

‘ONE WORLD ONE DREAM’

THE NEED FOR CHANGES BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST, AMALGAMATION OF THE TWO SOCIAL SYSTEMS TO CREATE A NEW WORLD ORDER.

Understanding the Causes of Divisions between the East and the West

In today’s world where there is a convergence of cultures between the East and the West there is a danger of conflict and therefore there is a need to change on both sides to avoid potential confrontation due to misunderstanding resulting in clashes of derivatives. The way the world is going at the moment with all the predominant social systems it will eventually lead humanity to the end-time and the major division is found in the diagonally opposite social system between the East and the West. We have therefore to resolve this before we can strive towards ‘One World, One Dream’.

Before we go into the suggestions where both the East and the West social systems need to change we have to understand the concept of **derivative**, which is responsible for conflicts between different social systems and countries that has led to confrontations and wars. You will find that the issues that are at odds among religions and the conflicts in societies and cultures that generate passionate debates, even to the extent of going to war, can be traced to these derivatives, very often at the expense of downplaying and ignoring the core of our spiritual beliefs in which everyone shares.

Derivatives are the ideas and concepts giving rise to the beliefs/philosophies/practices and general ways of looking at things forced upon the individuals by the powerful force of conformity caused by the workings of group dynamics associated with different histories and cultures of the groups.

The concept of derivative is an overriding perspective and a sharper delineation in understanding the more important causes of conflict between religions and what I refer to as social systems or ‘ways of life’. In understanding the concept of derivatives there should be distinctions made between the concepts of culture and social system, or what I call a ‘way of life’, including distinctions to be made between religious theology and political ideology. Derivatives are all of these, but the greatest conflicts in today’s social systems are in fact found at the roots of the different religious theologies and social systems or ‘ways of life’ and **not** political ideology and culture.

Religious theology (caused by the philosophical mindset and at the same time inherent in the religious beliefs) gives rise to social system or ‘way of life’ and culture (practices and expressions of the emotional element). Religious theologies evolved as a result of derivatives of history and culture, which influence the social system or the ‘way of life’. Cultures are non-antagonistic and are represented by the arts, practices and other means of expression of the emotional elements of beliefs; social system is the way society is organized, to be influenced by the pervading philosophical mindset (which encompass religious theology) that has become the ‘way of life’. Underlying the concept of derivatives it includes the culture, the pervading philosophical mindset (encompassing religious theology and the formulation of political ideology) and the social system or ‘way of life’, with religious theology and social system that are at the roots of the problems in today’s conflict, clashes of ideologies and animosity that lead to wars and destruction.

The diversity of cultures is a result of the derivatives, but it should not be seen as the cause of great conflict that leads to wars. In today’s world it is not the different cultures within society, as presented by the different expressions of the emotional element of beliefs in the forms of customs, rituals, music

and arts, that pose problems of integration that is tending towards a world culture of multiculturalism, but the philosophical mindset of derivatives that is at the root of the problem; after all, multiculturalism does in fact contribute to the enrichment of living. Unfortunately, it is by association with the social system or 'way of life' that conflicts are generated.

All the other religions of the world have yet to develop a social system that has become the 'way of life' except Confucianism. China has maintained a social system that is multicultural, living in a harmonious 'way of life' for over two thousand years that had enriched its culture shaped by its unitary philosophical mindset of dialecticism. Political ideology should only be seen as the instrument by which the culture and social system are maintained and is subordinate to that of culture and social system when it is used to analyse world conflicts. Religious ideology and social system should be the guiding considerations for analysing world conflicts and are more important than the political ideologies that are formulated to enhance them.

Political ideology should only be seen as an instrument to engineer the social system or enhance the 'way of life'. In fact, examine it more closely we realize that all societies in history adopt or formulate political ideologies that are seen most suitable in maintaining their social systems or 'ways of life'. It is always the social system or 'way of life' that determines the more appropriate political ideology that is used to enhance it, in whatever the circumstances the derivatives have evolved. It is therefore not culture and political ideology that should be the causes of major conflicts, **although these are in fact the two major pretences pronounced as the causes of conflict in the world of the past and today**, dictated and instigated from the West and the Middle East (due to their philosophical metaphysical mindset which has as its root 'Gnosticism'); when in fact, with a sharper analysis it should be religions and social system as parts of the derivatives that are more important at the roots of the problems of the world. **If we were to achieve 'One World, One Dream' we should focus on resolving conflicts found in religions and social systems (inclusive of the pervading philosophical mindset) and not political system and culture.**

These derivatives are created to cater for our biological and psychological conditions within a defined social and cultural milieu. The biological identification of race and ethnicity is a powerful starting point for people to form groups of exclusion for security and survival reasons, cemented by a common history in the evolution of a culture, giving rise to derivatives. Perhaps in this, there is the biological force at work as part of Darwin's concept of natural selection in the process of survival of the fittest as evident in other animal species. Some of these derivatives are also arisen as a result of lack of knowledge at that point in time, or just due to the normal social evolutionary course of history as part of our psychological makeup. As a result, there are many layers of derivatives that confound and divide the common inherent spirituality of Man, even though some of these derivatives may have their source spiritual expression in their origins. These derivatives often confound and confuse further the real issues underlying the common core of religious beliefs. **You will find that the issues that are at odds among religions and the conflicts in societies that generate passionate debates, even to the extent of going to war, can be traced to these derivatives, very often at the expense of downplaying and ignoring the core of our spiritual beliefs in which everyone shares.**

On the psychological front all of us want to be reassured of our identity and to have self-esteem, as this would bring about our feeling of uniqueness, superiority and righteousness. All want to adhere to their derivatives as the 'truth' and claim to be exclusive and all followers will then belong to an exclusive 'club'. This 'belonging to an exclusive group' is a very powerful part of our 'fallen nature'. The forces of group dynamics as a psychosocial phenomenon are very powerful indeed that are the causes of divisions between groups that lead to animosity and even wars.

All the derivative intellectualizations of the respective religious and ethical beliefs lay claim to self-righteousness. The differences in the three monotheistic religions, for example, could have arrived at because of the different histories, social and cultural backgrounds of the people, camouflaging the core beliefs and roots of their respective religion which all three shares. Thus even among the monotheistic religions there are differences in beliefs which are results of the derivatives caused by the psychosocial conditions that are part of our 'fallen nature'.

These sorts of derivatives are also responsible for divisions within the same religion, resulting in many denominational groups, each claiming to be the **truer** 'truth'. These differences in the claim of a 'privileged and exclusive' position among the monotheistic religions are the causes of divisions; and the core beliefs in which the three religions share are very often inadvertently overlooked. The core belief that the same One True God created all human beings equally from the one true source is often forgotten and intellectualizations were formulated to support their respective derivatives.

An Example of a Difference in the Derivatives

We live in a value-laden world and it is in how these values are used in our actions that gives rise to the derivatives. A good example of the differential approach to the universal acceptable **value** of 'doing good', based on the different Hebraic-Christian-Islamic and the Chinese philosophical tradition is the belief in the concept of 'do unto others the things you would like others do unto you', epitomized as the 'golden rule' in the Hebraic law of the Bible as mentioned by Jesus in the Gospel (Matthew 7:12, Luke 6:31). This universal value is conceptualized differently as part of the derivatives of the western and eastern cultures. Confucius who was born more than 550 years B.C. already had this concept, but this was stated in the negative aspect and that is 'do **not** do unto others what you would **not have others** do unto you'. Some Westerners, including Jews, Christians and Muslims, observing the Confucian formulation of advice based on the principle of reciprocity have concluded that the positive statement is more superior.

The positive aspect can only be seen from the biological and psychological perspective as a more superior approach to the survival of the group. Western ideals, growing out of Hebraic-Islamic-Christian heritage, in which the 'will' of God (as conceptualized by men) and the wills of men play a dominant role, tend to be stated in terms of wilful, even aggressive assertion, rather than in terms of willing, permissive, even submissive acceptance. The dialectic approach embodied in the Chinese philosophical tradition recognizes the reciprocity involves in both positive and negative aspects of all things; for no matter how one prefers to state his ideals, the need for both 'doing' and 'doing not' recurs so frequently that preference do in fact determine the disposition of action. In fact it requires greater effort of 'will' to 'do not' than 'doing'.

The characteristic 'Chinese behaviour' has long been misunderstood because of the non-aggressive, submissive and acceptance of the 'do **not** do unto others' attitudes found in the Chinese character of the Confucian tradition. The reason for the conceptualization in the negative instead of a positive aspect is found in the Taoist ideal of *teh*, namely, that one who has *teh*, the ability to live naturally which is a virtue, will neither deviate from nature's way by intruding into the lives of others. To 'do unto others', that is to be on the offensive, is a form of 'meddling', that is to go against the nature of things. The nature of things for one is to develop individually and be with nature as from within each individual. Hence, the most appropriate way of formulating ideals regarding reciprocal behaviour is to state, as Confucius did, that one should '**not** do unto others'.

Thus from the materialistic (biological and psychological) viewpoint the statement in the positive is more superior, but from the humanistic viewpoint (spiritual) in prompting men to be more

virtuous by restraining from within themselves to avoid the greater propensity to offend, then the negative statement of restraint is more superior.

In fact the underlying sentiment of ‘doing’ and ‘doing not’ is the same, because it exalts people to ‘love your enemies’ and ‘be servant of all’ in its respective sentiment. It is in the **interpretation** of the differentiation in what is involved in ‘doing’ and ‘doing not’ by adopting either a **metaphysical or a dialectical mindset** that predisposes the course of action. Jesus said (Luke 6:27-38):

*“But to you who hear I say, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you. To the person who strikes you on one cheek, offer the other one as well, and from the person, who takes your cloak, do not withhold even your tunic. Give to everyone who asks of you, and from the one who takes what is yours do not demand it back. **Do to others as you would have them do to you.** For if you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners do the same. If you lend money to those from whom you expect repayment, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, and get back the same amount. But rather, love your enemies and do good to them and lend expecting nothing back; then your reward will be great and you will be children of the Most High, for He Himself is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked. Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful. Stop judging and you will not be judged. Stop condemning and you will not be condemned. Forgive and you will be forgiven. Give and gifts will be given to you; a good measure, packed together, shaken down, and overflowing, will be poured into your lap. For the measure with which you measure will in return be measured out to you”.*

Jesus in fact made this discourse in both positive and negative terms. The positive aspect of ‘Do unto others.....’ stated here is in context of ‘love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you.....give to everyone who asks...’ which are **positive affirmative actions** that are to impart onto others, only in instances where there are positive actions needed to be done in response to negative conditions. The negative aspects are those of the negatives that are **not** to be inflicted upon others as in ‘to the person who strikes you on one cheek, offer the other one as well’, ‘....do not withhold even your tunic..’, ‘....do not demand it back..’. These are in fact non-aggressive and non-reprisal stances of behaviour. In fact the core of His summary is more in the negative sense when He said derogatorily that “... if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you?”. **The disposition of ‘doing not’ is more akin to the core teaching of Jesus in the overall character of Jesus and this is clearly demonstrated by His life and death on the Cross.**

Perhaps it is in the **misinterpretation** of the ‘doing’ influenced by the Gnostic mindset, that is to impart to the outside of self (‘an-eye-for-an-eye, a-tooth-for-a-tooth’, ‘offence is the best form of defence’ philosophy) as against ‘doing not’ which is to practise restraint from within, that helped developed the metaphysic dispositions and aggressive behaviours of the Middle-Eastern and Western cultures and this is part of their derivatives of history.

Christianity is supposed to be the only religion that explicitly preaches love as the guiding principle for ‘doing good’. Unfortunately through Man’s attempts at intellectualizing their actions conditioned by the derivatives of Gnosticism or metaphysics, wars and aggressions can be justified. During the Crusades, the Christians justified their war of aggression in Jerusalem against Muslims as doing the will of the Christian God, but this went against the teaching of Christ – intellectualization was at work again. Because of the intellectualization that has evolved, there is separation between the ‘loves of neighbours’ with the social ethics of living in a western culture; wars can also be justified under a different pretext.

Even in predominantly Christian countries, by the separation of other social dimensions with religious beliefs, wars can be justified because it is being intellectualized as the wish of majority of its people under democratic rule, a result of 'Pluralism' that has evolved in the West which has become part of their social system and has become a 'way of life'. There is no homogenous set of humanistic values in such a social system. Under such a social system people who are elected into power are those who are skilful in deceiving the public in predominantly satisfying their biological and psychological needs, at the expense of downplaying the spiritual part of human nature. Having used a different derivative to justify going to war then the shift to the adherence of Christian values is identified and within a pluralistic society this can be rationalized and is accepted. Thus it is the follies of men that the core beliefs in religions are hidden, to be embellished with all sorts of justifications, all in the name of self-righteousness as guided by their respective doctrines, a man-made set of rules that are the derivatives of histories, societies, politics and cultures.

The Basic Differences in the Mind-sets of Middle-Eastern and Western cultures and the East

The Hebraic-Christian-Islamic Traditional Mind-set

Monotheistic religions tend to aspire for **idealism** within the **metaphysical mode** of thinking, whereas in the eastern tradition it is **pragmatism** in the **dialectical context** that prevails. Judaism uses the commandments of God as the yardstick by which all men should aspire. Again, in Islam the ideal is to live in accordance to the dictate of the Koran by upholding the 6 pillars of Islam. In Christianity the ideal is to 'be like Jesus'. **Idealism inevitably brings about conflict, because these ideals are inevitably impossible to achieve against the backdrop of our 'fallen nature' and as a result creates disharmony in living.** Disharmony in living has to be rationalized and the causes pinpointed.

The causes of disharmony are then attributed to forces from outside the system (metaphysical mode of thoughts). Bringing into the system outside factors for the causes of the disequilibria from within will inevitably create more contradictions. In order to rationalize the aspirations of living, a pluralistic society with the concept of 'individual freedom' evolved where contradictions are introduced and imposed onto the society to be accepted as norms of life. Pluralism is very much a by-product of Gnosticism and metaphysical philosophical thoughts that has permeated the Middle Eastern and Western cultures and is part of their derivatives, which will be the source of human conflict that will lead to the end-time (see Chapter 37 - 'Christianity and Future Times – Towards the End-time').

Religions that embrace idealism within a metaphysical mindset and accept the sinfulness of man have left open the interpretation and justification of killing and inflicting aggressions against neighbours simply on the pretext that it is doing the will of God, because it could be interpreted as fighting against evil, a force in opposition to the goodness of God. This is intellectualization at work again. In Judaism, wars can be justified on this count because of its belief that the Jews are the 'chosen people', which gives them a sense of self-righteousness. Thus in Islam there is justification in a 'holy war' based on 'jihad', a reactionary disposition caused by its history. This rationalization of a justification is in fact a retaliation against the outside forces that infringe upon the Islam religion and is very much part of our psychological nature. In today's context the U.S. and some European powers can justify their wars of aggression on the pretence of championing the causes of freedom, the western concept of democracy and the protection of Christian values.

All that are in contradiction to the core beliefs can be explained in terms of self-righteousness towards the cause of fighting evils in the name of God. Anything wrong within the system is blamed to the forces from outside the system. In fact the concept of the Devil, ascribing the causes of human follies or sinfulness, has its roots the metaphysical (Gnostic) mode of thoughts of the middle-eastern and

western cultures. Any internal conflict is perceived as 'evil' caused by an outside system of a culture or society, based upon its own set of derivatives and is seen as a threat to its own system and thus warrant an engagement of a war and aggression. It is perhaps the nature of this conflict and using idealism (within the metaphysical context) that gives these societies the impetus to wage wars of righteousness, explore and exploit Nature, leading to the extended intrusions into other social systems and cultures, the development of science, a drive to control Nature instead of living with it.

It also accounts for the 'tolerance of contradictions' in societies that led to the separations of individualism, religion and the affairs of states. Under such a society and culture, all mistakes or errors of judgment made can always be excused under the concept of democracy where majority of opinions can hold sway to changes and revelations in which deceptive politicians can manoeuvre public opinions. In a pluralistic society men who are elected into positions of responsibilities are more likely to be those who are good in deception upon a mixed bag of self-interested values, rather than men being selected upon a set of virtues beneficial to the whole of humanity. On the contrary, in such a society virtuous men (or women) by definition are facing insurmountable odds to be recognized and promoted to positions of power. Both modes of thoughts – metaphysics and dialectics – uses different means to overcome contradictions, but it is in the ways the contradictions are resolved that create a different set of derivatives among the Eastern and Western/Middle Eastern cultures.

This led to the formalization of the principles of western democratic freedom as an example. Democracy as a concept of popular votes by the masses and the embracing of 'individual freedom' is a myth caused by a pluralistic society that has as its roots our psychological conditions and not from our spiritual state and is therefore a derivative. The concept of 'individual freedom' is a myth because in any social system, there is actually no such thing as 'individual freedom' except that it can only be exercised **within the context of the overriding factor of community welfare**. In fact, popular votes by the majority are not necessarily right in deciding what is best for the group in the spiritual sense (except for selfish biological and psychological reasons of the majority) or what is best for all those outside the group. On the contrary, decisions that are made by the majority or what are considered as popular decisions are likely to be wrong and least desirable from a spiritual perspective and for the whole of humanity.

This is because majority of us who are bonded by our 'fallen nature' are greatly influenced and overwhelmed by our biological and psychological over-indulgences. After all, it is the majority as part of our 'fallen nature' that wishes to have their own biological and psychological wellbeing satisfied more so than our spiritual well-being. Under this system the leaders that are selected are more likely to have acquired the skills of deception and dishonesty to cater for the majority's demands for better biological and psychological conditions of living than that which the spiritual nature demands. **One must not forget that it was the majority that condemned Jesus to die on the cross.**

On the one hand it is preached that we must be obedient to God and the authority to which He has vested, but on the other hand it is promulgated that the majority of individuals has the freedom to choose who should be the authority. This is where the values and objective clash between God's plan and the 'fallen' part of human nature. This is thus a contradiction that is caused by the derivatives of the Western cultures which has as its root the acceptance of pluralism.

This is what happened in a pluralistic and so-called 'democratic' system of government. In such a society any point of views has its reason and is accepted by some people, and in the process creating a lot of confusing issues based on different terms of reference - therefore leaders who are 'elected' into positions of power will have to be very skilful in appealing to the majority; and **not necessarily men of good virtues and character** (even that they have to be shaped to appeal to the masses through

skilful deception). In such a system, men of genuine good virtues and honesty are less likely to be elected into positions of power because good virtues of decision-makers do not cater for our biological and psychological overindulgences – there is no homogenous set of humanistic values under such a pluralistic social system.

The acceptance of pluralism alongside with the concept of one-man-one vote to elect someone to power and authority can only create social behaviours of men who aspire to win votes to succeed only upon the conduct of deception and hypocrisy, which is in conformity to our ‘fallen nature’; after all, the masses are more concerned with immediate benefits closer to their immediate needs rather than which benefit humanity as a whole on a wider platform of concern. In such a society the **men who are voted into power are not necessarily virtuous but more likely to be ‘good politicians’ who have mastered the art of deception.**

Such a social system that has been created to cater for the biological and psychological overindulgences of its members will always intrude into other social systems in all fields of economic and political considerations that will lead the world to an end-time. In such a society the men who are voted into power are not necessarily virtuous but more likely to be ‘good politicians’ who have mastered the art of deception and acquired the skills of engendering material possession.

This leads to the formulation of the ideologies of capitalism, ‘free enterprise’, ‘economic realism’ and the rewards of high professional occupations such as CEO of large corporations, politicians, film stars and sportsmen (women) and the development of a sophisticated legal and financial system with an administrative machinery that are non-productive in the rudimentary sense as to provide for the more basic needs of the community at large and the equitable distributions of the earth resources for the whole of humanity that live upon this earth.

This type of social system is responsible for the start of what is called the ‘monetary market system’ which focuses on the acquisition of money as the misrepresentative value for its contribution to the market economy, creating an artificial value to replace the real contributors who are the farmers and working class of society based upon humanistic values. Upon life value analysis this ‘money sequence of value’ leads to ‘value disorder’ based upon humanism and is part of the derivatives. The use of the word ‘economy’ is a direct contradiction to its meaning, because the true meaning is to economize by reducing waste and making optimum uses of resources. The driving force in such an ‘economic’ industrialized system is to promote ‘planned obsolescence’ and waste for all its productions. In a free market capitalistic system the economy is driven by increasing demand on consumerism and consequently waste of natural resources, resulting in upsetting the ecosystem against ‘nature in the order of things’, that will eventually lead the world into the end-time. This ‘monetary market system’ caters predominantly to our ‘fallen nature’ by developing values that promote the biological and psychological over-indulgences.

The system of democratic rule would have a better chance of being civilized if it is concomitant with the acceptance of a standard and desirable set of values that are closer to those that focus on humanity as a whole; and people in power and authority are selected upon this set of universal values. Such a society rested upon pluralism and the voting of someone into power based on one-man-one-vote can only promote materialism, the use of economic power and armed forces as means to maintain its sovereignty and influences, but it is detrimental to the long-term interests of mankind because this goes against abiding with nature in the ‘order of things’ (discussed in more details in Chapter 35 “Christianity and Future Times – Towards the End-time”).

Good genuine virtues are spiritual in nature, just as are found in Jesus. **One must not forget that it was the majority or popular votes that condemned Jesus to die on the cross** – His perfect virtues were not recognized and accepted by the majority. If Jesus were to live among us today He would surely die in the hands of the majority, thus signifying the unchanging universal aspect of our ‘fallen nature’. If Jesus were to exist today He will never be 'successful' in being elected, because the majority, under the so-called ‘democratic’ system can only elects those who could cater well for their biological and psychological over-indulgences. You must not forget that it was the majority of Jesus’ time that put Him to death and this majority is still with us today. Therefore, the so-called ‘democratic’, pluralistic and ‘free’ societies of the West, in particular the U.S. with all its materialistic values and weapons of mass destruction will be leading the world towards the end-time.

This desirable model of an election based on virtues reveals that the western concept of democratic election by the masses is misleading and its promotion of the concept as ‘individual freedom’ is a devious means by which the ‘devil’ (our ‘fallen nature’) works in creating more conflicting values and confusing issues using the appeal of the masses as justification. It is in fact this same concept of ‘individual freedom’ to choose and the ‘majority rules’ that determine the course of action that resulted in Jesus being crucified – so much for the western concept of democracy. This shows that as part of the derivatives associated with our ‘fallen nature’ the popular votes of the majority will always be the one that works against the spiritual interest of our nature and it is only the minority of virtuous men and women that is on the right path, akin to the teaching of Jesus Christ. This is another example to show how derivatives are being intellectualized using our core beliefs to justify the confusing issues that have been created.

An ideology that accepts contradictions and tolerance on all fronts, ascribing causes from the ‘outside’, will have a better chance to exploit and control. The tendency is to solve contradictions, not by resolving from within as in the dialectical approach, but to look for the causes and solutions from outside the system and to ascribe the contradictions to be caused by the outside forces instead. With the attack on the outside forces more contradictions are introduced into the existing system.

With this mindset a culture and society developed, built upon more contradictions upon more contradictions. The focus is on increasing the ‘Yang’ instead of addressing the emergence of the ‘Yin’ that is, increasing the proactive without addressing the corresponding reactive. This result in the compilation of the ‘Yang’, a mixed bag of values that tends to contradict each other which leads to the forced acceptance of pluralism and proactive actions taken against the outside forces – in the West this may be called ‘individual freedom’ and will be the cause of world conflict through championing its cause in the belief of self-righteousness.

Thus you can see in history for such a pluralistic society, those who advocated restraint are often those who delivered the first strike. Yet, this can be justified in the name of fighting ‘good against evil’, with the evil party always from the outside, all in the name of self-righteousness on some grounds. Those who advocate the control of weapons of mass destruction in such a society is actually the one who more likely harbours weapon of mass destruction first and justifies their uses on the ground of self-defence; and supposedly all these are done for the good of the many.

Those who advocate wars on terrorism often forget the roots of the problem that come from within and justify their own acts of terrorism as a reactionary response which eventually propagate the cycle of occurrences. The Chinese discovered gunpowder and they used this to enhance harmony of living by using it as fireworks as an example, a process of identifying the corresponding ‘Yin’ which harmonizes living, which highlight the difference between the East and the West in the use of new

discoveries. The West used this to invent firearms without addressing the emerging ‘Yin’, not to enhance living but to fight evil from without. Those who bring out the need to protect our world ecosystems are often those who are guilty of polluting them and yet, in the name of self-righteousness preventing others to do the same.

The Eastern Traditional Mind-set

It is in the Eastern religious traditions that the harmony with Nature and adherence to the ‘order of things’ are held more in respect than the ‘Western’ or ‘Middle Eastern’ religions. This is perhaps so because to the eastern religious beliefs, ‘God’ as an individual entity is being ‘replaced’ by the concept of ‘Nature’, the former being held by the monotheistic religions. That is why there is a tendency for the Eastern philosophy to try integrating religious beliefs into the ‘nature of life and the order of things’.

This has become a derivative of the Eastern history and culture, which was isolated from the Western historical and cultural influences in the past. They do not relate to the Creator directly but only to his Creation, thus attempts are made to create harmony as part of a deep reverence for Nature. They do not ascribe to the wrath of God when things go wrong, but only to the follies of men who create disharmony (as part of our ‘fallen nature’) and the attempt is to adjust the follies of men to bring things back to harmony. This is a continuous process by which human societies naturally evolve through resolving contradictions from within and the perfectibility of life on Earth and the whole of creation are hoped to be achieved.

The Chinese ethical beliefs have also undergone profound changes that are distinctly different from the West, but the derivatives are evolved in harmony with nature and the ‘order of things’. The Chinese ethical beliefs have evolved into a society and culture that has become ‘a way of life’, a social system that embraces a homogenous set of humanistic values and all religious teachings are to conform and be integrated into the ‘order of things’ as part of the harmony of nature, as opposed to, for example Islam, where religion is the guiding force to develop the ‘way of life’; and Christianity, where its ideology is being imposed onto the society and forces upon the acceptance of pluralism as ‘a way of life’. It is in the Chinese ethos that imposes its culture (or ‘way of life’) onto religion, while Islam and Christianity have the tendency to impose their religions onto the culture.

This explains why a Chinese can be a Christian, Muslim, or Buddhist and still remain a ‘Chinese’ in character by following the Chinese ‘way of life’. Buddhism is not an imposing ideological religion and is not evangelistic in character. As a matter of fact, the practices of Buddhism whose philosophy conforms close to the Chinese ethical beliefs have been modified to integrate into the Chinese ‘way of life’. Yet, within these ideals of a culture there are still conflicts arising at the individual level within the system that are at odds with our ‘fallen nature’ that are causes of human conflict. These different approaches to creating the ‘way of life’ are the causes of today’s human conflict and many wars are fought to impose or protect each others’ ‘way of life’. Derivatives are still evolving and continue to be the causes of human conflict leading to the end-time.

Thus in the modern context, many countries of the West would like to claim the uniqueness of their respective ‘way of life’ and social values. The Australian politicians, for example, insist and indeed even propose signed allegiance to a set of ‘Australian values’ as though these values are proprietary to them, implying that for those who do not hold these values they are inferior and are considered undesirables. How anyone could lay claim to any set of values that is universal? Values are always evolving in the context of the time and culture bonded by the derivatives, especially in pluralistic societies. At best it should only be the derivatives as perhaps represented by the code of laws that can

be claimed as unique to a particular society and culture and not a set of values. Perhaps to avoid conflict, humanity should learn to respect and appreciate the different 'way of life' found in different cultures and not to impose different ideologies by use of force or other pretences.

The Eastern traditional philosophy requires an attitude of pragmatism within a dialectical mode of thoughts. Pragmatism within the dialectical context attempts to resolve 'contradictions' in societies and religious beliefs, to arrive at a harmonious state of existence, to be realistic in accepting all that are part of nature and in the 'order of things'. Life and religious beliefs must harmonize in order that 'truths' can emerge. Thus religious beliefs should be made to become 'a way of life' and the society is evolved in that direction where any form of religion should blend into the 'way of life'.

Pluralism is not acceptable because this will create disharmony. The acceptance of pluralism would bring about disharmony and conflict, leading to disorder and multitudes of deviant values that go against nature and the 'order of things' that are founded upon a universal set of humanistic values. Harmony in nature is seen as an important and desirable aspiration of mankind and human societies, because Creation and the Creator are seen to be in harmony. The concept of 'individual freedom' is also not acceptable as long as it infringes into the general welfare of the community at large. It is only confined to individual differences in character, but at the societal level all these individuals are expected to conform to the overall interests of the masses.

The Chinese ethos believe by having a harmonious society and mode of living, it will bring about consonance with creation and the Creator, an ideal to be strived for, and this will bring about peace and longevity of existence. Buddhism has a tradition of great respect for Nature and to live and aspire to be with Creation, minus the sufferings in the world. This is being achieved by striving towards attaining nirvana. Hinduism maintains the 'order of things' as part of the universal law of the dharma. In this core belief found in Buddhism and Hinduism there is similarity with the Chinese ethical belief of 'abiding with nature in the order of things'. Perhaps because of this approach, the eastern cultures had difficulties in exploring new frontiers; and the evolution of their societies, in terms of advancement in science and materialism, takes a more conservative and arduous route.

In the Eastern culture, the authority that has been vested by the natural course of social change is accepted as having the mandate from up high. Coupled by developing a consensual system of educating, selecting and appointing men of virtues it has resulted in a homogenous society where contradictions are being resolved from within and pluralism is not tolerated. In the traditional Eastern philosophy, this authority is believed to be invested from above and is part of the 'order of things' under heaven and any contradictions are to be resolved from within the system.

The concept of 'democracy' where the majority elects people into government can only work when the 'way of life' is centred on developing men (or women) with virtues that are harmonious throughout the society. In this respect, perhaps Islam has this as part of its religion by wanting to create a society in harmony with its religious beliefs, but in today's predominant metaphysic mindset and intrusion of outside powers with its overpowering influence of pluralism and its own metaphysical mindset, such an ideal can never be achieved and more likely to cause conflict because of their traditional mindset of Gnosticism.

The Main Source of Conflicts Between the East and the West

In the battle between metaphysic and dialectic mindsets, metaphysic is always a stronger force over that of dialecticism, because it 'plays into the hands' of our 'fallen nature' and will 'win' in this world at the end. Metaphysical thoughts are reflected in our 'fallen nature' because of the belief in the sinful

nature of life on earth and the acceptance of an imperfect world and consequently the ‘fight’ against contradictions of this world (‘an eye for an eye’, ‘a tooth for a tooth’ disposition). **The world is full of contradictions (as it was recognized by the Chinese in their concept of the ‘Yin’ and ‘Yang’) and it is not so much the acceptance of these contradictions that distinguishes the metaphysicists and dialecticists, but how these contradictions are dealt with.** The Chinese acceptance of the ‘Yin’ and ‘Yang’ is to accept contradictions but to resolve them from within the framework of the existing order to achieve harmony (see chapter 31 in looking at the universality of Christ’s teaching).

In metaphysical mindset the attempt is to introduce contradictions to solve contradictions instead of trying to resolve contradictions from within the existing framework. It uses some sort of a scapegoat from the outside for the causes of the disorder from within, thus introducing a new factor in the resolution of the conflict. The mindset in such a social milieu, for example, is to cast suspicion upon the outside forces and under the pretence of self-defence mounts an offense. The forces of offense will eventually encroach onto the dialectical societies and out of pragmatism, in order to survive, these societies will have to change from within and may eventually lead to the development of an amoral society and the forced acceptance of pluralism against that which should be based on the principles of humanism.

Even in religions that preach the ‘order of things’, wrongdoings may be justified upon the pretext of maintaining order, but not under the pretence of fighting for good against evil. Thus in Hinduism, and Confucius/Shinto ethics, the rights to maintain order or to make revolution or to do the works of the emperor can be justified in the ‘order of things’, all in the name of pragmatism in the context of dialectic thoughts, but at least this is not done at the expense of intruding into any outside system. In all of these dialectical and metaphysical approaches the **intention to create a more humane society is the same, but in each of the mode the ‘fallen’ part of human nature still prevails.**

However, if a more harmonious society with a homogenous set of good humanistic values adopted, our ‘fallen nature’ will have less chance of overcoming the social forces at work. However, the struggles for power, wealth and self-indulgences are still powerful forces that act against the intention of creating a more humane society, thus there will always be evil men in politics and society that go out to deceive and control. **Our ‘fallen nature’ is therefore a stronger force that is responsible for the derivatives of all cultures.** The drama of life on Earth will always be fought upon power, material possessions, self-indulgences and self-righteousness, which will inevitably lead to the end-time.

Under the dialectic homogenous system, although there are deceptions and dishonesty in the selection of leaders in terms of distinguishing these virtues because of the ‘fallen nature’, there is a clearer and standard benchmark of consensual virtues that are in demand by the majority founded upon humanistic values. In such a case the principle of ‘democracy’ in selecting people to rule based on a universal set of accepted virtues can work to a large extent, but we are still overwhelmed by our ‘fallen nature’. Thus the Chinese believe in the emperor having the ‘mandate of heaven’ whose virtues are seen to have done good for the majority but the people have the ‘right to make revolution’ when this mandate is taken away from the emperor whose rule leads to a decadent society is very much a ‘democratic’ system that is based on a harmonious set of values. This could be taken as a different concept of ‘democracy’, a democratic system that is part of nature in the ‘order of things’.

In such a system or society, there are still the problems caused by our ‘fallen nature’ as a result of the natural evolution of history in the ‘order of things’, but at least this is held in check through a homogenous set of values. On the other hand, one only has to look at the model of electing a new Roman Catholic Pope by the conclave of cardinals who were appointed by the previous Pope, where

the cardinals are appointed to their positions based on virtues, conform close to the Chinese model of old. The Chinese's belief in the people's rights to make revolution in the instant of a decadent rule is in fact more democratic than the papal model!

The concepts of freedom and democracy have a better chance of working if a homogenous society can be developed where a uniform set of desirable values which promote men (and women) of virtues into positions of power can be inculcated, thus a synthesis between metaphysical and dialectical (synthesis between the West and the East) approach to the development of a uniform world culture. The Western concept of democracy in choosing those to power and authority can only make sense if the society and culture focus on developing the virtues of men based on a more homogeneous culture of good standards of humanistic values as in the Chinese and Catholic Papacy models, where men in power and authority are selected upon virtues and a universally accepted code of conduct which have become a homogenous 'way of life' in a society based on nature in the 'order of things'. Coupled with the belief that the masses have 'the right to make revolution' (the right to overthrow the government under whatever political system of government) when this universally accepted set of values is abused then there is greater democracy.

This is the irony of life as witnessed in the past and ever more today. Idealism which aspires perfection only for the afterlife and having accepted and created contradictions in life, will find it amenable to exploit and control the dictates of life on earth and the earthly environment, while using pragmatism with dialectic mindset from the cosmic perspective, by its very nature, will strive to achieve harmony and resolve contradiction from within, both of which are still succumbed to our 'fallen nature'. It is our 'fallen nature' that will rule upon the Earth, because by nature it is 'sinful'. It is the societal forces that dictate the social behaviours of Man, to be compounded with the other sides of our fallen nature, that is the biological and psychological forces that are at work, all of which, with respect to our spiritual aspiration, has made us 'sinful'. More about the subjects of our 'fallen nature' and the concept of 'sin' later. More also about eschatology, the study of the end-time in chapter 35, the path in which the existing system of the world leads us.

Actually there are no 'rights' and 'wrongs' with derivatives because they are founded upon the biological and psychological factors and they are the benchmarks majority embraced. All derivatives can be rational and their justifications can be argued upon the premises that have been derived from their histories and cultures. Thus focusing on arguing about derivatives and ascertain who is 'right' and 'wrong' can never resolve any issue and this often leads to animosities, even violence and war. Perhaps this is part of the Creator's Plan and the different sets of derivatives are the mechanism by which the world as we know it will find its final fate.

Antagonistic actions should not be taken upon the differences in the derivatives if we were to come to terms with dealing effectively with our biological and psychological natures. We must only seek to understand how these derivatives come about and to find the roots of their origins. Only then can we come to terms with understanding others and take appropriate actions for possible reconciliation. In finding solutions to all issues pertaining to derivatives we need to focus on the commonality rather than the differences, and that can only be found in the spiritual dimension of our being, shared by all of the humankind. In the final analysis, the fate of life on Earth is in the hand of the Almighty, but the battle of reconciliation is the responsibility of every individual that dwells on this Earth.

For all the seemingly different concepts of idealism and pragmatism within the metaphysical and dialectical mindsets underlying the western and eastern religious traditions respectively there is a commonality of belief held by all, and that is, the respect and awe that is given to a higher order of Being in the perfectibility of His Creation. In the monotheist religions this is God and with the eastern

religion it is Nature or Creation. All of these subscribe to the same objective and that is, to be reunited with or becoming part of Creation or the Creator. Where the two differ is in the Eastern religions' belief of the perfectibility of life on earth and the focus on creating a society in consonance with the 'order of things' which is seen as part of Creation on the one hand, whilst the monotheistic religions sees life on earth as a struggle against evil and perfection is found only in the afterlife. The Eastern philosophical thoughts have the cosmic view of creation where all aspects of God's creation are good, while the Western philosophical thoughts see life as 'sinful' and perfection can only be achieved in the afterlife. The derivatives of idealism and pragmatism within the different metaphysical and dialectical mindsets are results of the different history and culture of the West and the East.

Changes that are needed to be made in the East and the West

The difference in the derivatives between the East and the West is primarily found in the social system or the 'way of life'. In the East, especially China, the focus is on formation of the social system or the 'way of life'; and religious theologies and political ideologies are made to conform to the 'way of life' in order to establish harmonious living. China is the only civilization in the world that has a continuous and unbroken line of history that has evolved into an entrenched 'way of life'. Whereas in the West the focus is on religious theologies and political ideologies to develop the many evolving social systems – this leads to the acceptance of pluralism as a 'way of life'. The Middle-Eastern countries where religious theology is guided by the teachings of Islam, the focus is on religion to develop the social system or the 'way of life' and different political ideologies are used to facilitate this, and in the process develop disharmony. The Middle-Eastern and Western social systems **do not** focus on harmony as the guiding principle in developing the 'way of life' and with the pervading philosophical mindset of Gnosticism or metaphysics, attributes the disequilibria within their social systems to causes from without leading to conflicts and confrontations between different social systems. They have yet to develop a 'way of life' that is consonance with their religious beliefs, whereas the Chinese has already succeeded in developing a 'way of life' that is homogenous with its ethical beliefs, being incorporated as part of the 'social system'.

If the world were to have less chance of confrontation due to derivatives, perhaps the East and the West need to come to terms with understanding the respective social system or 'way of life' and not be focused on political systems or ideologies. Political systems or ideologies are only the means by which the social system is expected to be engineered. Ultimately it is in defining the social system or 'way of life' where the one most suitable political system hopes to bring about that is of paramount importance to arrive at a more civilized society. The following are some of the things both the East and the West need to change in order that the world can bring about a new social order that is more civilized based upon the dialectic model.

To Maintain the Dialectic Culture of China

China has for over two thousand years maintained a homogenous culture guided by Taoism and Confucianism which is based on humanistic values guided by the dialectic model. It is a good model that has succeeded in upkeeping humanistic values throughout the hierarchy of society that helps checks on deviant social behaviours caused by our biological and psychological natures, although in the final analysis it is still our 'fallen nature' that will predominate, but nevertheless it has been evolved with 'nature in the order of things', a harmonious living within its own social system.

China's social system has been evolved harmoniously over a period of over two thousand years and thus very much entrenched as a 'way of life'. Because of the stronger force of the metaphysical culture of the West where pluralism reigns, the dialectic social system or 'way of life' in China is now

being threatened and will eventually be eliminated through the passage of time if no effort is made to adapt to the onslaught of Western influences of pluralism, the concept of 'individual freedom', materialism, consumerism and the metaphysical mindset. China's concept of a truly civilized society is the greatest contribution China can make to the world. It is in maintaining the positive parts of the dialectic system from within and understanding the metaphysical system from without, with steps taken to prevent the negative influences of the West that China can hope to contribute to the world.

There are 6 basic issues that China has to address:

1. To maintain and modernize Confucianism as a guiding philosophy founded upon dialecticism, the approach to address the 'Yin' and the 'Yang' in all aspects of life, the development of homogenous set of humanistic values that applies throughout the whole hierarchy of society, starting from the family and going right up to people that are in government. It may mean updating Confucianism and revising the set of humanistic values to include those preached by Jesus of Nazareth and the core of all those other religions. This means to revise the educational system at the school level to inculcate these values at the foundation stage of the development of its citizenry. The emphasis is on development of virtues in men (and women) and focus on electing men (and women) to position of authority based upon these virtues that are recognized and accepted throughout the hierarchy of society.
2. Equal emphasis should focus on developing and enhancing life in the rural areas, to ensure there is a balance between the 'Yin' and 'Yang' in the way of life of the urban and rural culture that is homogenous throughout China. It means providing the infrastructures and social amenities, like schools and hospitals equally made available in the rural and urban areas to create a harmonious way of life. It also means making farming a rewarding occupation.
3. Attempts to address the problems between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' by offering opportunities for training and employment, compensating the underprivileged in maintaining an acceptable standard of living.
4. Maintain a balance in the ecosystem, following Confucius' teaching to 'abide by nature in the order of things', by use of recycling of resources, use of alternative eco-friendly sources of energy. It means to eliminate pollutions, bypassing the mistakes made from the western industrial countries.
5. All those who are elected to serve which includes government officials and all leading professional and business people must get rid of corruption. If men (and women) who are elected upon the uniform set of homogenous virtues it should address the problem of corruption, but because of our 'fallen nature' a system of checks need to be introduced within the political system to monitor corruption and deviations of government officials and business enterprises from the set of humanistic values that the social system embraced. If a political system has to evolve that is closer to the democratic system to maintain the homogenous 'way of life' as a form of check then it should be used, but it should be subordinate to the social system that is deemed desirable.
6. Be aware of western influences, especially in the acceptance of pluralism, consumerism, materialism and decadent influences of the entertainment industries of the west, understanding where these are coming from and find means to redirect and shield these for greater achievements. From the dialectic viewpoint the greatest danger of a possible dysfunctional

society could come from within, where Western values relating to materialism succeeds in infiltrating the social system to be exploited by the West.

The Changes that the West Needs to Make

The alignment of a world culture does not mean the adoption of a common political system like 'western democracy', 'democratic socialism', 'socialism', 'authoritarianism', 'communism', 'feudalism', 'dictatorship', 'aristocracy', 'sultanate' and 'monarchy', etc. It is in the model of a social system ('way of life') that should be the consideration.

Political ideology should be seen as just an instrument to bring about or enhance a desirable social system that adopts a universal set of values that is based upon humanism. In this sense all political systems should be subordinate to this kind of social system. Political ideology should therefore not be seen as causes of conflict. Unlike China, the Middle Eastern and Western cultures evolved around religious beliefs and political ideologies and consequently the social systems have not evolved harmoniously and had undergone many changes over time. China is the only civilization in the world that has developed an entrenched social system that provides a model to the world. Analysed from this perspective the roots of the major conflicts in the world are actually caused by religious theology and social system or 'way of life'.

The Western and Middle-Eastern social systems have yet to develop into a 'way of life' that is homogenous with their religious beliefs. The Western social system has developed 'pluralism' as a 'way of life' which is **not** homogenous with the teachings of Jesus (Christianity), whereas the Middle-Eastern social systems are trying to impose their religion (Islam) to become the 'way of life' but at the same time still maintain the Gnostic mindset that is in disharmony with 'nature in the order of things'. There will then be respect for 'nature in the order of things' and to maintain a balance in the world's ecosystem. The following are some of the changes within the social system of the West that need to be looked at:

1. Adopt the dialectic model of educating its citizenry upon a uniform set of humanistic values, focusing on electing virtuous people into positions of power based upon this recognizable set of values. Religious theology should be revised to conform to this set of humanistic values. Let pluralism have its demise along the process. It means reintroduce a common set of moral values that are universal to be taught in the schools as a foundation of its citizenry throughout the country. It may also mean for people who aspire to be in government they need to undergo a university education in the areas of economics, politics, ethics, moral codes of conduct, understanding histories and cultures of all major countries of the world. Only then the democratic system of electing people into government makes sense.
2. All people in the media and entertainment industries should learn to be more responsible and accountable and **not** to promote values that are not in concert with what is taught in the schools, thus making the embrace of these values homogenous throughout the social system. The media should act as checks upon deviations from these values within their own social system and just report news of factual happenings from other social systems and not to pass value judgment without proper understanding of the facts.
3. All Christian churches should work towards unity, to revise their dogma based upon the commonalities of beliefs that are universals, especially upon those homogenous set of humanistic values that is decided to be inculcated in the schools, making clear that the practices and rituals are only means by which each individual finds comforts in organizing and

expressing these values. It means reinterpreting the Gospels, especially the teaching of Jesus, from the dialectical perspective and to develop ethics in accordance to these principles.

4. Learn to solve problems from within and not to interfere with other political and social systems. It also means to curtail consumerism and materialism and not to pollute the environment and to use the earth's resources responsibly to focus on recycle of materials.
5. Allow the various social systems and values of the world to compete freely and allow the best social system to shine. It means not to interfere with other social systems, championing causes upon their own set of values – to make wars upon these pretences is the greatest crime against humanity.
6. Let the world evolves naturally in the 'order of things' and be participant in this process without creating conflict.

When these changes are made on both the East and Middle-Eastern/Western social systems to establish a new World Order, all other derivatives will gradually evolve in the right direction provided a homogenous value system is established. The 'monetary market system' will automatically be degenerated and perhaps a 'resource based economy' catering for all who dwell on this Earth we share will be established and the life sequence of value based upon humanism will flourish. A unified world is then one that should be founded upon a uniform set of values that are homogenous throughout the world which is founded upon a common social system based on humanism – the realization of 'One World One Dream'. It is towards the evolution of a common social system based upon the dialectic model that will unify humanity and not ideologies founded upon religion and political system. If the world could accept the dialectic framework in its evolution of a world culture it would bring about peace and be a better place for it to evolve naturally in the order of things.

Michael S.K. Toh
5, Mar., 2011 (revised)