (or call it *subconscious or tacit* knowledge²³). The subconscious knowledge is knowledge just as much as ignorance is, and given that it is not formed out in speech, or at most in a very nebulous way, we only have a very intermediate knowledge of the contents of the subconscious. Another point of view which we similarly cannot avoid is the difference between sociological types of *ruling and subordinated* knowledge. Within our *mediatic*, communication-driven world order the powerful situation of knowledge does not decrease - to the contrary, it may dramatically increase, but at the same time its superiority is all the more uncertain and less stable, because the world of digital media also supports the freedom fight of subordinate knowledge. Popular knowledge (pre-theoretical, every-day routine knowledge) and high knowledge (religious, scientific etc.) abide to traditional divisions, as their distance remains unchanged. Contradicting all rumours to the contrary, however, during the past decades an unprecedented amount of high knowledge has descended into popular knowledge.

What *is* knowledge after all? It is not primarily a lot of new information, and it does not consist of an incredible number of new perceptions. As I have outlined before²⁴, it rather is a comprehensive vision of Wholeness, of the entire reality. I might as well add to this prior recognition that we are talking of a holistic knowledge, and that this holism is able to create knowledge society, provided this new-type knowledge, this knowledge capital will result in a re-organisation of society, in unification, in a renaissance of the intellectual capital of society. If we abide to such a definition of knowledge, traditional subdivisions of knowledge will become obsolete, and such a well-developed, global knowledge structure will definitely gain significance, which allows for a distinction between supra-formal, formal and sub-formal knowledge.

Secondly, is there a new role to knowledge, or do we only now perceive its "new" role, which has been there all the time unrecognised? In other terms, within the age of new-type globalisation, how did the function of knowledge change?

At this point we should clarify the overall goal of globalisation, understood as a component of wholeness (Wholeness). We may answer in very different ways, given that the answer is largely determined by values and by levels of knowledge. Here are some possible types of answers: 1. The goal of the new system of reality is nothing else than to provide for a global, comprehensive system (system-theoretical approach). 2. The fundamental meaning of

²² Mannheim Károly: *Ideológia és utópia* (Atlantisz, 1996)

²³ Polányi Mihály has derived the term tacit knowledge from the fact that we can know more than we are able to tell. (Polányi Mihály: *Tudomány és ember*, Argumentum Kiadó, Polányi Mihály Szabadelvű Filozófiai Társaság, 1997)

²⁴ Varga Csaba: *Tudástársadalom és tudásrégió* (Kiss Endre.-Varga Csaba: *A legutolsó utolsó esély*, 2001)

Wholeness is that it provides for justice²⁵ (justice-theoretical approach). 3. The underlying general goal is the classical programme of individual beatitude²⁶ (beatific-theoretical approach). 4. Holism is not really concerned with values, its goal is maximisation of profitability (utilitarian-theoretical approach). 5. Its central strategic meaning is to fill up the "empty" system with knowledge, with the underlying presumption that knowledge will provide for a more useful and happier life world²⁷ (knowledge-theoretical approach). 6. Economics and society of the turn of millennium first of all creates a symbolically outstanding economy and society (symbolist-theoretical approach)²⁸. 7. The third cognitive level of knowledge is that as many humans as possible are lead towards a superior state of mind, to re-birth, to justification, to enlightenment²⁹ (enlightenment-theoretical programme). 8. It is a critique of all previous attempts of adding meaning to life, it incorporates relativism, it renders unnecessary new attempts of adding meaning to life³⁰ (post-modern approach). 9. The unified, integrated assertion of all of the above, including those approaches not listed (unification-theoretical approach). 10. etc.

If possible, we should try to unify the above approaches into a unified thought network. The holistic approach focussed on knowledge theory strives to *integrate* the above approaches, comprehensively or at least partially. In every age information, knowledge, experience and symbols³¹ had their significance. The new role of knowledge, however, is that now, around the turn of the millennium, it assumes a central function - without negating other approaches, rather by organising into a contemplative system all possible and impossible previous approaches.

Thirdly, did the age of information bring about new knowledge, and if yes, what kind of knowledge?

The answer is quite clear, it *indeed* brought about new knowledge. Yet *what kind* of knowledge? Within the 20th century, the theory of relativity, along with quantum theory has changed scientific thought above all expectation. Beginning with the mid-century, following a development rush in information technology – information science, computing, and (amongst others) language theory have been constantly developing. Apparently social science has been left behind, but within knowledge sociology, system theory, or economical philosophy serious progress has been achieved nevertheless. The new knowledge of information age do not simply appear in globalisation theory, or even less so in localisation theory. First of all it declares a *general insufficiency*.

²⁵ John Rawls: Az igazságosság elmélete. (Osiris, Budapest 1997.)

²⁶ Huoranszki Ferenc: Filozófia és utópia (Osiris, 1999, 38-40 l.)

²⁷ Varga Csaba: Tudáselmélet, tudástársadalom, tudásrégión. INCO 2001/1.

²⁸ Pethő Bertalan: Technikai civilizáció és lélek (Platon, Budapest, 2000)

²⁹ Ravasz László: Kis dogmatika (Kálvin Kiadó, 1996); Láma Anagarika Govinda: A korai buddhista filozófia lélektani attitűdje (Orient Press, 1992), stb.

³⁰ Amongst others, Jürgen Habermas, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Richard Rorty: A posztmodern állapot (Századvég-Gond, Budapest, 1993)

³¹ For a definition of terms see Czeglédi János: Iberianicum (Tekintet Könyvek, Budapest, 2000)

It cries out for a *new unified theory*, integrating fields and disciplines of science. This theory is still wanted, even though post-modernity, or post-post-modernity essentially means the eclipse of the age of great comprehensive theories, as scientific disciplines are specialising to a degree never heard of before. Thus it comes to no surprise that only a minority of scientists is reclaiming, within the next couple of years, a unified theory (or the vision thereof) extending at least to natural science.

Fourthly, is new knowledge transforming the universal and global world of knowledge?

It is indeed doing so, and to an extent never even dreamt of. With time elapsing, slowly we are reaching the point when everything looks different, and we have to re-draft all of our plans. The spiritual seed planted by Einstein slowly bears fruit, but still we are only guessing, where we are heading for, and what level of knowledge are we going to reach. As a tangible (good or bad) result, certain knowledge not only globalises, independently of continents and cultures, but new knowledge is less and less linked to the knowledge of the recent past (the past two or three hundred years).

Before we progress further, I would like to summarise. Is knowledge the *manifestation* of awareness? By saying that objective knowledge is a comprehensive vision of wholeness we have examined social knowledge itself, and we have first of all treated common knowledge of a given age, without connecting it to some kind of collective awareness. If we look at individual knowledge, however, on the one hand we can state that concrete individuals - with the rare possible exception of super geniuses - never hold and understand more than *one given fragment* of the holistic vision, and on the other hand we understand that individuals do not hold any knowledge *without (personal) consciousness*. Even though only later will we define awareness, it is already quite clear that knowledge is the presently available *form and content of consciousness*, which has been expressed by way of language.

New Society, or the New Substance of Society

New Society, too, at the same time exists and doesn't exist, *van* and *nincs* - not only because of its novelty, but because society itself is a priori of a *vannincs* nature. If reality at once extends to totality and to the concrete, then society represents the concrete, or rather a manifestation of the concrete, while at the same time it also is wholeness and tangibility. According to present knowledge about society³² only earthly civilisation has developed into an independent and unique system, even though it may not be excluded that -

³² Szociológiaelmélet, edited by: Julius Morel, Eva Bauer, Tamás Meleghy, Heinz-Jürgen Niedenzu, Max Preglau, Helmut Staubmann (Osiris Kiadó, Budapest, 2000), Peter L. Berger-Thomas Luckmann: A valóság társadalmi felépítése (Jószöveg Műhely Kiadó, 1998).

provided there is intelligent life on other planets or in other galaxies - intelligent beings *always* create society.

Besides this, two "something" have been in the way of human intelligence and reason for thousands of years, next to mankind and human awareness: *society* and *social awareness*. Given the flow of our discussion we would not like to return to the time and place of the birth of society, even though its genesis would probably betray a whole lot about the nature of society, but our hypothesis holds that we now precious little about the genesis of society, or societies. We would not even dare to estimate chances whether society existing within space-time today, at the dawn of the third millennium according to Christian time, is *essentially different or more developed* than at any time before. We would like to examine New Society only, and perhaps we can state without risking too much, that the novelty of today's society means that within elapsing time this present society presumable is *not quite the same* that a hundred or two years before.

All our precaution is in vain, however. If society existed thousand or five thousand years ago, then presumable there are such characteristics to it which are not bound to space-time. If, according to many signs society is not the same than at the time of our grand-grandfathers - as for a superficial observer would seem evident - then criteria of society do exist which are *bound to space-time*. The only problem is that distinguishing between bound and not bound characteristics simply is not very helpful, for we cannot exclude that exactly those qualities which are not bound are the *more essential and decisive ones*, and that those which are bound to space-time are immensely devoid of interest. And exactly the opposite may be the case also. For a thinker who is not, or only little bound, every hypothesis represents an *alternative*. Within European thinking, and in particular Central-Eastern European thinking during the past fifty or hundred years the ideology that society is not so much the community of individuals than a *system of relationships between social groups* has become deeply ingrained. May this hypothesis be upheld, although it is associated with a certain age?

If we are to answer to that challenge, a ready but schematic answer is tempting, fair question, but yes, individuals *are* being organised into groups defined by e.g. similar *work activity or social situation*, and the relations between groups in turn exert a decisive influence upon work activity between groups, and upon the social differences. That is why we are talking about groups exerting agricultural, industrial or intellectual activity, and about very rich, quite rich, and more or less poor social groups.

If we have come that far in our schematic answer to the challenge, we are prone to feel very uncomfortable and to *hesitate* whether we are actually right to analyse this topic at all. Yet it cannot avoid our attention that this schematic answer is only correct provided that it is true that work activity and wealth, income or social status is *the essence* of individuals, or generally speaking of

humans. If the present, substantial content of human beings proves to be something quite different, such as knowledge for instance, or awareness, or the ability to think in a reflective way, then we are safe to think in other alternatives than the above schematic answer. This, of course, is not identical with the stance that work activity or welfare status or the prospects granted by them are of little significance in view of structure. We are taking another turn upon our logical track: Do humans carry with themselves, within their genetic code that knowledge and awareness, which is at the essence of their humanity, or do they receive it completely within society and from society, conveyed by language? If we have come this far with our assumption, we might as well claim that the essence of society itself is not (or rather, not only) the structured network of relationship between groups, but the very existence of social awareness, which goes to say that society is nothing less than a *vessel of knowledge* where *unconsciously or consciously the acquisition* of knowledge takes place. Even with this claim we cannot content ourselves. Without language, no ocean of knowledge, and those longing for knowledge will remain thirsty. If that is so, society is nothing less than *the cradle, the token and the channel* of language.

Obviously even *one single parent* would be able to pass language to its offspring, but lacking society it would not be able to properly use language as a means of communication between individuals, which is a crucial function of language. Society, however, is not equal with a physically-spiritually-intellectually existing individual, that is society does not exist, or its existence may not be shown without pointing at *living particulars called humans*. Of course according to our present knowledge we cannot ascertain beyond doubt that there is no society at all without the presence, or independently of human beings. This would provide for two consequences: in principle, non-human beings, too, might create a society, and society is not necessarily the internal, intelligent result of earthly nature, of its natural world.

Where have we got at? It seems if we were drifting aloof of an answer, at a point where we are called to answer, just *how and from where and from what* did language come into existence – and, of course, another schematic answer hurriedly navigates us into the assumption that language is intrinsically connected to knowledge and intelligence, and if so we are pressed hard to assert that society is "simply" a *product of knowledge and intelligence*. Now everybody will agree that society is neither physically existing nor any other natural manifestation of life, rather it is a mental labyrinth, which in itself is more formidable and aggressive to those individuals who are born and bred into it than any physical manifestation could ever be. Society is a *system of limitations, a network of chaos*, a kind of natural life world I would tend to compare with an individualised Mount Everest everybody must vanquish, first individually then jointly. Think only of *institutions and symbols*, which are tangible expressions of society.

I would merely like to add two lines of reflection to my vain efforts to interpret – or rather to my ignorance in matters of – society:

1. The essence of society (as an existing, or not existing reality) cannot be seized by any past or present one-sided effort to understand or describe it. Besides independent characteristics (which more precisely are only dependent on extra-terrestrial factors) we are forced to take into account almost *countless constraints*. I am listing some of them without differentiation: society is obliged to space-time, to economy, to power and to knowledge, to culture and language, to religion, to individual persons, and, amongst other obligations, to itself and to its proper consciousness. Obligated to the effect that obligations themselves are constantly changing, in two senses: the *thing itself* changes, on which society depends, and the *mode of dependence* also changes. First of all there are so many compulsory factors, so many elements to it, structured and unstructured results of change, that by its sheer complexity the most developed mathematical language probably would be *incapable to grasp it entirely*.

By contenting ourselves with this situation, we do not propose that we do not and cannot know anything about society. The above consternation in any case may help us to get our minds clear on the fact that any partial or holistic approach to understanding it simply is *one possible hypothesis*.

2. If the prerequisites for societies – individuals, particular human beings – are given, then between individuals and social groups, and between groups of individuals a wide range of co-operation or negations to co-operate becomes manifest, and of spoken or written language facilitating more or less gentle communication; and further on *variations, forms and conditions* of virtual and real, institutional and informal, conscious and unconscious *co-operation* will be conceived, and those will be reflected upon each other, and organised into systems and subsystems.

Society thus becomes interpretable only on the grounds of chaos theory³³, as an incredibly complex, chaotic system, which on one side manages to completely liberate itself of the individual, but on the other side only individual humans may modify it, who have managed to grow into *personalities made up of independent consciousness*. Once more this is a systematic irregularity, a system lacking methodology. Lifeless, always achieved, apparently immovable system, or non-system, but also resurgent, eternally changing and moving, apparently fragile, stable instability³⁴. Society in its essence is a *virtual, non-material reality*, which relentlessly manifests itself in terms of *existing, material reality*.

At a time and moment when not only the surface dimples, when not only a scene-shifter is at work, but individuals and groups of individuals get on the move, then it "incidentally" happens that *the initial or final condition(s)* of our chaotic system *will be modified*. This will facilitate New Society.

³³ James Gleick: *Káosz* (Göncöl Kiadó, Budapest, 1999)

³⁴ Niklas Luhmann names this an autopoietic, self-creating process.

An alternative called knowledge society may be equally understood *in such terms*.

Information and/or knowledge society

This study has been conceived because we would have liked to outline the essence of *information and knowledge society*³⁵, and of a *strategy* in view of a Hungarian knowledge society. As I have taken seriously this somewhat naive point of departure, I quickly found myself wrestling with the problem that I was unable to *precisely define* either information, or knowledge, or society and its movements, or perhaps the strategy needed to provide for its mobilisation.

Viewed from that point of incapability, we might be tempted to say nothing at all - because *nothing might be more* than a lot of nonsense - or to constrain our venture to rolling out everything anew, with the advance knowledge that our interpretation effort will repeatedly get mingled up with the same nonsense affirmations. Could it be that *this and only this* is the essence of knowledge society? And perhaps in itself this represents an advance?

Defining knowledge and society apart from themselves raises the question whether we would be able to grasp the *joint meaning* of those terms. We have ascertained that objective knowledge is a comprehensive vision of wholeness, and that individual knowledge is the presently available *form and content of awareness, or consciousness*, which has been described by language. Pondering upon society, we have found that it essentially is a *virtual, non-material reality*, which relentlessly manifests itself in terms of *existing, material reality*; which goes to say that society is defined by virtual and real, institutional and informal, conscious and unconscious forms and variations of co-operation or lack of co-operation between individuals and groups.

By further simplifying our terms we reach a point where we perceive society as a creature of knowledge, a virtual co-operational system created by knowledge, and knowledge itself as a comprehensive vision of interdependence always dependent on and regulated by society, a system of reflection motivated by society - yet knowledge as well as society, as they *institutionalise, are aloof and drifting away* of individual and social knowledge, as they have changed into an interdependent, exteriorised auxiliary system of stipulations. If seen this way, the story of knowledge and society is nothing else than the story of mutual restrictions, or of a manifestation - presently *less than satisfactory* - of the potential of knowledge and society. The example of the past two thousand years presents us with an age where both knowledge and social awareness have been a scarce commodity, with a history of *separation and estrangement* between

³⁵ On the first problem: Marshall McLuhan: A Gutenberg-galaxis (Trezor Kiadó, Budapest, 2001), and: Jean-Francois Lyotard: A posztmodern állapot (see: Jürgen Habermas-Jean Francois Lyotard-Richard Rorty: A posztmodern állapot, Századvég-Gond, 1993), the most thorough analysis: Manuel Castells: The Information Age: economy, society and culture (Blackvell, 1998)

knowledge and society. Meanwhile knowledge and society fought a constant freedom fight in order to regain its potential, or to successfully attain an even *greater degree* of implementation.

It has remained a general vision of humanity to realise ideal society, and to reach the best level of knowledge. As humanity advanced on the famous historical circle, it has never reached back to its point of departure, and within the bending space-time system shaped like a globe the *recognition of new tracks and patterns* was delayed.

The *inhuman balance* between insufficient knowledge and an insufficient society finally, at the end of the 20th century began to crumble. So far, insufficient knowledge mutated towards *somewhat sufficient* knowledge, and societies partly kept under control by democracy have to some extent, at some places are changing to the better, to the effect that a push in quantity and quality of civilisatory goods and chattels may result in the possibility of society being recharged with more and more sophisticated knowledge. Society thus always and by nature *was* knowledge society, the society of present knowledge, and the turning point is nothing less than a certain *critical point*, when increased knowledge renders possible a *real advance* in the development of society. This is realised by a limited, but significant and growing number of personalities who dispose of a surplus of knowledge and are in a position to *consciously* shape reality.

From this point onwards we are able to understand why we *distinguish* between information society and knowledge society. Supplying society with information and with devices for capturing information still belongs to the category of civilisation achievements. Information society is still tuned on technology, whereas knowledge society already managed to get *tuned on knowledge*, and within its framework, technical innovation serves the *innovation of society*. Information society has made it to technological industrialisation, but contents itself there, and not by chance is it also called society of information science. Knowledge society advances towards social industrialisation, supported by applied knowledge. The essential difference between the two of them is best described in the following terms: Whereas information society is "only" an economical and social system that provides for the availability of goods and achievements, knowledge society, after it made goods available it grows into a mode of life, *servicing knowledge and real contents*, and striving to make best use of the distributed knowledge for the transformation of society. We are talking of both the acquisition of knowledge and its application. The third new element is that knowledge society not only creates elite groups in possession of information, but also those elite and *middle classes rich in knowledge*. Those (may or) will be catalysts of functional change within society, facilitating transformation from a classical elite democracy into a network-type democracy.

Contemporary Europe is on the lookout for the sophisticated knowledge necessary for creating a *world of knowledge capable to ingrain into popular*

knowledge. Meanwhile it keeps sending confused messages to society, because it does not yet know for sure, just *what new society* it will create, and *how* it will go about it. That will be the story of the first half of 21st century.

Tradition-Oriented Knowledge Society

I would like to pose another two exciting problems: 1. Has there been a historic age in which an incredibly sophisticated knowledge has created an *ideal knowledge society*, at least for some time, or at least with regard to a minority? 2. How may collecting and integrating pre-historical and post-historical knowledge help the construction of a *future knowledge society*?

So one possible question of social history, or even of theoretical history is whether any age during the past ten or fifteen thousand years of humanity (at pre- and postdiluvian times) might be called – partially or entirely – knowledge society? The first dilemma of this question is whether in examining millennia of human history, precisely what criteria should be applied to declare a particular age, or section of history to be knowledge society. If we pick at random the prerequisite that knowledge society should be a mass phenomenon – it should reach many individuals –, and suppose we accept as the leading prerequisite that the given knowledge *influenced and determined to a high degree* the given concrete culture, civilisation, the empire (etc.), then – within the framework of a certain theory of history – we are going to distinguish between various types of pre-knowledge societies. One of the problems of globalisation theory is that preceding modernity there have been predominance, partially global power systems, most of the time partially extending to a given continent, and the question goes, which ones of those might represent some kind of more or less developed globalisation. The difficulty of the question in part stems from the fact that historical science does not yet have the ready answers from a *comparative research* of extensive civilisations existing on several continents before Christ, even though it seems more and more likely that the effects of inter-continental relations precede the “discovery” of America by thousands of years.

The *problem of the golden age* is particularly apt to confuse recent theories of knowledge society. Suppose we content ourselves with present obscure knowledge, assuming that the ancient mysteries only make symbolic mention of Atlantis, or of Golden Age(s), then our situation is comparatively comfortable, given that ancient symbolical systems and value hierarchies may even help a great deal in planning the contents of tomorrow’s knowledge societies. If to the contrary we allow for the possibility that Golden Age was a *de facto historic reality*, and – once we have entered that avenue – in fact ancient messages make it quite plausible, why, on what grounds, and what kind of golden ages have existed, than we have assumed a huge and relentless challenge, given that this image of the past casts a substantially *different image of the future* onto the screen of future centuries.

This option makes us formulate quite stunningly unusual conclusions, e.g. with regard to the question whether a present or future knowledge society may be *conceived at all without* the return of gods, without their earthly parousia, without acknowledging their existence, or – generally – without accepting the divine, accepting the reality of a pléróma dimension.

In any case from a future point of view probably the *most pressing challenge* is to analyse the history of – at least partial – knowledge societies, and to formulate the conclusions they hold in common. This analysis cannot be the task of one single science, such as archaeology or cultural history, because dogmas of a given branch of science would be prone to *limit* the terrain of possible questions and answers. Today researchers of tradition³⁶ have come to the conclusion that society is intrinsically tradition-oriented. Of course this only makes sense if we stress that tradition is not a collection of relics of the past, but rather the *organic building material of the future*³⁷.

This *new concept* of tradition deeply roots in the theory of knowledge genders. What happened before, at any time, is not necessarily tradition. Even more so, our memories of history only are caricatures drawn up by our mind. What we do know about the past is concentrated in historic knowledge, and what remains within the ruling knowledge of society is at best the surviving section of collective knowledge. The vision of the past provided by science and art is a present-bound high-knowledge theory with a very limited diffusion, as compared to the sheer volume of the total of spontaneous creations by the human community, which has mostly remained alive within the unformatted common unconscious. The remains of the knowledge of the ages of oral culture only are message-like, modest sketches of the possible tradition(s).

Tradition is the formatted and unformatted, visionary, symbolical, past common knowledge superior to time and space, not more and not less than the *comprehensive knowledge of the past about Wholeness*. We can speak of a tradition-oriented world, if this comprehensive knowledge presently is part and remains part of *individual and group knowledge* (or at least part of latently formatted knowledge).

This notion of tradition, based upon the spheres of world structure, upon space-time and knowledge theory is able to exploit *types of tradition quite different from each other*. Within the world of pléróma, for instance, we can only speak of tradition above form and time. Within global worlds, to the contrary, we can speak of tradition dependent upon form and time, or within individual consciousness or sub-consciousness, again we are finding traditions aloft from time and form³⁸. On this basis we can also distinguish between symbolic and mythic, scientific and mythic, between symbolic, thematic and

³⁶ Hoppál Mihály: Tradition-Based Societies: Local Values for International Cooperation (in: Seitel Peter ed., Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment 182-184., Washington DC, 2001)

³⁷ Csörgő Zoltán: A múlt hagyománya, mint a jövő paradigmája (INCO 2000/2, www.inco.hu)

³⁸ See: Varga Csaba: Új hagyományelmélet és hagyományalapú társadalom (manuscript, 2001)

concrete, everyday, hardly symbolised, and – amongst others – types of tradition symbolic and concrete at the same time. If we are consequent in our analysis it might soon become evident that presently *no type of tradition*, if seen by itself, is able to convert comprehensive, accumulative past knowledge anywhere into individual and common knowledge. Thus tradition at the same time *exists and does not exist*, it is accessible and at the same time unapproachable, it may and may not be unfolded; in one word, the world of tradition, too, is Vannincs type reality.

From this point of view, the contours of future evolve: Only *knowledge society* can possibly be tradition-oriented. If the essence of knowledge society is formatted (and even more, conceptualised and visualised) common and individual knowledge *accounting for wholeness*, then the task within knowledge society is that *quality common knowledge descriptive of the past, too*, becomes as formatted as possible, and is converted into individual and common knowledge at once concrete and symbolic.

Within space-time, tradition-oriented future is thus still *ahead* of us.

The Super-Technology Paradigm

Let us begin with reflecting upon a timely problem. During the 20th century knowledge could best rid itself of its economical and social dependencies by concentrating upon technological development, given that the massive war industry – a sector future-oriented by necessity – along with powerful industrial organisations branched upon the present were always interested in financing research and development. By today, a new and wider interest group has taken over the prime, up to now held by the military industry. “*New Economy*” presents itself as innovative and knowledge intensive. The existential interests of this latest type of economy, focused upon information and communication, dictate the pace in an on-going technological revolution, because without technical innovation global markets could not be supplied with constantly updated quality products. The super-technology paradigm is nothing else than, *firstly*, a new lap of scientific and technological development resulting in superior quality, but *secondly*, it represents the global domination of knowledge-oriented economy, and *thirdly*, the necessary technological development “overdrive” potentially is prone to create numerous prerequisites of the *reconstruction of the entire world*. The vast majority of actors officially does not intend the latter, and even specialists are predicting it only in theory and for times still to come, yet society is not at all aware of technological forecasts, and this is precisely why technological future does not seem credible to the majority of humans.

Today the inception and application of new technical knowledge, along with technological innovation and development has become the most superior

level of *knowledge concentration, extension, amplification, and regeneration*. It is the “secret weapon” against obstacles in the way of present changes, the forerunner of the future we more or less attend.

Where did we get with all this? We have managed to move from the question we posed in the first place to the basic question of *technical philosophy*³⁹. If the immediate and the mediated relationship between modern humans and the entire world (or parts of it) is being realised *by using certain tools*, then those tools, along with all *new tools* developed in the way of technological innovation not only determine the process of mediation itself, but also are influencing mankind whose representatives first perceived them, including human life world. The novelty of information age is that it offers *new, intelligent tools* to mankind, and those tools in turn offer revolutionary new possibilities for interactive relationships between humans, as well as between individuals and the world. Thus relationships gain a *fundamentally new significance and meaning*.

Only in this context are we able to understand why technology is *that important*, and what is the role and effect of super-technology. Intelligent technology creates preconditions of *an intelligent world*. Without new technology, no new image of reality (non-reality). If theoretical physics does not advance radically, I'd say we would not understand anything better about the new society. If, say, we would not get on to nanotechnology, there would not be the faintest prospect to knowledge society. One of the “classical” errors of 20th century philosophy was that it thought technical development to be a threat to traditional historical and cultural heritage, but those fears helped to recognise that even technology needs intelligent human control.

What does *technology theory*⁴⁰ reveal, if interpreted generously and embedded into scientific progress)? 1. Development of science, or non-science – which can be delayed but not prevented – is the basis of technological process. 2. Science and, independently, non-science have reached about the same time the point when they broke through the borders between science and non-science. 3. During the past hundred years natural science – first of all physics, biology and their new branches – has most of all progressed, rendering possible the birth of new technology theory and practice. 4. Long-term, innovative, high-quality adaptation and development, representing new knowledge is a vital question for

³⁹ A good presentation is found in: Don Ihde: A technika filozófiája, mint hermeneutikai feladat. Részlet a szerző A hermeneutika fogalmának kiterjesztése. Vizualizmus a tudományban című művéből. (in. Hermeneutika és a természettudományok, Áron Kiadó, Budapest, 2001.) See also: Don Ihde: Technics and Praxis: A Philosophy of Technology. (Boston, 1979)

⁴⁰ I am only listing a number of books of various kinds: Carl Mitchum: Thinking through Technology (Chicago, 1994), Hermeneutika és a természettudományok (edited by: Schwendtner Tibor, Ropolyi László, Kiss Olga, Áron Kiadó, 2001), Arnold Benz: Az univerzum jövője (Kálvin Kiadó, Budapest, 2001), Tasi István: Ahol megáll a tudomány (LAL Kiadó, Somogyvámos, 1999), Egely György: Tértechnológia (Kornétás, Budapest, 1998), Bevezetés a tértechnológiába (szerkesztő: Egely György, Egely Kft, Budakeszi, 2001), A tudat forradalma (edited by: László Ervin, Új Paradigma Kiadó, 1999) Agy és tudat (a Magyar Tudomány tematikus száma, 2001/10), etc.

the living world, for humankind, and for an intelligent future, which presently is realised best of all by progress in technology. 5. The thirteen or fifteen thousand year old history of technology known by us prove that physical-technical progress is at once caused by and a result of fundamental changes in socio-economic, human paradigms and practises. 6. Technological progress has meanwhile reached another new age and paradigm border, as at one time the expansion of traditional physics (and other branches of natural science) is on the way, as well as establishment and acceptance of new physical findings, and gobal diffusion of applications and tools created on their basis.

I would like to elaborate one of the last possible points, which may be the most elementary new recognition of technology theory, as it immediately surpasses the frequent point of view of technology philosophy: long-term, creative thought cannot be represented only or mainly in terms of technological process, because new, intelligent tools visually render possible *the progress of humans and their world*, who are the two “columns” of the mediating relationship.

P.S.: The classical relationship, human-tool-world also needs to be fundamentally re-defined; not only because humans have been using themselves as tools from the very beginning, but amongst others because the progress of technology has reached the point where tools may be inserted into the human body. If we count knowledge amongst tools, then mediated knowledge transfer, for instance, determines the functioning of humans and of the world. At this point we cannot escape the question whether man, tools, and the world may all be defined as knowledge, and if yes, if this technological relationship consists in the interaction of different kinds of knowledge. Or we can even go further, assume that the world isn't the world we knew before, as it has become a globalised world, a world (re)created by man, is that new earthly civilisation tool in itself, or a world associated with and shaped by tools? Have we reached a point where we need to think in terms of *human-tool, tool world, or world tool*? Or has it been like this all the time long, only that we were not clearly aware of it? What else will arise, following this tool-oriented relationship?

New Economic Theory – The Doctrine of Knowledge Society Economy

Society and economy are the world's (world tool's?) two most prominent institutions.

Are society and economy presently playing distinctive tunes, or one single melody on the stage of this world? Or will society in the 21st century retrieve its role as a first violin? One of the most ancient scientific assertions is that within the entire world society is one (or the only?) totality, or even the whole system itself. Society also contains constant or temporary sub-systems, the most

important of which are economy and politics. On the one hand we may ask whether during the past two or three thousand years society always represented totality, or perhaps during the last one or two hundred years we witnessed to a dual socio-economic system, with the primacy of society constantly decreasing. On the other hand we may also ask whether at present economy does represent the system, containing society as a sub-system, and during the past decades economy definitely left out of its original bed, spreading its dominion over virtually all sub-systems, such as politics, society, law and order, education, communication etc.

The third approach would base upon the typical groups of societies as defined by Niklas Luhmann⁴¹, which are rooted in history. Luhmann distinguishes between three typical groups, the *first* of them being the archaic segmented differentiated, the *second* those already stratified, and the *third* (following the French Revolution) societies that are functionally differentiated. The segmented differentiated might be called the classical archaic societies, where society represents totality, unique totality, and within this economy truly is only a partial, even though *organic* sub-system. To the contrary, societies that are functionally differentiated by economy, as increasingly the case following another “French Revolution”, 1968, are eventually completely dominated by economy, and grace to the influence of new globalisation they have become unified *economical societies*. This process, however, has *not yet come* to a term, and it is quite possible that for a period of time it will not either. Anyhow, the fourth typical group of societies is in the making, namely the functionally differentiated ones will slowly, but surely be replaced by *knowledge differentiated societies*.

The new economical theory not only is the theory of New Economy, but more and more grows into a programme in view of accelerating an inverse process, which for decades has been called *social economy*, or *theory of solidarity economy*. This theory in any case *negates* the self-created economy in face of society, by stating that economy is bound to subordinate itself and to become again a sub-system of society.

There are still many problems with the processes of reality and with theory starting out from reality. Flying financial economy only in the *age of information*, with the help of information and telecommunication technology was able to become totally dominant. Meanwhile real economy, and even financial economy itself is rapidly changing into knowledge-oriented economy, in the framework of which not only money, but knowledge, too, becomes a means of exchange, or in any case knowledge may increasingly be changed into

⁴¹ Niklas Luhmann: *Soziale Systeme, Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie*. (Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 1984). See also: Brunczel Balázs: *A politikai és a gazdasági alrendszer kapcsolata a globalizáció korában (INCO 2001/3)*

money, and money into knowledge. As global and local processes are complex and interrelated, it is not easy to distinguish a dominant trend. We keep to our stance that the entire reality is an *asystematic system*, which if viewed from outside appears as an achieved and self-sufficient, self-created economic system, but viewed from inside it is perfect instability. Instability by the way is normal, and its main cause is not simply the incredible volatility of the new financial system, but at least as responsible is the circumstance that neither on a global nor on a local scale can it be pertained that economy apparently remains profitable, even though its proceeds (including social and knowledge type) only benefit a *minority section* of society. Meanwhile quality of life of the entire society has definitely become an interest of global economy and finance.

Change is called first of all, *economy for everybody*. Or, economy in favour of society as a whole. We are not talking just about any economy, but about *knowledge economy*. The system or system model which provides for this possibility is called (electronic) *social economy*. Will new economy, e-economy, or social economy sooner or later become a unified – what? – a fundamentally new type of economy? The denomination of change cannot consist in the repetition of an old programme: *work for everybody*. There are several reasons to this. Firstly, work is not the same it has been within industrial society, it has become *knowledge work*. This means above all a constant renewal and application of knowledge. Secondly, economy has integrated into itself non-economy (education, health system, society etc.), and knowledge in turn has incorporated economy and non-economy alike.

Where do we arrive at? Traditional, clear-cut (producing and trading) economy will be something different, which is not at all described or explained by the term new. That, which is about to be born, *knowledge society economy*, can hardly be described by words. It comes to no surprise that in Western Europe people slowly recognise that business societies must not only be audited financially, but also in view of *solidarity and knowledge*.

Not only it cannot be cramped into a combined word, we are even unable to *describe its near future*. Assume that in the long term population on earth will not continue to grow at the same pace, and that as an integral part of the global world even the developed world will become aware of the *limitedness* of economical resources, and the premise becomes unavoidable that traditional provision of society's members financed by proceeds from work cannot be maintained forever. Work does not equal physical work any longer, and as knowledge work does not or rarely provides for traditional work possibilities, no well-paid work places for hundreds of thousands are generated – shall we continue? Theory and, later on, practice of knowledge society economy will be constrained to recognise that *continuous acquisition of knowledge* by adults should be perceived of like traditional work, and remunerated from state or market-generated funds. Adult compatriots could even receive a monthly ground wage, after earning their first tertiary diploma, or they could receive a life

allowance independent of a work place and of the revenues regularly created by a work relation.

Knowledge society economy only works within the age of knowledge society.

The Future of the State and of Democracy

The state as the *most important* institutionalised mediating system *between humans and the world*? Democracy as the *functional modality* of this relationship?

Within Central Europe and in particular in Hungary, during the past hundred and fifty or two hundred years, the national principle has become the *principle of the state*, or the goal of the principle of state has been to help people *grow into a nation*. The twentieth century in this respect has provided one single new thought: the principle of state has shrunk into a sheer system principle, or the aim of government remained the radical transformation and the maintenance of the present system. The history of the Hungarian state since 1849 – with small interruptions through to 1989 – has been a history not of economy, not of democracy, but of *power-oriented* governance. It could not have passed otherwise, because this country existed at the meeting-point of partly global *medium and world powers*. Government made use of the means of power, serving the interests of internal or external groups of power. At the turn of the millennium those old and new groups grasping for power are confronted with the problem, which national and state principle they shall represent, and which system principle constrained to the small space left by the principles of nation and state. As they notice with consternation that the state principle has mutated into continental principle, and even spread to a global world principle, they realise that they are unable to construct a system principle based on twentieth-century presumptions.

Nothing is like it was twenty or fifty or hundred and fifty years ago, neither state principle nor state practice. In the 21st century if we refer to the nation, or to Europe, or to society, we are saying hardly anything. Or perhaps are by those references or assertions we declaring what are the roots of our thoughts? The difficulty is that in Central Europe one might continue for one or perhaps for two decades to experiment with a power-centred government style, but this is limited in time due to the trend of globalisation, and due to integration of the European continent, which will deprive nation states from this function of power, or at least limit it.

A traditional Liberal answer would certainly be to strengthen democratic principles of governance – only that the dilemma remains, *what type* of democracy and *what type* of state are we speaking of (a neutral one or what would its alignment policy be?) Or are we holding that society, economy and knowledge (knowledge society economy) is in a position to prevail without state

support and intervention? The answer of Social Democrats might be the most confused, because they don't dare to publicly pronounce their point of departure, society-oriented governance – and the problem remains unsolved, *what* society and *what type* of state are they promoting? Besides, as power is tempting, they also openly flirt with democracy and nation type governance practices. The conservative answer is not much more reflected, as they simply answer to the problem by reaffirming *nation state* government practice – only to leave the question open whether *what* nation and *what type* of state they are talking of. Or perhaps they content themselves with the distinction between nation and state, but with the help of government they try to help developing a vibrant, holistic nation (knowledge or culture oriented nation).

We still hardly can see even the outlines of a new theory of democracy or of governance. We will now state within parentheses that the ideologist backdrops listed are all put to service in view of *embracing or holding on to* power. The theory of information society and knowledge society provide us with different alternatives. Post-socialist countries at the threshold of the information age are put in front of two alternatives: a still power-oriented state government extending its influence to *information*, or a more or less *neutral, service-type* form of governance, in partial fulfilment of the programme of a state *supporting economy and society*. Naturally a blend of the two is also possible. What is more, the latter development is apt to openly or silently serve the reconstruction of a *nation, or still-nation state*. (The possible alternatives cannot be readily combined with classic political ideologies.) This *multiple-mix* of governance practice presumably will not remain for very long, as sooner or later a *predominantly information state* government (not power-oriented) will evolve, if there is at all time left for this development to occur.

Within present Hungary (as generally in Eastern Europe) we are still observing some remains of post-feudalism, we are fully into post-socialism, but already head-over into different models of market economy, or capitalism (ranging from early post-capitalism to global monetary economy, or even to information-communication economy). Looking at this mix the tendency towards a multiple-mixed model of democracy and governance comes to no surprise. Another question is, *where do we go from here*, and how?

If we do not think of the future alongside political interests and power peer groups, nothing will be more natural than stating that within a chaos-type economy and society, the state should strive even more to provide for *stability and balance*. The secret of this operation is that rather than using the means of power and the *retarded limitations* of our present model of democracy, it can be achieved with the means of digital democracy – void of most of the roles of a nation state, a *developing, digital state*, which makes best use of the tools of information age, firstly in order to maintain an *e-state*, secondly in order to remain a state *obliged to progress and development*. If those objectives are achieved to three-quarters or at least to some extent, then we are moving close to

a civil state, and this is e-democracy; both are putting into action the programme *democracy and state for everybody*. Yes, this also applies to the state, but not to a state in full control of power, but to a *service-type* state which is protecting its nationals. Such a state we may call a *personal-impersonal state*⁴², which is concerned with all citizens personally, as they are co-operating in personal and impersonal ways.

A state which has lost touch with society needs to *find back* to society. It can only reach individual members of society by means of the *tools* provided by *information and telecommunication technology*. E-democracy only by name resembles to representative democracy, because this new-type democracy will largely be an *immediate* one. This is not a pre-modern village community, it is about digital settlements and cyber-regions, and about *digital democracy* achieved between Union members on the European continent. This digital state with its new technological tools creates a new system of *political relationships* between humans and the world. Real future only becomes possible grace to the age of knowledge society, because e-democracy not only needs a new concept of state, but also masses of *personal-impersonal citizens* who are prepared to meet the challenges of e-democracy.

Within the reforms of real-life politics a digital state, along with e-public administration will be realised within a *medium-range* of time. The direction of further development is quite *unpredictable*.

A Doctrine of Divinity in Knowledge Age

Have the forces of modernity *banned* God forever into religion, or even into the institutional walls of churches? Is the concept of God only accessible and intelligible to religious people, whilst God has been forever *driven out* from scientific thought? Perhaps divine reality does *not even exist* any longer, because - according to many - its notion is intrinsically alien to science? Is all that knowledge of pléroma which has been accumulated by religious culture over thousands of years void and useless?

At the age of knowledge society we cannot pretend if human culture never had spoken of a divine reality, or more precisely of pléroma, or of God himself. Hegel said, "Every other form of reality is not for real because of itself, it does not exist because of itself; only God alone is the unique, absolute reality. He is the absolute substance."⁴³

Discussing this question is *independent* of any religious practice of the analyst, it is *independent* of the religion or religious philosophy we may or may not hold. It is equally independent of the circumstance that for several centuries religion and science have lead separate existences, but it may not be entirely detached from the willingness of both interpretations of the world to ponder

⁴² Varga Csaba: Az újkonzervativizmus koncepciója (in. Varga Csaba: Hagyomány és stratégia, Kapu, 1997)

⁴³ Hegel Vallásfilozófiai előadások (Atlantisz, 2000, 44.o.)

upon each other. The question whether we are able or not to imagine vinnincs nature of reality without the existence of a *superior dimension* is of some significance, but the existence of superior reality is not dependent on the spiritual fundamentals the analyst may hold.

We have proposed that space or space-time does not end at the external borders of a planet called Earth. From this we conclude that the entire space-time structure goes beyond the nine earthly spheres, with first of all our own solar system following, then the Milky Way galaxy, then the universe and, according to our present knowledge, "finally" *quantum space, and/or divine reality*. We would propose that the hypothesis is right, which states that Wholeness *is not complete* either without quantum universe, or without divine reality. Besides this the dilemma, whether quantum universe should be situated next to divine reality, or rather below, next to cosmic reality, is of secondary significance. Of course any decision as to the precise location is a difficult one, and we are only able to affirm, that according to our preliminary assumption quantum space is *one dimension* of pléróma.

On the peak of the complete and bending space-time world structure we may imagine three steps: *cosmic reality, quantum reality, and divine reality*. Between the three spheres a clear-cut and a soft border may equally be imagined, or possibly a clear-cut border may be restricted to the border between cosmic universe and the common quantum-divine universe. If we imagine a unified territory of quantum and the divine, just like some kind of *light, energy, not material*, centre or non-centre *intrinsically depending upon spiritual consciousness*, then the above localisation is acceptable, because pure light, or the world of the absolute may not be cut away from quantum space. The question whether *how do we call* outer and inner infinity of our total, spherically bending (or multi-dimensional) space-time system, though it is of significance, is not the most important one.

All this together we may call supra-terrestrial *unconditional reality*⁴⁴, even though there exists - underneath this world, but even more so *within the world - conditional reality* also. With this in mind, we would propose another denomination: unconditional reality is the *wholeness* of total space-time reality, but the *most superior reality* of this unconditional reality is the common quantum and divine reality, which as we have signalled before is *equally present* in quantum space and in the sub-atomic world, and perhaps in the consciousness of every human being. With this latter statement, however, I am not quite comfortable. If for instance we accept the notion of unconditional reality, according to which *it is not dependent in its existence on nothing else, and it does not infer to anything besides itself* (Weissmahr, 1996), then we might reasonably reduce this territory of space-time reality to pléróma, which in turn would mean that outside pléróma every material and spiritual manifestation is *only a consequence* of quantum universe and/or divine perfection. This we

⁴⁴ Weissmahr Béla SJ: Filozófiai istentan (Mérleg-Távlatok, Bécs, Budapest, München, 1996)

would not like to think. Therefore we prefer to stick to the hypothesis that we do not limit unconditional reality, but extend it.

We thus accept *absolute reality*, as the very last foundation of anything which exists, or not exists. Further we think that it is correct to propose that the fundamental question of a philosophical doctrine of God is the understanding or the ignorance with respect to unconditional reality, even though by saying so we would not like to keep things *out of reach*, within the outer territories of the *inconceivable*. According to our interpretation, pléróma is the essence and the meaning of vannincs reality⁴⁵, but this reality substance cannot be moved away into a transcendent world above our world. *It is existing and not existing out there, too, but equally down here, van/nincs*. If you like, this is a material and a non-material existence at once. We are not particularly preoccupied with the fact that this stance radically surpasses the ancient struggle between theists and atheists, who have been slandering each other for thousands of years.

One of the *most critical questions* therefore is: may individual reality be distinguished from divine reality? How can the *personal* relationship between a *personal* God and a *personal* individual be interpreted? Those are just a couple of "simple" problems: 1. May the individual only be personal, if god exists *personally*, or even if they personally communicate with each other? 2. If God is not accessible in a personal way, because God is *not personal*, is, then, the individual impersonal, because god-less? 3. Is it that an *impersonal individual* is unable to reach a personal god, or is a personal god constantly trying in vain to reach humans who lost their personality? 4. Is a *personal human being* unable to communicate with an impersonal god, or is impersonal pléróma incomprehensible as a non-existing reality to man, the one and only personal being? 5. Is God at the same time *impersonal and personal*, and therefore relationship with him is also an impersonal-personal one, presuming an individual who is also intrinsically impersonal-personal, who in its earthly existence has nothing else to do than to reflect upon and to pass through impersonal-personality, that is to mould it into *personal-impersonality*?

Questions may be posed in many ways and aiming at many directions. If we do not consider God and earthly humans (individuals) as *equally* personal, or impersonal, then it is apparently easy to state that between human and divine reality there is a huge *gap, a barrier*, even though the question may be answered in a manner without postulating a barrier, if within their substantial existence (within their personal or impersonal nature) they differ, because the personal task of the individual precisely is to *identify with the impersonal absolute*. Neither can we exclude that in all humans, or in their vast majority, the impersonal absolute may exist or non-exist to some extent, given that lacking this perhaps they would be utterly incapable to identify-unite with impersonal completeness. One of the good answers in any case is the assumption that again we are confronted with an arenot/are type problem, because within uniform

⁴⁵ Frithjof Schuon: Az emberi állapot gyökerei (Arcticus Kiadó, 2001)

vannincs reality pléróma, characterised with the metaphor of God, and the individual, characterised with the metaphor of Man *are both personal-impersonal*. The essence of man is precisely that on the one hand it is a personal being and on the other hand it *partakes* of impersonal divine reality. All this means that in place of separation there is *one unique identity*, and our line of thought suggests that the relationship between personal-impersonal parts is an *intimate one of interdependence, a pre-existing but not necessarily an internalised one*. Thus the task is nothing else than to personally experience and *internalise* natural personal-impersonal common existence.

Another fair question is whether divine reality and unconditional absolute reality to what extent are distinctive, and is there a *gulf of separation* between the two of them?

Consciousness as a Secret and an Obstacle, and as Most Important Possibility

If only *personal-impersonal humans* are able to communicate with, for instance, a personal-impersonal state, an equally personal-impersonal divine reality, may we therefore assume that *consciousness* is the vehicle and medium of personal-impersonality?

Intelligent civilisation is at least ten or fifteen thousand years of age, and even after all that time passing we are only able to state that *consciousness* is perhaps the least comprehensible of all realities, next to the frequent elusiveness of god. Amongst all earthly civilisations, is Euro-Atlantic culture the one which still is not at the *least level of understanding*? It essentially does not understand consciousness at all, or hardly understands anything of it, and up to now scientific hypotheses have been elementary and fragmentary. But nevertheless they exist, and they are important.⁴⁶ Consciousness therefore beforehand appears as a complete *secret*, and that is the most marked obstacle in front of a very complex interdisciplinary research approach. If that is so, and this most likely is the case, is there any *question more important* than examining consciousness?

One reason of ignorance, of non-understanding, or of least-understanding is probably that consciousness *in itself* isn't comprehensible either, which approximately means that we should have such a hypothesis of *wholeness* which with its interpretative system helps us to largely define consciousness. The other reason is that supposed nature of conscious reality and the present logic of science are *out of harmony*, or science, which first of all is preoccupied with studying the material world, does not really have an idea what to do with the non-material character of consciousness.

⁴⁶ A tudat forradalma, edited by László Ervin (Új Paradigma, 1999.), John. R.Searle: Elme, nyelv és társadalom (Vince Kiadó, Budapest, 2000), Agy és tudat (Magyar Tudomány thematical edition: 2001/10), Kampis György: Test és elme (in. Filozófia az ezredfordulón, Áron Kiadó, Budapest, 2000)

Enquiring about consciousness is the same as trying to interpret reality. It is the same, but perhaps even more tense and exciting. One of the fundamental theoretical questions is again, whether consciousness does exist without somebody to look at it, or to interpret it. Or we might ask whether consciousness within the infinite and within concrete space-time is always the same, and stays the same independently of the consciousness and the knowledge of the one asking?

Consciousness as the object of consciousness - what shall we reckon? Does the present image of consciousness interpretation change, if only a given age or a given researcher of consciousness defines it in a certain way, respectively if thought hypotheses are constantly unfolding ever-new characteristics, relationships and dimensions of the infinitely-complete image of that consciousness veiled in secrecy? We are still adding to the tension of interpretation: is there no image of consciousness, *only some type of face, some illusion of consciousness interpretation*? Or does consciousness exist and it is always the same - *only that we never can approach it and understand it completely*? If we continue on this track of investigation, the clarification of the problem may become even more fascinating: What happens if the very question whether consciousness does or does not exist is in itself a *senseless and useless* conjecture? Its existence is hardly in want of proof. If according to our previous, earth-bound world view consciousness-reality at the same time exists and does not exist, than the fundamental nature of consciousness, according to our present knowledge, is equally *vannincs*.

If we continue to research reality and consciousness, another conclusion may be formulated, because consciousness existing in space-time, just as with reality, virtually always has at least *two dimensions*, which in turn perfectly matches *vannincs* nature of consciousness. One of them is the "is" characteristic of consciousness, immediately recognisable conscious reality, which almost always is connected with brain activity, and the other one is the "isnot" characteristic of consciousness, which is such an inner reality which frequently can't be recognised, not even in a mediated way. The realisation that even though consciousness and the brain are organically interconnected, consciousness is able to quit the body - and according to many signs it *continues to exist* after death - well symbolises the scientific problem.

The greatest secret remains unlighted: if consciousness is material, and at the same time it is not, then who/what is in control of consciousness, and of the co-operation of the two dimensions? Or how is the dimension not dependent upon the brain influencing the material, brain/consciousness dimension? Would this be the essence and the secret of consciousness? Non-material consciousness as an eternal element of consciousness, an organic piece of transcendent reality? Or should we at this point accept Bohm's theory, which holds that Q quantum potential as a *control wave* transcends total reality of space-time, and that this quantum potential stems from quantum reality from outside of space-time, or

from the "final" inner order. The only thing is that with this question we end up at the same place: quantum-vacuum reality outside traditional cosmic reality is already part of *divine reality*, of the reality of the absolute, or is it not? Does it or doesn't it make part of the absolute consciousness?

Analysis of quantum potential has lead us towards a definition of the inner structure of reality/consciousness. The most important structuring levels of the life mode structure of reality/consciousness *still* are divine reality/quantum reality (pléroma), cosmic reality, earthly (material) reality, human reality, and then *conscious reality/earthly quantum reality*. The unity of those is the collective of all *spiritual/material, existing/non-existing* elements of reality/consciousness. Thus analysis of consciousness strenghtens positions we held of reality, namely that reality and consciousness still appear more inseparable, and even the non-material, conscious definition of reality is more elementary.

We are at the same position than when examining reality. The new image of consciousness means *new reality*, but new reality at the same time points to the *new image* of consciousness. If there is a new image of consciousness, this means new reality, only that new reality is *not more* than a new awareness of always-constant reality? Always-constant reality and the present vision of this reality may equally be *conscious reality*, whilst always-constant reality may be also understood as a *reality independent of consciousness*, and conscious reality even may be defined as something existing independently of personal consciousness. That is why we may speak of a vinnines nature of reality/consciousness.

We are still returning to this point: brain or consciousness? There is a fair chance, however, that this 'question of the century' is a bad one. The "are" makes it impossible to understand brain and consciousness. Another bad approach is the question pointing to matter or spirit/consciousness/no-matter. So our hypothesis again remains that matter and no-matter is just the same, as brain and consciousness are the same - so to speak both of them together form vinnines reality. *Matter - at anytime? - may be no-matter, and consciousness - at anytime? - may transform into matter*. That is why the question goes, *who/what* is in control of co-operation between the two dimensions of vinnines reality, or how is the inner (non-material) dimension exerting influence upon the external (material) dimension and the other way round? The answer may be *more than one*: 1. Inner dimension is consciousness itself (only this is conscious reality). 2. Consciousness works the switch between the external and the internal dimension (as consciousness/energy). For this approach the internal dimension also is material/non-material reality. 3. The inner dimension is not simply consciousness, but itself the essence material/non-material reality, which necessarily is identical with the ability to switch, and at this time the sending dimension is nothing less that the present form and manifestation of inner reality. 4. The external and the internal dimensions are equally forms and

manifestations of the existence/non-existence of quantum potential, that is why quantum potential itself is consciousness (conscious reality) and god (divine reality), which is equal with all dynamics, movement, transformation and development. 5. Other answers or alternatives are also possible.

The space-time consciousness structure is equally fundamental, because the spheres of consciousness (1. quantum universe / divine reality / consciousness, 2. earthly material/non-material reality/consciousness, 3. individual brain/consciousness) in principle are at the same time separable and not separable. This problem of separation is a crucial dilemma, because without it we cannot understand anything about the role and the tasks of individuals thrown, or sent into earthly civilisation. For me it is already evident that we are facing a future (centuries and millennia) - and indeed we have been perceiving or not perceiving within that space-time for quite some time - which within *short time reaches* the point, the field, the dimension, where the answer and the solution to all good or bad is going to be a question of *consciousness*. How shall we understand this? Knowledge society is probably coming into existence, and creation of its technological, economical, and even social and (mostly) knowledge prerequisites may be *planned*, and even the likely problems may be *foreseen*, so that they are *fixed quite easily*.

As long as knowledge society only transforms knowledge and society, its track may be largely pre-calculated. The great obstacle: *consciousness*. The millions of individual conscious and subconscious, and the lesser (but still countless) number of global and local consciousness, and the subconscious of society. The condition of earthly realities/consciousness, its openness and closeness, relationships (or lacking relationships), and quantum universe/pléroma with its absolute realities/consciousness. Future, and even present are already in *conflict* with consciousness and with its limitations, its suppressions. 21st century may see many dramas and many positive solutions, but realistic or optimal schedules are deeply getting entangled with consciousness and with the problems of its development.

No matter how good or bad the raised questions and answers are, may there be a *question more important* than consciousness?

New Hypotheses of Man

Individual, personality, man - up to now we have generally used those three terms. The individual rather is the dominion of psychology and sociology, personality is frequently used by theories of consciousness, knowledge and moral, and man is the preferred term of philosophy⁴⁷ and religion. The individual represents *past and present*, personality the *exceptional present and*

⁴⁷ I am formulating a bit awkwardly: what a wonderful age are we living in, which is marked with such great spirits such as Heller Ágnes, Pető Bertalan, Hankiss Elemér, Szász Ilma and others, who wrote magnificent works about the individual and about man that are hardly appreciated adequately by their age.

the future, and man is the subject of *infinite space-time*. The individual is what exists concretely, personality is the *potential*, the chance of consciousness, and man is at once *essence and idea*.

I have no intention to philosophise about the little quantity within earthly civilisation of presently available knowledge, which falls short in view of getting to know and to understand humans. It is in order and even represents a source of motivation, if many details are still *unrecognisable* for man, such as god or sub-atomic reality, but the greatest of incomprehensible secrets are *humans* themselves. For instance because individuals of yesterday and of today have virtually *nothing in common* with becoming a personality or/and a personal-impersonal human being. This tension, this high-tension is the cause for all such glowing pain, rage and hope, which has been experienced by the most outstanding and the most fallible seeds of human culture. It is the mental peak tension wrought by pain and suffering which renders individuals of all times incomprehensible, or, if the subject is a philosophical, religious man, misunderstood.

Thinking about humans is so exciting because man of philosophy, potential personality, and in every age a few dozen of individuals (grown into human personalities) are able to think essentially *new things of reality, in order to transform it*.

Well, towards the very end of the last century I had the "crazy idea" that collecting and systematising our up-to-date knowledge about man would represent a very serious *scientific result*. We could begin with a comparative study of anthropology within *world religions*, and then we could interpolate ancient hypotheses of world religions, as compared to *modern scientific* knowledge about nature, although no unified and uniform theory of nature is not yet ready and the comprehensive theory of life and social science has not even been perceived. The ancient knowledge of religions, however, cannot be easily systematised either, just as is the case with theoretical physics and theoretical biology (if there is such a thing at all) consists of an endless number of new hypotheses, while philosophy has stepped back towards the "sub-atomic element" thought to be the last one, to *language*, to *words*, but from the smallest particles of substance it will be constrained sooner or later to return to the fields of Wholeness, and get serious, for instance, with *man*.

Inter-religious and interdisciplinary research and theory construction goes with incredible hardships because the individual/personality/man by itself virtually *cannot be interpreted*, only as part of the world, of reality, at the same time subject and not subject, and also a *central* player, probably *the only one who thinks ahead in a reflective way*. Thus we get entangled with all questions up to now, with problems and theoretical confusion, and the number and intensity of conflicts is so incredibly large that the resulting peak-tension is apt

to cast its shadow upon the main question, raising and consequently discussing the distinctive problematics of man.

Meanwhile we are at the point that I would prefer to use the following *integrated* (plugged out of their initial surroundings) and unified terms: 1. *World around man*: a) divine reality or pléroma, b) collective field of consciousness, and the subconscious of society, c) the field of society, or society reality, d) field of identity, surrounding world and "world at hand" within a local entity, e) field of the physical world (natural and constructed environments). No need to describe those terms, I have done so when defining them in previous chapters. 2. Let us look at the world *within man*: a) personal physical field, b) life force field, energy field [astral body, fine material body, ether body], c) spiritual field, personal and collective consciousness, sub-consciousness, d) true ego field, or divine ego. We have amply discussed those terms also,⁴⁸ even though at times it is not quite evident whether psychology for instance uses the term true ego fields in a way similar to religions. In any case this *toolbox and network of terms* serves to create a minimum of intellectual prerequisites for a fruitful *on-going interpolation and interpretation* of religions and human sciences.

If we do not talk of man in philosophical or religious terms, but of the *individual* subject of sociology and psychology, we are able to observe four potential *strategic tendencies* within the age of new globalisation and localisation: the second (qualitative) individualisation of individuals may begin, individuals are less subject to situational constraints caused by society and ideology, within knowledge society individuals may gain access to information and knowledge without external (economical, technological and society) limitations, and finally, within fifty years we are prone to reach the pre-chambers of the age of knowledge development. Of course we may remark on all this, that trends may well prove right in theory, but concrete existing individuals (potential knowledge individuals) will *not be able*, within a couple of decades, to live up to those strategic chances. We cannot answer to this objection according to a yes/no logic, but if we manage to free *vannincs* reality from the thick, grey dust of our *preconceptions and dogmas*, then we will perceive the age of individual and group ability utilisation *much closer* than we might have attended.

It is all a question of dusting and of anticipating future.

Theory of Change

What is *change* bringing about?

What does the fundamental question stand for: transformation of the relationship between man-tool-worlds. Change has already taken place. The complex, interactive network of *ember tool - tool world - world tool* has been created, or is created now. What happens if this is further developed into

⁴⁸ See amongst others: Szász Ilma: *Az Úr ruháját hordja minden* (Vízterítő Kiadó, Fót, 2001)

knowledge man - knowledge tool - knowledge world, a super-interactive spherical system? Nobody has been able to affirm that the predictable/unpredictable process has come to an end.

We could ponder upon a whole lot of questions: How will tool man become *knowledge man*? By what terms does tool world transform into *knowledge tool*? Is there any chance that out of world tool *knowledge world* emerges? At what *point, or points* is the creation of the new world initiated? Is this organic evolution, or rather "unorganised" caprices of consciousness?

In what *dimension* of reality world or/and at what *structural level* can we reach change? Does change take place independently of humans, or are potentials depending from man being utilised? Does change become effective within space-time without human intention, because this is the intrinsic *self-organising property of cosmos*? Q quantum potential is only carried consciously by man, so only *man* is able to carry out fundamental changes?

Generally *what* is the essence, the intention of change, and what *knowledge* is necessary for change to become effective? Evolutionary/non-evolutionary transformation does not result in change within the fundamental dimension of reality, but thanks to its historical modes of existence does it result in significant transformation? Or put it the other way round: will present life mode change only after the fundamental dimension has been loosened? Is change not more than paradox *self-movements* of immutability, or is progress a genetic characteristic of reality? Or, is change only taking place on the surface of immutability, but surface transformation also have an effect upon the inner dimension of reality? Is the theory of change at once theory of progress, of development, or are we unable to speak of de-facto progress?

If reality is two-pole ninesvan state/movement, then in principle change exists for itself, or/and change may be constrained - on *both poles*, or as an *interaction* between two poles?

If one basic law of reality states that the co-operation of two dimensions define Q *quantum potential*, and this quantum potential always mean the internal space/order effect upon an external space or system, then naturally the question arouses whether development of reality takes place not only in two, but in *three or more* dimensions. *Alternatives*: 1. "Changes" are running on external poles, without transforming the essence of reality, but these may be described by classical physical and biological laws. 2. Transformation resulting in external changes also have an effect upon inner space, and at the same time the "will" of Q quantum potential will be done. 3. Internal movements and changes define the external-internal order, and those exclude or/and describe a dynamical development of reality. 4. Internal changes are more important, and thus unattended, unintended - insecure - quantum leaps, which according to their nature may bring along fundamental development/non development.

On the grounds of all those, how do we evaluate knowledge society, of which we - hopefully - have established that they signify change in paradigm?

Or, the paradigm of knowledge society how does it help or not help reality to become the *future life mode*? Knowledge society paradigm and life mode are they superficial manifestations of an external space/order, or do they radically exert influence on the essence, the spirit of reality? We may also ask, is knowledge society a new type of more or less developed expression of Q quantum potential?

We do not know, but there is no sign that immobility would have become the dominating factor. Grace to this, the dispute may be substantially settled. It becomes a question of time (space-time), when is going to be born knowledge man, knowledge tool, knowledge world within a super-interactive relationship of knowledge relationship.

Reflections on the New Object - Instead of Daily Recommendations

What might happen in the present, goes to say *tomorrow*?

Within the field of politics, the 19th and 20th century has seen general suffrage being introduced, the task of the 21st century will be to *distribute election knowledge*, and to *create actual participation*. Realisation of democratic systems has exactly shown to what small extent did the declaration of legal freedoms to the creation of true *freedom of society*. Legal and political gestures up to now have made possible the development of a mass society, which later created work possibilities for many to work, receive regular salary and enjoy consumer freedom.

Within the developed world mass emancipation reached an end when the goal of a mass economical culture was attained (for many, but not at all for everybody). This brought a clear quantitative rise, as a result of mass consumerism. But already this quantitative result has cost the lives of generations, that is we do well by honouring the result.

If the 20th century was the quantitative century, can the 21st become the qualitative century? We already perceive the future quite clearly: today, there is only a chance for a wider diffusion of knowledge, because a great obstacle in the way of understanding and utilising quality knowledge is - and will be - the present state of individual and social consciousness. It is possible that the first half of the new century will be spent to create the quantitative prerequisites for mass diffusion of knowledge, and besides it must count as a good result if masses are elevated from the eight years of high school towards College level (not a very high quality one)..

With respect to education, future appears quite clear, but unfortunately not very bright.

All along the thirteen or fifteen thousand years - according to recent hypothesis - of intelligent human culture knowledge people have been a *small minority* of a given age and society. There has not yet been an age when a comprehensive diffusion of knowledge was achieved, and nobody knows

exactly where it the exact border of the extension. We find ourselves at an ever-higher position, but with regard to knowledge diffusion, at the same place than thousands of years before: we would like to render accessible for the larger sections of society *superior knowledge* (and also a more human life). Society always relied on the knowledgeable: the wise men, the initiated, the shaman, the priest, and later the philosopher and the psychologist. Perhaps only the names and the actors changed?

Ancient *dilemmas* keep returning: Is every human being able to receive superior knowledge and to live with it? Superior knowledge itself, will it be apt to really improve people's life? Society touched by superior knowledge, will it be able to support elevation of knowledge level and life expectation?

We do not know the answer, because we still ought to know man, consciousness, society, knowledge, the future (etc.) *at a much deeper level*.

It seems a pretty *simple* task to solve the assignment of the 20th century, compared to what awaits us during the next hundred years. The lesson is ready, and it not only goes about nations (only), but firstly it is *local*, secondly *global*. It is impossible to answer to questions only within a national framework. Its fundamental questions require *overall-human, multi-disciplinarian scientist*, and *religious* intellectual efforts, while within every local world of the globalised and the always-globalising world (too) we ought to experience qualitative improvements.

The standards of workplace environment, income structure and consummation within the developed world should be preserved and extended to the second, third and fourth world, which in term *seems quite unreal*. On a global scale, are we able to create a knowledge society on a level falling behind the Euro-Atlantic world?

This study originally was only concerned with an attempt to systematise⁴⁹ and to formulate a possible Hungarian (national and/or nation state) strategy of an information society. While thinking through those old and new questions that arose, it has become obvious that we had to reach, within our train of thought, the groups of questions defined in the chapters that follow each other. The central problem no longer presented itself from a Hungarian, nor European, nor to that effect Asian point of view, from which in turn we do not conclude that the answer will be *not at all* Hungarian, *not at all* European, or *not at all* South American.

Our proper tasks here at home may be quite well *deduced* from the study, but only *in train* of solving the global meta-lesson.

There is no pardon: we need to provide for the prerequisites of information society (*access conditions*) as soon as possible. No reason to deny, most of our significant interest groups have realised this, and we are going to manage this technological question. All the rest remains within gentle fog. More precisely, not many are discussing the circumstance that in building our future

⁴⁹ About the necessity of system theory see: László Ervin: A rendszerelmélet távlatai (Magyar Könyvklub, 2001)

first of all contents (knowledge) is important, and perhaps the majority won't deny that we need to digitalise national culture in order to attain accessibility. Different question, *up to where* will we go ahead with this?

I have some good news: within a global world sooner or later *all states* are going to solve that top lesson. In creating a positive system of preconditions, however, Hungary will only be able to attain a temporary advantage, if any at all.

I repeat the *three dilemma* ahead of us, because those are posing the new questions, the new rules of competition: Is every human being apt to receive and to live with superior knowledge? Those who dispose of superior knowledge, will they be able to actually improve on their life situation, and society sublimated with superior knowledge, will it be able to raise levels of knowledge and of life expectancy? Or, how can we make high(er) knowledge accessible to the majority of society? *In which ways* can superior knowledge *improve upon* life chances of our earthly civilisation, of knowledge-centred economy, and how are we able to mix knowledge-centred society with the application of knowledge, with the pool of old and new, individual and collective (global, national, local) consciousness?

New strategies need to answer to those dilemmas and peak questions.

The term knowledge society is thus an awfully clear-cut one: *knowledge and development of society*, each on itself and also taken together.

The future is held by those erudite, knowledge groups, nation states or regions, continents (etc.) who manage to answer those question in a theoretical and practical manner, even if only partially, if only they put it into practice.⁵⁰

The time will arrive when *new propositions* will be introduced every our or so. Before and after us an intellectual tornado is predicted. New theory and new practice are *in sight*.

One more reason to take seriously the ancient wish: *May God be with us*.

⁵⁰ What *new initial steps* could be imagined in Hungary? A nanotechnological state research and development institute within the best science park. Social-economic businesses and banks, and a knowledge channels as a central element of internet television. Inter-university peak-university and/or global conscious research and development centre. European institute of knowledge society, which we have already partially organised. Next to the Hungarian Academy of Science (and Arts) there should be a theological academy, or rather there should be a comprehensive Knowledge Academy. Integrated centre for the development of local society in one of the regional centres. Concentrated regional knowledge and society development experiment, or at least some pilote project in view of an electronic regional council anticipating e-democracy.