

# DEMOLISHING ISAAC'S COFFIN

*The dawn of the social complexity and the birth of new tragedy of spirituality*

Hokky Situngkir  
Bandung Fe Institute

It was all begun by the categorization on sciences. It was all begun by the ambitious works of G.F. Hegel pursuing the encyclopedia of sciences. It was all begun by the famous Emmanuel Kant's question on what we can know. And the truth is to be pursued by scientific approaches; the scientific methodology that standardized became a kind of transcendence. The social sciences and the natural sciences have been diversified so far away, even though it was true that social sciences supposed to obey the scientific methods that was stated and established in the natural sciences environments witnessed by the history of time.

The diversification on sciences has made the sciences become rich of constructions creating our civilization nowadays but the outcomes are fuzzified since the only difference is mere the objects to be approached while using the same methodology of science. The way social sciences grow is qualitative afraid of becoming reductionism while the natural sciences grow to be much more quantitative to become much easier getting over the state of engineering and design process shaping the modernity of life.

The contemporary social science though has met the deadly suicide since the aura of postmodernism met the conditions on relations between power and knowledge as inseparable elements. While the social scientists must admit the emptiness of the naive meta-narratives and universalism that become the faith of the rationalism era as inherited by Descartes, the natural sciences still pursuing the wholly idea on the way we are living by some mostly rigor mathematical syntaxes of the effort on ceasing the quantum mechanics and the general relativity theory, the endless evolution of life on earth bio-system, organic chemistry on cloning and so forth that sometimes bother the ethical way of our life in some dominant religion dogmas such as Christianity and Islam. Natural science patiently scanned natural phenomena, constructed the theoretical framework, by the hope of finding the patterns of the evolving nature. Many scientists get drunk in the tight way of thinking and rigor theories they built but not see some revolutions that presented by some social scientists defied any dogmatic and transcendence airing the life of the human-kind: still become the faith of the positivism in the evolution of science generally.

## **Evolution: the way of the thinking**

It was begun by the works of Maturana and Valera contending the bio-system as autopoietic: system that self-producing, evolve dynamically and adaptively in order to gain the most optimum sustainability. It was also begun by the works of Richard Dawkins tiding the scientific evolutionism. Those scientific masterpieces are welcomed by the advance of the theory on cellular automata, fractal, fuzzy logic, constructed a new perspective of system theory seeing every system exist as complex system that adaptive, dynamical, non-linear, emergent. The system of living is now seen as evolutionary system, quoting J.B. Haldane, "...chaos is ubiquitous..."

The civilization and the social life of human being that colored by ideologies, philosophy, human tensions on economy reflected by the practical industrialization and modern engineering are now to be seen as the way human defies the natural evolution of nature. Warfare, corrupt government, hunting of some rare species in the world that disturbing the ecosystem, the change of weather, et cetera are the way of modern ethics that nauseated the perspectives based upon the evolutionary ecosystem in the earth. Modernity is felt to be simplified and linearized too much.

These facts force us not to be able relying upon the modern theories of social life offered by the philosophers, and even more social scientists in general, since the wisdom they offered seemed to be too linear and fatal concerning the complex system of the bio-system. While the conditions of incompleteness state of the existing rigor mathematical and analytical perspectives (inherited by the Gödel theorem), it is obvious that however human kind need something to hold on for the basic foundation of the positivism. Human needs something to replace the nihility of the predator and prey system of the ecosystem, as in optimum sustainability situation every words of representation shall be defined very carefully; we cannot say that the lion is cruel while preying the deer et cetera, and probably while a man kill the other – it is very hard to justify whether some actions is a cruelty or not. Even worse, the general propositions of postmodern ethical philosopher, Richard Rorty contended the basic rule of every ethic (of ironical liberal man) is how not to be cruel. Ecosystem somehow need some (in linear world called) cruelty in order to be sustained. Predation and preying is the way the earth evolved.

Realizing those analytical perspectives and the unbelievable qualitative schools of thought, the scientists somehow feel drought ideologically – as a well described by the psychoanalysts that human needs transcendence as prime fuel for the soul for living. However, we can see unique phenomena in our generations of scientists constructing some philosophical thinking based upon some ancient literatures, cultures, spirituality. Apparently, Fritjof Capra constructing some philosophical ideas based on Tao, Vladimir Dimitrov in Hindu, and many other scientists that clearly proclaimed their philosophical ideas based on ancient spirituality with some additional notes on some emptiness they found while looking to the nature. Somehow they built some pseudo-rationalistic (and even pseudo-mystic) propositions of literatures in Hindu, Tao, et cetera, within some terminologies they usually use in chaos theory, cellular automata and so on. By some history philosopher, they can be called as the new-age movement, the philosophy raised upon some ancient traditions and spirituality.

The ancient traditions and spirituality hopefully offer some perspectives on how to behave such a way that we will not be trapped in such linear way of qualitative thinking (since non-linear perspectives are somehow hard to be approached qualitatively). The ancient literatures also offer some basic philosophical ideas on maintaining individuals of human regarding the sustainable ecosystem. The practice of yoga, meditations based on Hinduism or Buddhism in such a way become popular not even in scientific community but also in some general living of postmodern cultures. Social problem is hard to be defined and solved since its rigor non-linearity. In advance, it is hard to believe modern sociological perspectives have ability solving general social problems. Everything shall be given back to the personal and individual behaviors and somehow ancient literatures talks much about. Evolution of the society will bring the whole social system to the asymptotical optimum bio-system.

This is the tragedy of the new spirituality of postmodern civilization. Since Christian-dome has much influenced by the modern schools of thought,

Christianity is not genuine anymore, and the heart of science comes to the ancient spirituality. This can be seen as a new mode of fundamentalism since the deep adhering of ancient spirituality, but not fundamentalism brings out some kind of terror or forcing the others to join the spirituality. The new kind of fundamentalism however brings out some practical permissiveness that however can harm the social system itself.

### **Coping the complexity of social system**

However, the pseudo-rationalism perspectives by the argument described above is naïve and offers new simple mind on social phenomena. Much or less, it can be seen as collective psychological escapism among scientific societies. The reluctance to adhere the improvement of social science will give some practical permissiveness. Quoting Julien Benda, intellectual shall give some new directions to the society but not permissiveness. The escapism described above is the death of the science, as the system of thought circularized back to old times of (pseudo-mystical) thinking.

The improvement of many computational tools shall give some help to evolution of social science as far as in the natural science. However, some of the scientists have done this, simulating such social phenomena in artificial societies, social simulations, contributing the advancement of complexity science in analyzing some social phenomena. Must be admitted that this approach is still a new, but it should be improved by the scientific tradition in social science. Social science somehow must follow the vast improvement on the computational analysis, seeing the social system as complex system, and try to give some suggestions on how the system shall behave and in the other hand sustain.

The social scientists must admit that the conventional sociology once was inherited the Newtonian approach on natural phenomena – as the fact that the label of 'sociology' was once come from the science labeled 'social physics'. The advancement of methodology in natural science must be also enriching the methodology in social sciences and humanity in general. This is why the trends of academic society is not categorized - as in classical ones inherited by the classification of the ancient Greek's philosopher, Aristotle - but interdisciplinary of sciences. The vast improvement of natural sciences must also coped by the vast improvement of social sciences. This is the way of scientific revolutions of Thomas Kuhn ever stated. While in advance, the science as a whole will give out some useful directions for the evolutions of social system itself.