

And it justified science, for it was a victory over the self. The Creed of intelligam was the open sesame to the tree of knowledge.

The Three Sciences.

The basis of ^{any} science must be ~~our~~ faith: science shall be. To explain this belief, the three ages of universal science, medieval, modern, and our own, the scholastic, the ~~modern~~ academic, and the educational, or, in other equivalent terms, the Christian, the humanistic, and the social, era all three ~~were~~ obliged to ~~be~~ to analyze the process of science which is described by the simple phrase: I think it.

This sentence: I think it, consists of three parts, a no, an action, and an object. Before a mortal can become either the subject, the process, or the object of science, certain conditions must be fulfilled. No self-centered, passionate, prejudiced individual may be the ~~subject~~ who of a real science. Therefore, the Middle Ages stated that man's science depended on some energy bigger than his bodily greed, hunger, lust, appetite. Deus illuminatio mea, is ~~our~~ heritage from medieval science. Without ^{the} no man born from woman, can transcend his ego and turn into a scientific mind. The scientist's mind is a mind that can think against his carriers advantage or material interest. Otherwise no science is possible. If god had not become man, there was no ~~promise~~ ~~even~~ for man to set out for research of a universal, obligatory truth for all and every soul. ~~Science is more than personal.~~ The Who is the central scientific problem of scholasticism. Who thinks? If man does not connect himself with the infinite, he can not go beyond his passions, prejudices, and self. Hence the formula that man's faith seeks permanent truth. Fides quaerens intellectum. This constitutes the thinking subject which Academic and Humanistic ~~science~~ plunged into the ~~problem~~ of thinking. They simply inherited the purified transcendental ego produced by the scholastics, and did not need to worry any longer about the process how ~~it~~ was produced. They now set out to reproduce the divine thought itself. Natural science pierced behind the phenomena, the appearances of sunrise or sunset, and it discovered behind the semblance the "real", mathematical process. The scholastic mind was haunted by the question: Does god speak, or the devil? Do we tell the truth or do we tell lies? Who, for heaven's sake, speaks when man thinks? The academic mind asks, instead: What is appearance, what is behind the appearance? They abstract from all appearance: The sun does not rise, is the great paradigm of a scientific statement in the academic sense.

We are concerned with a different question in the social sciences. Here, the scientists, not the scientific objects are the object of ~~the~~ science. Life and death of science, of society which produces science, of scientifically educated engineers and workers, is the problem. What is dead, what is alive, what leads towards disintegration, what is constructive, is the vital problem of the social sciences. The "it", in the sentence "I think it", raises its head, and wants to be recognised as a partner in the scientific process.

obliged to

the thinker,

T: thinking

to be thought of

Analysis is afraid of any consequences of his thinking. Once this was achieved.

1500,

as a process.

That

And again, The first commandment of science: Science shall be, was justified man, vehemently. If man's being in the world of objects depends on his reasoning, let him reason by all means.

The object of theology was to find the author of truth in man. Who was it that spoke the truth, unselfish, unprejudiced, illuminating; and who was the father of lying? When the scholastic disputation embarked on this campaign, it discovered soon that both sides of a disputation could contribute some truth, some grains of truth among the chaff of falsity. The advocatus diaboli was introduced, accordingly, into the trial for the canonisation of a saint. The relativity of human veracity was established. Whereas the dialogue of antiquity was a cross examination where one interlocutor was wrong and the other was ~~right~~ now, there was found in every man's soul a voice of truth and a voice of falsehood struggling for the domination of the soul. Nobody, I suppose, would deny that this is ~~the~~ ^{our} common heritage. Today, ~~the~~ ^{no longer} the scene of the struggle for truth is ~~set~~ ^{between} a black and a white sheep, a sophist and Socrates, a plaintiff and a defendant. The struggle takes place in our own chest. The soul is the battlefield of two armies, one recruiting all our self-centered, defense mechanisms, one advocating the infinite courage to think against our individual interest or habit or inclination. The dialectical process of thinking ceased to be an external spectacle between A and B. Instead, $\frac{1}{2}A$ and $\frac{1}{2}A$, $\frac{1}{4}A$ and $\frac{3}{4}A$ were involved in the struggle. The human brain was changed by this scholastic method. And no man living today can even try to think in pre-scholastic patterns of dividing the world of men in good and bad men. God is accessible to every one of us, at least partly, through faith. And faith is nothing but the power of man to question his own veracity, and to survive the rebuke of his prejudices. A mind that is scientifically trained, believes in a sequence of steps in discovering the truth. Therefore, he is between complete ignorance and complete knowledge. Homo sapiens is the animal that can change his principles. He is the being with a sequence of more than one "Weltanschauung." In this way, the principle of conversion was exploited by the First Science of the Occident.

The Second Science took advantage of man's pure reason; his mathematical genius enabled man to retrieve the rhythm, law and size of nature in his curves, equations and laws. Nature was reflected in man, once it was admitted into his mind in its purified stage. Man is that animal that can be a part of nature only by thinking nature. Man roots himself into nature through scientific thinking. He neither stands nor belongs into nature except when he digests nature scientifically. Because he is weaker than any other animal. His weapon against nature is reasoning. The reasoning process grants man 'being amidst the forces of nature. [Cogito ergo sum omits the object] of the formula: I think it, for good reason. The operating mind, the mind in operation, is the goal of the natural science. Because the true image of nature in the scientists mind is man's magna Charta of Being amidst nature. The Third Science which lies before us, is of quite a different character.

The first science brings man up to the level of a Who, good and true. The second science makes his brain the motion picture of reality.

L Therefore the version given to the problem of Science by Descartes:

And again, the justification for his very existence is found: Man cannot function in society without being edified into it by science. Three justifications for the Third Science ^{had to be} given in 1100, 1500, 1900. *crowded in,

The third science makes the member of human society into ~~the~~ the living substance of this society.

Who is man that you should remember him? An atom in the universe, replaceable everywhere. A hired hand, a cog in the machine, a girl friend for one date, an acquaintance on the train, a face among thousand others. Under his feet, there opens the abyss of nothingness, of being ignored, overlooked, ~~xxxxxx~~ falling the victim of propaganda, cannon fodder for the next war, unemployed in the depression, caught in the nets of an instalment plan during prosperity. And yet, he runs his race, from birth to death, asking to be loved and to be permitted to love. For society is nothing but the power of human hearts ~~xxx~~ for symbiosis. And this object, the creature that is man, sighs and hardly articulates its sigh: Give answer lest I die. His utter helplessness ~~and~~ is his majestic claim. His weaknesses are the motive why we should try to understand. His repression and his suppression, his being ~~im-~~pressed easily, and expressing himself with difficulty, these are the problems of the Third Science.

I think it, the tessera of science, is printed in three languages. For any science speaks its own language. The divinity that is man, the human mind that is man, the nothingness that is man, all three express there view point in the three epistemologies which are at the bottom of theology, natural science, social science. 1. I open myself to something l than myself so that I might see the light; 2. My ideas represent reality; 3. Let me be re-instated! - these ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ are the three devices of man as a particle of God, a particle of nature, a particle of society. As a member of society, I must be employed, as a part of nature I must rationalize nature, as a part of God I must create.

The social sciences must leave the edifying forces of Faith and Hope to the sciences of God and Nature. ~~If~~ they wish to edify, too. For, edifying means nothing but to build up. However, they are building up not the church of God, not the world of nature, but only the society of men.

~~Human~~, since the social sciences must be transformed into one science, they, too, will have something in common with the First and Second Science. The objects of a real science must be One and Infinite at the same time. God and Nature are infinite and one. Anything may be said about God, and he still is greater than any such partial statement. Nature may be explored. Yet, she is bigger than any one of her parts. We can be so sincere about God and Nature, because they are infinitely bigger as any of their parts which we may ~~treat or criticize or analyze~~.

What about society? All the good people who speak about societies in the plural are still in the pre-scientific stage of the social sciences. The Oneness and the Infinity of Society are the two minimum requirements for any real science of society. As long as the negro, the Japanese, the Jew, the farmer, the child, the epileptic, the leper, must fear that they do not belong to society, in other words, as long as society is exclusive in any sense, the task of a science of Society is not even envisualized. Since all men are the objects of this science, everybody must be set at rest that he is not excluded. No Science can exist as long as there is no way of proving its laws to all and everybody. Any exclusiveness or any plurality in the concept of society frustrates its universal validity.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the questions of race, talent, function, sex, class, nationality, creed, are the real questions of the social sciences. Thus, we get the paradox that this science must be universal and inclusive, and yet courageous enough to differentiate in all external social functions. However, this same problem was solved in the First and the Second Science.

For the First Science, the trouble was great when it became clear that the saints of the Church contradicted each other. Since they all were Saints, they had to remain saints, However, since they contradicted each other, their statements could not remain as they stood, they were to be interpreted, through the dialectical method. That people with different opinions could all be justified by their faith, opened the path to the adventure of contradictory truth, of a campaigning humanity, half ignorant, half knowing. The Docta Ignorantia of the soul on her itinerary to God, is the result of Abelard's question whether man was or was not. Man is in process. The ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Sic et Non of Abelard, the Itinerarium animae ad Deum of Bonaventura, and the Docta Ignorantia of Nicolaus Cusanus are the three milestones on the road of the First Science, the Scholastic.

For the Second Science, the trouble is that appearance and reality contradict each other. The phenomena ~~do not turn out~~ what they seem to be at first sight. The contradiction of minds was the trouble with theologians and lawyers in the Middle Ages. The contradiction between first sight, ~~second sight~~, and closer investigation is the problem of the natural sciences. At first sight, our mind is unable to represent reality in full. It takes time to find out. Only at the end do human ideas represent the natural processes completely. Kopernicus, by asking ~~what~~ do the stars revolve, Harvey, by asking how much blood passes the heart, Lavoisier, by asking ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~, and Darwin by asking how do we develop, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ all solved contradictions between first and second observation. The scientific formula always runs: At closer inspection, we found..... But the appearance must precede the closer inspection. And the contradiction in appearance does not frighten the natural sciences. The unity of matter, energy, nature does not exclude complete diversity of phenomena.

Similarly, then, the contradiction between Society as the unity of all men, believers and unbelievers, dead and living, employed, and unemployed, old and young, men and women, black and white, and the relative importance of their differences is the paradox which must be preserved. Social

Liberals and Marxians are too inclusive, obliterating all differences. Conservatives and Catholics are too exclusive, narrowing the diameter of social thinking to a nation, or a denomination. But science is universal or it is no science; and it is specific, or it is ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ superfluous. What we have tried to do is to explain contradictions between living creatures within one human society, without destroying their right to live, their faith into their future, their vigour and pride. We have tried to demonstrate, ~~that~~ man is one, and his tasks are many.

through a science of revolution, that the most also, late contradictions in history are identifiable as the same idiomatic dictionary.

A new man was the result of the First Science:

stars how does fire burn

of one language.