



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: H
INTERDISCIPLINARY

Volume 15 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2015

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

The Field of ‘*Between*’ – A New Principle for Interdisciplinary Epistemology

By Hisaki Hashi

University of Vienna, Austria

Introduction- Contrary to the established field of mathematical philosophy, interdisciplinary research in physics and philosophy is not well known. Of course, there are the writings of physicists for the non-scientific public introducing selected topics for mass media distribution. Yet in the presentation of highly advanced theories to an audience of physicists, reflections on philosophy do not have a place. On the other hand, reports are written by specialists in scientific theory in which the authors oppose the traditional philosophy of continental Europe. Since the 19th century renowned philosophers have put forward theories interpreting areas of natural science, trying to insert them into the framework of methods traditionally applied in natural philosophy. What is lacking is an interdisciplinary philosophical reflection for contemporary science in which a philosopher is able to grasp the principles of physical thinking, reflecting physical theory in relation to the fundamental philosophical conception of the subject: ‘What is Truth’. To achieve this purpose for interdisciplinary research, philosophers should have a fundamental knowledge of physics. Vice versa, physicists should also learn the purpose of philosophical reflection and what the goals of philosophy are. The philosophy of science does not offer the same explanations for theories in physics or other natural sciences, but its goal is a fundamental reflection of ‘What is truth’, as a common basis for different intellectual disciplines.

GJHSS-H Classification: FOR Code: 220304



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



The Field of 'Between' – A New Principle for Interdisciplinary Epistemology

Hisaki Hashi

Introduction

Contrary to the established field of mathematical philosophy, *interdisciplinary research in physics and philosophy* is not well known. Of course, there are the writings of physicists for the non-scientific public introducing selected topics for mass media distribution. Yet in the presentation of highly advanced theories to an audience of physicists, reflections on *philosophy* do not have a place.¹ On the other hand, reports are written by specialists in scientific theory in which the authors oppose the traditional philosophy of continental Europe.² Since the 19th century renowned philosophers have put forward theories interpreting areas of natural science, trying to insert them into the framework of methods traditionally applied in natural philosophy.³ What is lacking is an interdisciplinary philosophical reflection for contemporary science in which a philosopher is able to grasp the principles of physical thinking, reflecting physical theory in relation to the fundamental philosophical conception of the subject: 'What is Truth'. To achieve this purpose for interdisciplinary research, philosophers should have a fundamental knowledge of physics. *Vice versa*, physicists should also learn the purpose of philosophical reflection and what the goals of philosophy are. The philosophy of science does not offer the same explanations for theories in physics or other natural sciences, but its goal is a fundamental reflection of 'What is truth', as a common basis for different intellectual disciplines. The Field of 'Between', an epistemological conception developed by the author as a working principle, was introduced into the interdisciplinary field of physics and philosophy in 2006. In the

following sections the essential points of this principle are presented in a compact form.⁴

1. The Micro-World Significance of the Terms: Being - Substance - Physical Reality

In a well known physical experiment, a light quantum is emitted towards a light sensor – the target. If the quantum hits the target, a visible point emerges on the flat material as the result of the physical *interaction between the flying light quantum and the light sensor*.⁵ The location of the light quantum is as completely unknown before measurement as it is after. An exact prognosis of the route of the flying quantum and its location is not possible. The protocol of the quantum flight changes from case to case, depending on what kind of physical facility is used for the experiment and on the method by which the quantum is measured.⁶ Even if some renowned physicists have contended recently that the condition of the moving quantum can be predicted to a *limited extent* in probability theory,⁷ the nature of the quantum is shown in the principle: the quantum being is dependent on accidental moments, its protocols are case by case changeable. The nature of quanta is 'created' by the experiments and its consistency with Heisenberg's *Uncertainty Principle* is evident in particle physics.⁸

What caused most argument in quantum physics was whether a quantum can be understood as a 'physical real being' and if so to what extent (the so-called '*physical reality*' ('*Das Physikalisch Reale*') presented by Einstein in his arguments in the *EPR-Paradox* against Heisenberg).⁹ In the way of thinking based on substantial metaphysics (Aristotelism, Leibniz's *Monadology*) it may be argued that the score of a flying quantum is in reality *just an 'accident' (accidentia)*, a pure *physical effect* in which an emitted

Author: Department of Philosophy, University of Vienna. Presidium of Verein fuer Komparative Philosophie und Interdisziplinäre Bildung (Association of Comparative Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Education) / KoPhil in Vienna. e-mail: hisaki.hashi@univie.ac.at

¹ For example: Einstein, *Grundzüge der Relativitätstheorie*, Braunschweig 1990. Heisenberg, *Physikalische Prinzipien der Quantentheorie*, Stuttgart 1991. Heisenberg, Bohr (Ed.), *Die Kopenhagener Deutung der Quantentheorie*, Stuttgart 1963. Schrödinger, *Über den Indeterminismus in der Physik*, Leipzig 1932. Treiman, *The Odd of Quantum*, Princeton 1999. See the quoted works in this report. Some works of Heisenberg are extraordinary examples of successful exceptions: *Quantentheorie und Philosophie*, Stuttgart 1994. *Physik und Philosophie*, Stuttgart 1990.

² For example: see *ibidem*.

³ For example: see *ibidem*.

⁴ Articles on this theme are found in my publications: see the references at the end of this paper.

⁵ Herbert Pietschmann, *Quantenmechanik verstehen*, Berlin, Heidelberg 2003, p. 26.

⁶ Herbert Pietschmann, *ibidem* 2003, p. 63. Cf. Pietschman, "Versuch zur Entwicklung des Denkansatzes der Quantenphysik", in: *intellectus universalis*, ed. by H. Hashi, W. Gabriel, Wien 2005.

⁷ Anton Zeilinger: *Einsteins Schleier. Die neue Welt der Quantenphysik*, München 2005. *Einsteins Spuk*, München 2005.

⁸ Werner Heisenberg, *Physikalische Prinzipien der Quantentheorie*, Stuttgart 1990, Kap. I.2, p. 16. Pietschmann, *Quantenmechanik verstehen*, 2003, p. 26.

⁹ *Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Paradox*, American Physical Society 1935. See section 1 of this paper.

quantum vanishes immediately.¹⁰ One scientific theory is that the 'quantum protocol is none other than an *artificial phenomenon* produced by experimental physical facilities.'¹¹

Here I should like to present another proposition: a quantum is the minimal physical substance of which the material of the *micro-world*, the *meso-world* and of *macro-cosmic space* can be constructed. But its essential unity can be *never* be explained by *substantial metaphysics* according to Aristotle or Leibniz.¹² Specialists in Aristotelism might say: 'a quantum is *only* a particles – a broken part of an atom. A physical protocol of a quantum results in an '*accident*' in reality, but a quantum *per se* is not a substantial being. The main position of substantial metaphysics since Aristotle does not in any way lose its meaning.'¹³

I will say: 'This position is right. The uncertain nature of quanta *does not interfere* with Aristotelian metaphysics. The theories of Aristotle, Leibniz etc. about *substance* have *no relation* to the aspects of the physical reality of particles in the *micro-world system*. The nature of a quantum has been *independent* from the *principles of substance theories* since the beginning of metaphysics. In other words, the nature of a quantum is *not* recognizable from the position of substantial metaphysics.' There are similar cognitions in the philosophy of continental Europe. Starting from this point my own position is as follows: '***If it is so, the contemporary theory of being has the possibility of changing its essential part dynamically.*** I say that the nature of a quantum is '***emptiness of substance, free from substantiality***.' It emerges and vanishes immediately. The visible point of the scored quantum is the track of the vanishing being. I say: 'This track emerges in the **Field of 'Between'**, the field **between the flying quantum and a receiving material**'.¹⁴

2. The Physical Real Being – Einstein's Argumentation in the EPR-Paradox

The issue in quantum physics from its beginning has been if and how far a quantum is understandable as a *physical real being*. This definition (*das physikalisch Reale*) was coined by Einstein who repeatedly brought arguments concerning the

Uncertainty Principle against Heisenberg. In short, Einstein postulated that the base of '*physical reality*' (*das physikalisch Reale*) is lacking in quantum physics, thus fundamental research in it is incomplete. In the opinion of Einstein the 'physical reality / physical real being' should have three main conditions:¹⁵

- Definitive location in space-time*: Physical reality is a definite unity in (traditional) physics; a physical material can be measured in repeated experiments. It must be observed and protocolled by a repeatable measuring method which is bound to yield consistent results.
- Stability of the measured object by execution of an experiment*: In measurement the condition of the physical object should not be disturbed by the experimental physical facility. This is totally lacking in quantum physics.
- Systematic relations of the measured object to physical circumstances*: The measured object is a physical system bound to its physical reality. Constructed in its own space-time in physics, it should have consequent relations to the physical beings around it. It must consistently show a definitive physical system. This is also absent in quantum physics.

Therefore Einstein concluded in his *EPR-Paradox*: 'All these conditions of '*physical reality*' are lacking in quantum physics. The basic theories and research methods of quantum physics should be fundamentally reconsidered.' Einstein held this position in a scientific theoretical alliance with Popper.¹⁶

The point debated most by natural scientists and philosophers was, if and how far a quantum can be interpreted by the previous concepts of '*being*' in '*physical reality*' at all. A quantum stays in physical *space-time* for an extremely short duration and *vanishes immediately*. A light quantum is bound to its own quantum count. It has a spin in a direction and it can be observed and protocolled but its duration is extremely short, for example, it appears with its own *space-time* for 10⁻²³ seconds and vanishes immediately. A light quantum can split into two further quanta (*double quantum* / *Doppelteilchen*) after the emission.¹⁷ The

¹⁰ Hans-Dieter Klein, "Inwiefern ist das teleologische Konzept der modernen Physik immanent?", in: *Die Natur in den Begriff übersetzen*, ed. by Thomas Posch and Gilles Marmasse, Frankfurt a.M. 2003. Cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book Δ 1025a, Book Z 1032 a-b.

¹¹ Friedrich Wallner, *Structure and Relativity*, Frankfurt a.M. 2005, p. 67.

¹² In agreement with this analytical philosophers say that classic metaphysics and ontology, like that of Leibniz, is not valid in contemporary philosophy: Chris Swoyer, "The Autonomy of Relations", in: *Facta Philosophica*, vol. 6 No. 1, Bern 2004.

¹³ For the idea of *substantia* / *ousia* see Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Books Z, H, Θ.

¹⁴ See the notes 5-8 of this article. See the dialogue of Hashi and Pietschmann, in: Hashi, Hisaki, *Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft*, Münster/Berlin/Zürich/London/Wien 2010.

¹⁵ Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, Nathan Rosen, "Can a quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?", in: *Physical Review* 47, American Physical Society 1935. M. Born-A. Einstein, *Briefwechsel*, München 2005, p. 272ff. Cf. Hashi, "Quantenphysik und ihre Anregungen zur neuen Seinsdynamik", chap. III.3., in: *Wiener Jahrbuch für Philosophie* vol. 38 / 2006, ed. by Hans-Dieter Klein, Wien 2007. "Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft. Denksätze bei Hegel und bei Popper", 2.4.b), in: *Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft*, Polish Academy of Sciences, ed. by Marian A. Herman, Andrzej J. Nadolny, Hashi, Hisaki, Vienna 2006/07.

¹⁶ Karl Popper: *Objektive Erkenntnis*, Hamburg 1973, VIII.3., p. 330. *Objective Knowledge*, Oxford University 1972, p. 302. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London 1959, appendix xii, correspondence with Einstein.

¹⁷ Pietschmann, *Quantenmechanik verstehen*, 2003, pp. 103. Machida,

quantum nature is accidental and differs in protocols depending on the kind of facilities used in the experiments.

3. Unproductive Debates

This point has caused many confusing debates. *Consciously* or *unconsciously*, scientists and philosophers consider that a *being* is bound to its *substance*; it exists consistent with its fundamental substantiality; according to traditional physics it is a material bound to a physical body. Natural scientists, influenced by Einstein, were conscious of the concept of the '*Being of Physical Reality*'.¹⁸ Philosophers (like Popper) tended to think that a quantum is bound not only to natural scientific fact, but also to its '*ontological substance*'.¹⁹ A particle of an atom is bound to its '*systematic unity*' which is *indivisible*, like that of Leibniz's *monad* or the *ousia* / *substantia* of Aristotle.²⁰ Physicists have proved that this character is *lacking* in particle physics in the *micro-world*. From this result the debates of physicists and philosophers developed in the direction that the 'previous theories of *substance metaphysics* of Aristotle, the *monadology* of Leibniz etc. might lose their relevance completely. Then the previous natural base of *substance, monad or the physical reality* / *real being of physics* would be negated totally in the new physics.'

In my opinion, there is a failing in the conclusions of interdisciplinary reflection. Unconsciously these thinkers *presuppose* that a quantum as a particle of an atom builds up a minimal part of the material being of the whole universe, by which these particles are valid as the construction of every being. In a *purely physical view* this is right. From the *philosophical* point of view we have to complement a critical reflection.

According to physical materiality a quantum must build an elementary part of any being. But, if we collect atoms in a physical laboratory, we can build, for example, two hydrogen atoms and an oxygen atom, but we cannot produce the '*water*' that we perceive in nature. We can break down physical reality in an analytical and objectivist way to the most elementary part, a '*particle*' of *micro-world*. We can construct a physical world in the *projection* of our *consciousness*, as a *scheme of the world* in the view of natural science.

But, the constructed *projection of the world* and the *real world* are *not* the same; they are different. Neither can be identified with the other. From the combination of the physical parts there cannot emerge a live being. Our self consciousness cannot be produced in a natural science laboratory.²¹ If we claim that we can explain and construct everything by natural science theories, our position turns into a theory focusing *excessively* on *natural science, a physical absolutism*, so-called 'physicalism'.²²

4. Epistemological Comparisons – What Aspects are Lacking?

From this point a long series of debates have emerged unproductively. Especially when the debates centre on methodology, their results are not interdisciplinary dialogues but crude and incorrect conclusions drawn by *both* natural scientists *and* natural philosophers because the *different systems* of *thinking* in philosophy and physics are *never reflected on in a comparative way*. In short, physics dominates the subjects of [*quid facti*], the areas of concrete real factums, real materials and causality in every detail to construct the physical world in a deductive way. Compared with physics, philosophy dominates the areas of [*quid juris*]: the *examination of the ways, forms and contents of thinking of every kind, the very methods of thinking* themselves as the fundamentals of philosophy.²³

The subjects of physics are factums, objects of real being that can be measured. The subjects of philosophy are, in contrast to physics, the various ways of thinking *produced in our consciousness*. This is for philosophy the *Intrasystem*, for physics and natural sciences the *Extrasystem*. Things that can be operated by physical *quid facti* are for physics [*Intrasystem unity*], for philosophy that of the [*Extrasystem*].²⁴ Unproductive debates between different philosophical and scientific disciplines start from the point where philosophers and scientists *mix up* and *standardize* their own '*intrasystem and extrasystem unities*', *without recognition of the different methods* of their disciplinary thought. **What is lacking is comparative reflection** on different scientific disciplines marked with the key words of the [*intrasystem and extrasystem unities*].

Shigeru, (ed.) *Quantum Theory in Contemporary Physics?* (今さら量子力学?), Tokyo 1990, pp. 26.

¹⁸ Einstein, EPR-Paradox. Cf. the letter of Einstein for Popper dated 11. 9. 1935, in: Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, 1959, appendix xii, pp. 457. The position of Einstein against Heisenberg is found also in "Die Quantenmechanik und ein Feldgespräch mit Einstein", in: *Quantentheorie und Philosophie*, Stuttgart 1994.

¹⁹ Cf. the 'Third World Theory' by Popper, in: *Objektive Erkenntnis*, 1973, *Objective Knowledge* 1972. F. Wallner, "The Split of Austrian Philosophy. Wittgenstein and Popper", in: *Konstruktion der Realität*, Wien 1992.

²⁰ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Books Z, H, Θ. Leibniz, *Monadologie*, Stuttgart 1990.

²¹ The method of cloning animals is successful in theoretically but in reality there are difficulties in every detail. In cloning, the female cell which merges with the male cell cannot be split easily. Cf. Okada, Yasuhiro, *Organism, Brain and Life*, Tokyo 1999. It has not been successful by a variety of methods in the contemporary science to produce a totipotent cell (see the scientific websites of the subjects „stem cell“, „totipotent“ etc. 2010).

²² Hans-Dieter Klein, *Geschichtssphilosophie*, Wien 2005, chap. I.1.

²³ The significance of these terms is quoted by Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, "Deduktion der reinen Verstandesbegriffe", B 116, A 84.

²⁴ These technical terms can be applied also in cognition theory and comparative philosophy: Hashi, Hisaki, "Das Feld des Zwischen – Zur system-externen Logik der Quantenphysik", in: *Interdisziplinäre Philosophie der Gegenwart*, Frankfurt a.M. 2009.

The unique merit of philosophy is the possibility of examining and proving thinking methods of any kind. As a result of the discourse we could make clear the principles of the various ways of thinking which are valid universally.

On the other hand, *the unique merit of physics* is *different*: it is able to handle concrete material things successively, continuously and in a deductive, verifiable way. Physics presents its way of thinking through physical schemes (formula, matrix, tensor calculation, coordinate systems of Riemann geometry etc.) by which it also finds the disprovable parts of physical reality that will become further issues to explore in nature.

5. Complementary Relation of the 'Intrasystem' and 'Extrasystem'

I am of the opinion that the non-exchangeable merits of both thinking methods (physics and philosophy) should be appreciated and reflected on, to lead to a *fruitful complementary interchange* between both *disciplines*; that of *philosophy* and that of *natural science*. The background to this thinking is the position of Yukawa (YUKAWA, Hideki, 1907 – 1981), professor at the University of Kyoto, who was awarded the Nobel Prize for physics for the discovery of the meson in 1949. He was of the opinion that the activity of the human spirit (*Geist*) can also be researched from the perspectives of the natural sciences, in such a way that *'human scientific'* thinking **does not lose** any of its **original value**. In his opinion **Human Science** and **Natural Science** cannot be separated or isolated. *Both* scientific disciplines serve the cognition of the human being. Each is related to the other, if we consider different kinds of knowledge from the *perspective of the cognition of the human being*.

Excursus

YUKAWA presented this position in his various writings from the viewpoint of his interdisciplinary thought. One of his typical positions is found in the essay '*chigyoraku*',²⁵ with a quotation of the Taoist classic 莊子 Zhuangzi: a dialogue of the Taoist Zhuangzi with his rival 惠子 Huizi (Hui Shi 惠施) while they are walking by the river.²⁶ Huizi (惠子) took a positivistic and materialistic view against the Taoist Zhuangzi (莊子). In comparing the Taoist and positivistic positions, Yukawa developed his own thesis that this kind of concurrence is also found among philosophers and natural scientists in the contemporary period. Yukawa said:

'Though I represent the position of physics and natural science, I am deeply impressed by the Taoist view. Regarding the development of sciences carefully, I

should say that there have been very few scientists since the period of Demokritos or Huizi (惠子) who have upheld exclusively one of the two poles of '*either A or non-A*': that is, 'I think and believe *either* the philosophical position concerning the universal truth of unity or the natural scientist's position recognizing only provable things in a positivist way of thinking. Contributions to the advantage of natural science have always emerged from the insight of scientists *not* satisfied with a *merely positivistic* way of thinking. To find and establish a new thesis or principle, the true scientist must hold a position *between* the two extreme poles: regarding the systematic construction of a hitherto unknown part of nature, they have developed their insight and imagination (like philosophers or Taoists). On the other hand, they have clarified what is provable in a positivistic way by employing a maximum of scientific deduction. I, as a particle physicist, want to find the systematic principle of a particle which is not recognizable as a 'substantial and independent particle'. The nature of a particle is recognizable only if we observe it in a relation with another particle: we cannot observe a particle in a constant and consistent state, but only in an extremely short time-span, i.e. when another particle is near the observed one and when the first particle removes the second one. The theory of particle physics is built on this field of relations, in which I, as the scientist, move always between the two poles; one of them is the insight to grasp a new cognition, and the other one is to prove a hypothesis by the scientific method.'

As he presented this position in his international symposium for physicists in Kyoto, this analogy seemed to stimulate many participants.

Yukawa reflected on his thought in his further writings and a result on the professional level for interdisciplinary philosophy is found in the dialogue with KOBAYASHI Hideo, one of the most intellectual of critics in 20th c. Japan, entitled 'The Progression of the Human Being' (人間の進歩について).²⁷

Yukawa's thesis on how to establish interdisciplinary relations, communications and contributions from natural science to anthropological philosophy is presented in his scientific paper 'Science and Human Nature' (科学と人間性). It is marked by four aspects, the Human Being as a *Thinking Being*, the Human Being as an *Observing Being*, the Human Being as an *Acting Being* and 'Science for the Well-Being of Mankind'.²⁸

This position of Yukawa postulates *neither mixing nor a thoughtless equalization* of natural

²⁵ Yukawa, Hideki, "chigyoraku" (知魚楽, "To know the pleasure of the fish in the water – A Taoist message in a dialogue with a Positivist") in: *The surprising Spirit* (驚く心), ed. by Tsurumi S., Tokyo 1990.

²⁶ Zhuangzi 莊子, chapter 17 (秋水, the water of autumn), Abs. 16. Ed. by Ogawa, T., Tokyo 1978, pp. 398 – 399.

²⁷ The Progression of Human Being" (人間の進歩について), in: Kobayashi, Hideo, Complete Edition, appendix vol. 1, Tokyo 1983, pp. 130 – 158.

²⁸ *Human Being and Natural Science* (人間と科学), ed. by Yukawa, Tokyo 1956, pp. 2 – 46.

philosophy and natural science. He calls for *neither isolation nor equalization* but a 'complementarity'. I think that this idea of [complementarity] can lead to a method of interdisciplinary thinking which is important for comparing [intrasystem] and [extrasystem] unities.²⁹

6. The "Field of 'Between' " as an Epistemological Concept

I am of the opinion that we can reconstruct our [intrasystem] thinking *from the stimulation* of [extrasystem] thinking. Generally, one can see *one's own unity* in the *other's reflection* of himself *objectively*. My interdisciplinary scientific concept is the *Field of 'Between'*, stimulated by a fundamental knowledge of Buddhist philosophy (*pratitya samutpāda*) which is in no way connected with esoteric concepts or mystification of any kind. (Problems of 'reincarnation' or 'irrationality' are *never* in my concept!)³⁰

The essence of the *Field of 'Between'* is in short:³¹ a being [A] becomes [A] only if it enters into a relation with another being [non-A]. The meeting of [A] and [non-A] constructs a field of an '*emerging relation dependent on each other*'. The relation from [A to non-A], [non-A to A] can be *maintained*, it can *develop*, be *dissolved* or *vanish*. The fundamental concept is the [relation of A and non-A]. I will comment that this '*Field of Relations Dependent on Each Other*' always shows a *space of 'Between' [A and non-A]*. The *emerging of a relation*, its *duration*, *development* and *vanishing* in Buddhist philosophy is not discussed according to the principles of Aristotle's *substantial metaphysics*. An expert in his substance metaphysics might say that 'the causality of emerging, staying and vanishing of a relation between A and non-A is in the *dynamis*, in the potential possibility of every thing and being. A and non-A, everyone, is an *ousia*, a substance. Everyone is

present within his or her own being, so there is no space between A and non-A. A and non-A are a 'substantial unity'.

If someone connects the words 'being', 'existing', 'emerging' and 'developing' etc. with a *substantial, constant moment* or *accidence as inconsistency*, he would never grasp the essential meaning of the *Field of 'Between'*. The *Field of 'Between'*, viewed purely physically, is a *field* of space-time that enables a *physical interaction*. Viewed physically, in the double-slit experiment, a physical interaction emerges *between* the shooting light quantum and the receptor. Viewed philosophically and epistemologically, the *Field of 'Between'* is the [space-time], where the things [A and non-A] enter *into a relation*.

We may apply this [A and non-A] in physical reality to ontology: there are two beings *actualizing a relation between [A]* and the other [non-A]; we may say in ontology and in anthropological philosophy, [A] and [B]. In this field, non-verbal communication can emerge between the contents of their consciousness (including parts of their unconsciousness), and their thinking and their feeling. Within Buddhist philosophy it is possible to think that both beings or persons, [A] and [B], do not have a fixed 'substantial unity': Of course we can say: 'viewed physiologically, each of them has his own DNA combinations, his own genetic series *non-exchangeable* with another; each is an organic 'closed system'.'³² But in Buddhist philosophy, the crucial issue is not the *biological 'a priori'*³³, but really the '*a posteriori*' in the anthropological field of what happens in the emergence of human relations. The main focus is on the empirical factums, if and how far every person / being is able to develop his natural potential (DNA-combinations, atomic construction) to the reality of what he can do and what he does. Both persons / beings, [A] and [B] ([A and non-A]), accompany their previous experiences / conditions (consciously and unconsciously) into the *Field of 'Between'*. This end result of the empirical unities of every person and every being cannot be predicted absolutely and also cannot be defined by a 'substantiality' of any kind. I shall remark here that my philosophy (stimulated by Buddhist philosophy) is *not* a pure *theoria*. My philosophy works with the main focus on *real experience in the centre of the field of life*.³⁴ I say

²⁹ See note 24. The starting point of an analytical way of thinking was founded by Aristotle in his *Organon*, *Metaphysics* and *Physics*. He criticized Plato's thinking of the *idea* (ἰδέα) of the *one / hen* (ἓν) and summed up his thesis in the following way: "To say that something that is, is not or that what is not, does exist – that is untrue. But to say that something that is, does exist and that what does not exist, is not – that is true." , *Metaphysics*, 1011b – 1012a. Plato held only the last position omitted by Aristotle. See "Parmenides"-Dialogue 152a – 166c. Cf. Aristotle's sharp criticism of Plato, in: *Metaphysics*, Book M. In comparison with Aristotle, I think that Plato's insight opens a possibility of fruitful reflection for the comparative philosophies of East and West.

³⁰ The projection of the "samsāra" as a "reincarnation" in substantial transfiguration from one personality to another is believed mostly in Tibetan Buddhism: But, contrary to popular knowledge in recent decades in Europe, this way of imagination has *less common ground with Mahayana Buddhism* as a religion and philosophy in East Asian cultures. A similar type of "reincarnation" in *Tibetan Buddhism* is found *primarily in Hinduism*. See the literatures of Buddhology: Nakamura, Hajime, *Classics of Mahayana Buddhism* in 7 volumes, (大乘仏典) Tokyo 2002-2005. Hayashima, Kyōshō & Takasaki, Jikidō (Eds.), *bukkyō indo shisō jiten* (Buddhology and Indology), Tokyo 1993.

³¹ This basic principle of being is *pratitya samutpāda*. See the Pāli Canon. In Mahayana Buddhism it was extended into a metaphysical/ontological and anthropological principle. See Nakamura, ibidem, Takasaki, Hayashima, ibidem.

³² Okada, Yasuhiro, *Organism, Brain & Actual Beings* (生命、脳、いのち), Tokyo 1999.

³³ Not in the Kantian meaning! Cf. the Original, *Critic of Pure Reason*, "Introduction", B 1 – B 30, A 1 – A 16.

³⁴ A background to this position is the philosophy of Kyoto School represented by NISHIDA, Kitarō (1870 – 1945) in his *Complete Works*, Tokyo 1965, 1979, 2001, *Selected Works*, Kyoto 1998, 2002. Nishida's system of philosophy includes the philosophy of science in which human experience in a real world is marked as a fundamental dimension for building the theories and the system of his philosophy. In this position logic is not limited to the formalization needed to construct a thought, but it expresses the form

that what is experienced by a person in a relation or in meeting is *more than* what is defined by the DNA-combination, or subject to physiological and biological facts. The *psychological* situation of a person on a certain day, his emotions e.g. his nervousness, or his character traits e.g. his arrogance, etc. are phenomena that cannot be defined as a 'substance' philosophically. These are, in Aristotle's philosophy, *not* the '*substance*' but something which is '*accidental*'. Those particles emerge spontaneously in the *field of communication between [A] and [non-A]*. They remain for a short time and vanish at the end of the communication.³⁵ The *Field of 'Between'* is the [time-space of an interaction] in which different beings, [A and non-A], [B and non-B], enter into relations, and engage in verbal and non-verbal interactions during which both of them construct a [time-space of 'dependent relation' on each other]. Interaction, reflecting oneself against the existence of a partner, communicating and isolating can happen in this *Field of 'Between'*. Viewed purely from physics, this is the space-time of the full *execution of physical interactions* and the results can be developed in further space-time.

For interdisciplinary epistemology I would like to define this using the previous terminology, namely [intrasystem] and [extrasystem] unities: the *interaction of natural philosophy and natural science* corresponds to the [repeated reflections, interchanging positions] in the [Field of 'Between'], between the unities of the [intrasystem] and [extrasystem].

7. The Field of 'Between' as a Cosmological Principle

In the previous sections, the *Field of 'Between'* was presented as an ontological and epistemological concept in the *micro-world* and the *meso-world*. I am of the opinion that this concept is also able to take part in the field of *macro-cosmic space*.

For example, we can consider the *dynamics of the ocean*, its *low tide* and *high tide* (flood).³⁶

The water level of an ocean rises if it is in the gravitational field of the moon, exactly, in the additional relation of the [centrifugal force of the rotation of the earth-moon system] (around their center of gravity) and the [gravitation of the moon], resulting in the high tide. That is, both the nearest regions and the furthestmost regions to the moon on the earth have a high tide. On

the *intermediate regions between those two regions mentioned before* of the earth, the gravitation of the moon and the centrifugal force of the revolution (rotation) almost cancel each other: The result is *low tide*, while the water of the ocean of the whole earth is pulled up in the high tide regions, during which the water of the ocean on the whole earth remains in the same quantity. Natural science calculates the proportional relations of the [gravitation of the moon] and the [centrifugal force] due to the rotation of the earth-moon system around their center of gravity, the proportion of the quantity of the high tide to that of the low tide.

Viewed from my natural philosophy, the phenomenon of this dynamic process emerges in the [Field of 'Between'], in the [time-space] *between* the [gravitation of the moon] and the [centrifugal force of the earth-moon system rotation] around their center of gravity.

And where is the place of *man* as a thinking and acting person? I say that man has his/her [time-space] in the [Field of 'Between'], the [time-space *between* the moon and the earth].

Notes

1. ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysik*, ed. by F. Schwarz, Stuttgart 1984. *Physik*, ed. by H.G. Zekl, Hamburg 1987-88.
2. BOHR, Niels, „Das Quantenpostulat und die neuere Entwicklung der Atomistik“, in: N. BOHR, W. HEISENBERG, *Die Kopenhagener Deutung der Quantentheorie*, Stuttgart 1963.
3. BORN, Max., EINSTEIN, Albert, *Briefwechsel*, München 2005.
4. EINSTEIN, Albert, *Grundzüge der Relativitätstheorie*, Braunschweig 1990.
5. EINSTEIN, Albert, PODOLSKY, Boris, ROSEN, Nathan, 'Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?', in: *Physical Review* 47, American Physical Society 1935.
6. HASHI Hisaki, „Das Feld des Zwischen – Zur system-externen Logik der Quantenphysik“, see *Interdisziplinäre Philosophie der Gegenwart*.
- 'Information und Wirklichkeit', see *Interdisziplinäre Philosophie der Gegenwart*.
- 'Das Feld des „Zwischen“', in: *Studies in Comparative Philosophy* vol. 33/ 2006, Association of Comparative Philosophy, Tokyo 2007.
- 'Das Feld des Zwischen als Leitidee zur konstruktiven Erkenntnis der metaphysischen Systemlehre', in: *Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft. Tangente und Emergenz im interdisziplinären Spannungsumfeld*, Münster/ Berlin / Zürich/ London/ Wien 2010.

and principles of real being: Cf. the lecture of NOE K., in: Nishida, *Selected Works* vol. 2, Works of Natural Philosophy and Philosophy of Natural Science, Kyoto 1998, p. 462.

³⁵ emerging-staying-vanishing. In Sanskrit: *utpada, stithi, nirodha*. Chines. 生住滅. Nakamura, Classics of Mahayana Buddhism (大乘仏典), vol. 5, Huayan-Sutra, Lankavatara-Sutra (kegon-kyō, ryōga-kyō, 華嚴經、楞伽經), Tokyo 2005, p. 189.

³⁶ Duden, *Physik*, Mannheim 2001. A thesis from the view of *natural philosophy* to this phenomenon is executed by Hans-Dieter Klein in a deduction from his system theory: "Systemtheorie und Monadologie", in: *Systemtheorie*, ed. by Karen Gloy, Bonn 1998, *System der Philosophie*, ed. by Hans-Dieter Klein, Frankfurt a.M. 2003.

- „Quantenphysik und ihre Anregung zur neuen Seinsdynamik“, in: *Wiener Jahrbuch für Philosophie*, Bd. 38, Wien 2007.
- 'Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft. Denkansätze bei Hegel und bei Popper', in: *Naturphilosophie und Naturwissenschaft*, ed. By M. HERMAN, A. NADOLNY. HASHI H., Polish Academy of Sciences, Vienna 2006/07.
- *Interdisziplinäre Philosophie der Gegenwart* (Ed.), Frankfurt a.M./Berlin/Bern/Bruxelles/New York/Oxford/Wien 2009.
7. HEISENBERG, Werner, *Physikalische Prinzipien der Quantentheorie*, Stuttgart 1991.
 - *Physik und Philosophie*, Stuttgart 1990.
 - *Quantentheorie und Philosophie*, Stuttgart 1994.
 8. KANT, Immanuel, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Hamburg 1990.
 9. KLEIN, Hans-Dieter, 'Systemtheorie und Monadologie', in: *Systemtheorie*, ed. by K. GLOY, Bonn 1998.
 - *System der Philosophie*, ed. by H.-D. Klein, Frankfurt a.M. 2003.
 - *Geschichtsphilosophie*, Wien 2004.
 - 'Inwiefern ist das teleologische Konzept der modernen Physik immanent?', in: *Die Natur in den Begriff übersetzen*, ed. by T. POSCH, G. MARMASSE, Frankfurt a.M. 2003.
 10. MACHIDA Shigeru, (Ed.), *Quantum Theory in Contemporary Physics?* (今さら量子力学?), Tokyo 1990.
 11. NAKAMURA Hajime, *Classics of Mahayana Buddhism*, vols. 1 – 7, (大乘仏典) Tokyo 2002 - 2005.
 12. NOE Keiichi, Lecture to the Natural Philosophy of Nishida, in: NISHIDA Kitarō, *Selected Works* vol. 2, Natural Philosophy and Philosophy of Natural Science, Kyoto 1998,
 13. OKADA Yasuhiro, *Organism, Brain and Life* (生命、脳、いのち), Tokyo 1999.
 14. PIETSCHMANN, Herbert, *Quantenmechanik verstehen*, Berlin, Heidelberg 2003.
 - 'Versuch zur Entwicklung des Denkansatzes der Quantenphysik', in: *intellectus universalis*, ed. by HASHI H, W. GABRIEL, Wien 2005.
 15. PLATO, *Parmenides*, in: *Sämtliche Werke* 4, Hamburg 1989.
 16. POPPER, Karl, *Objektive Erkenntnis (Objective Knowledge*, Oxford University 1972), Hamburg 1973.
 - *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London 1959.
 17. RIEDL, Rupert, *Evolution und Selbstbezug der Erkenntnis*, München 1990.
 - *Die evolutionäre Erkenntnistheorie*, Berlin 1987.
 18. SCHRÖDINGER, Erwin, *Über den Indeterminismus in der Physik. Ist die Naturwissenschaft Millieu bedingt?*, Leipzig 1932.
 19. SWOYER, Chris, 'The Autonomy of Relations', in: *Facta Philosophica*, vol. 6 No. 1, Bern 2004.
 20. TAKASAKI Jikidō (Ed.), *Buddology and Indology (bukkyō indo shisō jiten)*, Tokyo 1993.
 21. TREIMAN, Sam, *The Odd of Quantum*, Princeton 1999.
 22. WALLNER, Friedrich, *Structure and Relativity*, Frankfurt a.M. 2005.
 - 'The Split of Austrian Philosophy. Wittgenstein and Popper', in: *Konstruktion der Realität*, Wien 1992.
 23. YUKAWA Hideki, 'chigyoraku' (知魚楽, 'To know the pleasure of the fish in river – A Taoist message in the dialogue with a Positivist') in: *The surprising Spirit* (驚く心), ed. by TSURUMI S., Tokyo 1990.
 - 'The Progression of Human Being'. (人間の進歩について), in: KOBAYASHI Hideo, Complete Edition, appendix vol. 1, Tokyo 1983.
 - Human Being and Natural Science* (人間と科学), Tokyo 1956.
 24. ZEILLINGER, Anton, *Einsteins Schleier. Die neue Welt der Quantenphysik*, München 2005.
 - Einsteins Spuk, Teleportation und andere Mysterien der Quantenphysik*, München 2007.
 25. ZHUANGZI (莊子), *Zhuangzi*, in: *Laozi, Zhuangzi* (老子・莊子), ed. by OGAWA Tamaki, Tokyo 1978.