

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

The Field of Between: The Field of Inter-Action and Intra-Relation – Toward a Logic for a Global World

Hisaki HASHI

Key words: 1. Comparative Logics, 2. *tertium non datur* by Aristotle, 3. ”Logic of the Field” by NISHIDA, Kitarō, 4. ”Mesology” by Augustin BERQUE, 5. ”Logic of the included middle” by Eiji HATTORI, 6. ”The Field of Between” by Hisaki HASHI, 7. Comparative Philosophy

Introduction

Computer science and technology are at the center of various sciences in our current global world. Intellectual activity tends to collect knowledge in a network of computers in close proximity to each other, so any exchange of knowledge takes place exclusively in this circle or in the consciousness of the people connected to it.

A related topic is artificial intelligence: In connection with AI and quantum computers, ”humanity will unlock an extended dimension of knowledge and possibilities.” A gap that results from this idea with regard to possible experiments may be expressed as follows: There is a topos between human beings and the AI they oversee; a [There-Between], in which the competencies of humans of AI have to be compared, developed, and integrated.

In IT networks of any kind, interaction and communication takes place among people who are not equals. A particular topos exists between person [A] and [B (non-A)]. I term it [The Field of Between], which is everywhere. Regarding an encounter between two people, between [A]and [B (non-A)], the ”Field of Between” is encompassed neither by means of purely analytical logic nor by natural or cognitive science because it has to do with life and the experience of truth through the bodily existence of human beings.

Orienting one’s thought toward attacking the logical gap in the arguments of others is the preferred manner of thinking in analytical philosophy, cognitive science, and scientific positivism.¹ The principle of the excluded middle (*tertium non datur*) is a powerful tool. It is an indispensable contribution to the development of technology and the natural sciences because it deals with pure logic, applicability, and functionality. However, when logic – as a logic of logic itself – deteriorates into a mere language game, it becomes devoid of content.

When we consider logic in terms of the logic of life and the experience of truth, the dimension of logic becomes a comprehensive topos encompassing existing human

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

beings alongside their cultural environment and way of thinking as a whole. For this purpose we need a logic of the field which encompasses the beings situated therein.²

The Logic of Nishida – *basho* (場所) as the topos of experiencing a truth

Philosophy consists of logically constructed thought. The logic of philosophy is directed to comprehending the deeper nature of a particular subject, thing, or being.

Concerning a logic for our time, let us focus on *life through the experience of a truth*. Nishida's philosophy began with “pure experience (*junsui keiken* 純粹經驗).”³ *Pure* means in this case without the admixture of the experience of consideration, speculation, subjective emotion, self-interest, and profit-oriented calculation. It is *experiencing an absolute or comprehensive truth as a whole*. As Nishida says:

“In the very first moment when one visually perceives a color or acoustically perceives a sound, there is neither a subject nor an object.”⁴

In everyday experience, there is already some subjectivity present in the “first moment of visual or acoustic perception.” While surfing the Internet, one constantly perceives something visually or acoustically; this is not a pure experience because a preference for seeing certain things is mixed in from the beginning. A pure experience (online or off), on the other hand, is a gripping whole experience of something apprehended via a conscious bodily existence. Thus is one in the center of the experienced truth. A subject-object split or judgment has not yet taken place. Bodily existence and consciousness *merges* in the field, the place of the experienced truth.

It is a holistic, comprehensive experience of truth in which different approaches such as religion, philosophy, ethics, and all the scientific disciplines may intersect, sharing a common ground of truth. When someone professing a monotheistic faith has this *pure experience*, it is apprehended as a “place of the absolute will of God.” However, Nishida's *pure experience* does not presuppose any religious faith. It is free and open, leaving the believer the place for the substantiation of his particular confession. At the same time, the *pure experience* cannot be fixed to one particular experience at all. What is given is found exclusively in the pure experience: the bodily existence of an egoless self, its natural will to the union with truth, and the surrounding world (consisting of the temporal and the spatial; spacetime).

The self/I (as body and consciousness) in pure experience has a mental state of clarity. The self does not consider whether the subject or object is true or false. Instead, it lets itself be, surrounded by others. Itself produced by the pure experience, the experiencing self becomes aware of what is truth.

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

The consciousness of the I/Self immediately after pure experience develops in the following three steps:

1. It opens to the essential subject of, for instance, [I see]: The *1st* person pronoun in the singular makes way for the periphery of the thus-being of the truth,
2. The I becomes receptive to its fellow beings: it opens to the *2nd* person pronoun: *you*.
3. The objective, judging, and apprehending I recognizes the *3rd* person pronoun.

Based on this process, the ego constantly experiences a flow in its consciousness, producing thoughts or emotions. The stream of consciousness is based on the correlation of the abovementioned three parts. If consciousness becomes attached to the first part, it develops toward subjectivism, toward a selfish ego. If it tends to remain on the second part, it becomes egoless, in constant dependence on others. Suppose that consciousness were to focus exclusively on the third part. In this case, the results would be a position centered on objectivity, on the absolutism of the cognitive and natural sciences, of technology, whereby the subject ignores everything outside of these fields. This one-sidedness falls away in the logic of the Field. The Self opens in all directions.⁶

The Mesology (容中律) of Augustin Berque

“Tetralemma and Mesology” by Augustin Berque⁷ is one of the exemplary logics of this century. Inspired by “Logos and Lemma” by Yamauchi Tokuryū, Berque has reflected on the tetralemma of Nāgārjuna. In connection with Watsuji’s “Logic of Fūdo”, Berque discovered several principles of logic that do not have a place in the conventional philosophy of the occidental world. Yamauchi, a scholar in the field of ancient Greek philosophy, has been critical of the logos-centric character the occidental philosophy.

Subject areas that cannot be solved by logos are many – such as emotions and the life problems one encounters in connection with other beings of the environment. The latter needs further reflection. By means of supplementary lemmata, the territory of the logos is expanded. Only when this step is taken, does the pure logos and the lemmata become traceable to dimensions for solving the manifold problems of life. Logos and lemma stand in equal correlation. Logos is mainly present in pure, abstract logic. On the other hand, lemmata emerge in the dimension of the experiences of the empirical lifeworld. Together, both lead to an unfolding, expanding logic, which is oriented to a logic of field (*basho*).

Influenced by Nishida’s logic of field, Watsuji has formulated the “logic of *fūdo*

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

(milieu”. This is a concretization of the logic of *lemmata*. At the time of the first publication of Heidegger’s “Being and, Watsuji was experiencing a foreign culture by staying in Germany. The *time* referred to is the flowing, the passing away. Its essence can only be grasped in the context of the *being* of concretely, spatially existing things. If one imagines a clock having *time*, it must be said that the clock is only a measuring instrument of time, not time itself. Even if all clocks in the world were vanishing, time itself remains. The latter is an abstraction that cannot be concretized without spatially existing things. Robert Reininger said about it: “Time separates. Space unites.” Watsuji’s “Logic of *fūdo*” deals with the concrete existence of a being and its environment. By means of climatic environment, specific location, and human society, the *fūdo* (milieu) is formed. From there, the cultivation of the living world of people begins, with the *fūdo*/milieux influencing people’s thinking and actions. Watsuji aimed at a further development of Nishida’s [logic of a metaphysical, ontological field] to that of the [place of concrete being] and its ontology.

Inspired by Watsuji, Berque’s logic concretizes the subject. Nāgārjuna’s tetralemma, Yamauchi’s theory of the correlation of [logos and Lemma], Watsuji’s logic of *fūdo*—each is related to the others, with Berque’s focus lying on the essential entity that is each being. This is directed to where the thing [A] itself can be called [non-A] by shifting the perspective and reflection of the thinking/observing subject. An unnameable truth, provisionally called [A] or [non-A], consists of two elements that are in a correlation when viewed from the origin of the one truth.

In my opinion, one of the best examples is to be found at the beginning of Laozi’s *Tao Te Ching* (dao de jing).⁸ “The truth of the *tao* cannot be determined. If one states it as *tao*, it is no longer *tao*,” says Laozi. If one determines *tao* to be “origin of a truth”, *tao* becomes tied down to human linguistic knowledge. Phonetically it reads as *tao* and statements about *tao* are possible, but at the same time, this definition remains distant from the essence of *tao*. A logician may evoke the principle of excluded middle: “Everything that contradicts *tertium non datur* is not logic. Laozi’s Taoism is also no exception.” Even if the latter will omit Laozi’s *tao* in favor of logic, the essence of the *tao* does not dissolve. Taoism envelops *both*, that which can be explained by logos (the philosophy of the Occident) and also that which it cannot explain. Taking this position, we may say that statements and behavior that belittle and criticize *tao* make up only part of *tao*. Concerning this dimension of the nature of truth, Berque draws attention to how a state can be determined as being both A as well as non-A. From this basis he unfolds his mesology as the “logic of the admitted third” *yōchū-risu* 容中律.⁹

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

Berque adds as a factor of *fūdo* a Buddhist term, *sesetsu* 施設, an institution in society surrounded by climate and a place of human life that connects these entities. *Sesetsu* aims at communal life. In *Sesetsu* a concrete place/*basho* unfolds to the being and to the responsibilities of people for the consummation of their life practice. If Laozi's *tao* has a unique ontology, Berque's *sesetsu* is a concretization of *tao* in which the human community is surrounded by climate and milieu / *fūdo* is vividly presented. When two people [A] and [B] meet, a relation rather than opposition arises: human life as *inter-being in an intra-relationship* / *aidagara* 間柄). Berque takes up the logic of intra-relationship /*aidagara* from Watsuji and focuses it on a causal truth that underlies [A and B (non-A)]. The origin of this relation cannot be determined categorically. It is a reason without (an empirically or scientific-positivistically provable) reason.

In the theology of Christianity God would be present as an absolute. In the sciences, whatever may be experienced and proven by the scientific method would become grounds for truth. Berque advocates a basis for truth that can be proven neither by empiricism nor by scientific positivism: an Asian way of thinking.

In Buddhism, such a basis for unbounded truth is denoted by dharma, in Zen Buddhism by an unrestricted openness, “*mu*” or the “true emptiness,” an unrestricted openness of intuitive insight *prajñā* (真空般若, 般若叡智). These are terms that cannot be personified. Those who embody the dharma are buddhas and bodhisattvas; *dharmakaya*; the entity bearing Buddha-dharma does *not* denote an individual in Sanskrit.

This all-embracing primordial being cannot be limited by the "reason" behind any term. In the epistemology of Varela¹⁰ (which is influenced by Buddhism), we are presented with a manner of experiencing and knowing truth "open and free from any grounds" *mu-kitei-teki* 無基底の. Berque realizes that such an approach must also be expressed in everyday language. For example, the sentence “Hanako is sad,” has different contents depending on whether it is spoken from a third-person (an observer's) point of view or from Hanako's first-person point of view. Berque's Mesology brings together the essence of these meanings in a correlation wherein the “sadness of a certain person” from the point of view of the person experiencing sadness and an external observer are related are related to one another¹¹ and brought to the *middle*: an essential entity of the sought-after truth.

Eiji Hattori's Logic of the Included Middle (包中律)

Eiji Hattori is an intellectual with a great deal of knowledge based on his long-term

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

leadership of various UNESCO projects. His logic of the including middle resulted from a reflection during a conference in Locarno in 1993 when Nikoresk – a Romanian physicist – spoke about the necessity of reforming the logic regarding the phenomena of elementary particles.¹²

As known in particle physics, an elementary particle cannot be understood as a closed frame of reference like a body in classical physics. As a particle, it is discrete, and as a wave in a continuum it is simultaneous. If a particle is observed at a particular moment, its state as discrete is affected by the influence of the measuring instrument. The possibility of transitioning to a wave is present at every moment of measurement; whether the object of observation actually manifests as a (discrete) particle or as a wave (a continuum), the two states of A and non-A are always concurrent. With regard to this phenomenon, one cannot introduce the principle of excluded middle / *tertium non datur*. Regarding this elementary phenomenon of micro-objects, Hattori has developed a “logic for enclosing [A and non-A]”.¹³ It reminds us that Nishida introduced his term of “place/*basho* 場所” as “something that encloses beings”(包むもの).

Thinking in terms of the *enclosing of the things* comes with continual practice: by following a certain leitmotiv, different things are led to a unity. It is crucial that *basho*/place can enclose objects having opposite meanings. Even if [A] and [non-A] compete with each other, this place does not serve to enable a struggle for survival between [A] and [non-A]. Even though the two are in an irreconcilable, competitive relationship, their competition is grounded in a dimension that makes their existence possible. This basis includes the environment of both the histories of [A] and [non-A] along with their different criteria of judgment. The logic of the included middle focuses on clarifying, cultivating, and developing this basis as a common ground for the existence of irreconcilable opposites.

Different stories and the resulting criteria must, after all, have common ground. Therefore, crossing one’s own story with that of the other is oriented towards finding and inhabiting a transversal territory as an extensive common ground. Concerning dialogue between cultures, this step towards transversality¹⁴ is relevant: one ought to cross / transcend the conventional border of one’s own thinking. The goal is to find and create a co-existential dimension of [A and non-A] for a renewal of cultures for the good of humanity. The leitmotif in this case is *transcultural universality*.

Based on the above, Hattori’s logic points to an extension of the *place to enclose and develop*, accompanied by the practice of intellectual thought and action. This logic then

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

aims to valorize the singularity of a country’s own (historically developed) culture by looking at it and reflecting on its developments from the “field of the whole global world.” With this aim, we may cooperate to build co-existential ethics at the levels of cultural diplomacy, among others.

In this logic, the singularity of each culture is highly valued. This logic never aim at the development of a political-ideological superstructure to unify the philosophy of the whole world. On the contrary, its goal is the coexistence of different singularities: one is united with others in a harmonious work, but at the same time, one does not merely allow oneself to be grouped with others – as we find in the Lun-yu 論語 of Confucius. Accompanied by this spirit, the logic of the included middle becomes a perennial philosophical approach.

The Field of Between —The Field of Interaction (<間>の場 — 相互干渉の場)

I have been an exponent of this logic since 2006, beginning from my interdisciplinary investigations into the double-slit experiment conceived by Niels Bohr¹⁵.

Bohr’s experiment is set up in the following manner: One quantum after another is emitted repeatedly in the direction of a divider with one slit. Behind the divider, there is another with two slits which can be opened and closed. Behind the second divider is a screen, the destination of the emitted quanta, upon which the impact of the quanta are shown, displaying whether they have been received as discrete particles (points) or as a wave continuum. The final destination of each quanta is unknown until it finally strikes the target (the screen treated with a photosensitive agent). One can predict the result by probability calculation. However, this prediction is not always valid because each trial is heavily influenced by the experimental setup and the exact method employed.

In The Field of Between, I state the following principle: The result – a whether the emitted light quantum appears as a particle or a wave arises from the zone of *between*¹⁶, between the incoming light quantum and the target. From the point of view of physics, it is clear that the result is nothing other than a chemical interaction between the incoming light quantum and the light sensitive screen; the result is conditioned by the interaction of physical matter, no more and no less. There are, however, different ways of thinking in physics, philosophy, and in the interdisciplinary field between the two. Based on the latter, we can consider the topos of physical and chemical interaction from the viewpoint of philosophy. The impact of the incoming light quantum is a point on the

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

target; the quantum is registered at the point of impact instantaneously (accompanied by a click). In physics, the focus is exclusively directed at the object of observation, and all other reflections must be omitted.

However, in *philosophy*, we reflect in a different manner. Suppose we determine the double-slit experiment to be the object of our reflection. In this case, we consider the following factors to be a complete unity: 1. the [irradiating light particle], 2. the [detector], 3. the [topos of the interaction of 1 and 2]. The act of our apprehension occurs in the actuality of the topos, namely the physical-chemical interaction between the emitted quanta and the detector. Our active consciousness shifts to the tripartite topos described above. This does not mean we arbitrarily insert and project subjectivist interpretation onto the objective micro-phenomenon. On the contrary, interdisciplinary philosophy is capable of truly apprehending the given experiment, understanding what it is and how it works. The thus-being of physics in the consciousness of the observer is reflected. In contrast to physics, interdisciplinary philosophy makes the following the subject of reflection: the content of this thinking in the consciousness of our self.¹⁷

In physics, consciousness itself or the thinking of the our consciousness is not the subject of its theme. However, in philosophy, steps [1. the topos of the interaction of the incoming particles and the detector] and [2. consciousness itself, which apprehends step 1, mutually lead their interaction]. As a result, philosophical understanding develops, which is characterized by a critical reflection on the reflection itself. Our consciousness has the ability to access a subject that interests us. Here arises *the field of between* between matter and our consciousness. In this field of between, we interact with the object, and a realization unfolds from this interaction.

Let us now look at another example from our empirically visible mezzo-world. Nishida, referring to the phenomenon of the prism, asked: the light going through the prism splits into seven different colors. Did these colors exist in nature a priori? Or are the colors created by the prism? Nishida answers this question himself:¹⁸ ”The seven a priori colors in nature were brought out mediated by the experiment a posteriori.” From the viewpoint of the field of between, we may say: regarding the topos of a beam of light, a prism is inserted. From the field of between, i.e., the zone between the light and the prism, their interaction gives rise to the seven colors.

Starting from the appearance of the micro- and mezzo-worlds, let us consider a

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

phenomenon of the macro-world: tidal dynamics. This phenomenon arises from the interaction of the gravitation of the Moon and the Earth. Centrifugal force acts on the surface of the Earth due to rotation. As part of the Earth rotates to face the Moon, the gravitational force of the latter pulls up the sea water: high tide. On the other side, where the interaction of the Moon's gravity and the Earth's centrifugal force does not take place, the sea water level recedes: low tide. The overall volume of seawater remains the same. Considering this via the principle of the field of between, we may state the following: Tidal dynamics results from the field of between, from the interaction of the two following factors: 1. The [interaction of gravity and the centrifugal force of the rotating Earth] and 2. the [gravity of the Moon].¹⁹

In where is the thinking consciousness of ourselves? It places itself in both factors, encloses both and brings them to an integrated conclusion. The mark of philosophical reflection consists in the factors of 1. [Earth], 2. [Moon], 3. [consciousness of ourselves]. It clearly discerns and considers all the above factors in their relationship as a topos. *The essential feature of philosophy lies in the 3rd factor, namely the content of the thinking consciousness of ourselves, which determines the central relevant subject.* In the field of physics, on the other hand, the content of thinking is determined by the first two factors (the relation of the gravitational forces of the Earth and the Moon as objective terms in mathematical equations. Nishida called this manner of thinking a “logic of objectification” (*taishō ronri* 対象論理).²⁰

The scope of my terminology, [The Field of Between] – the field of inter-action, extends further than the subjects of the natural sciences mentioned before. The merit of philosophy is its ability assist sciences such as psychology, political science, physics, via a reflection from a comprehensive point of view, considering the former fields in the context of wide-reaching concepts such as *thinking of our humanity*, thus integrating the sciences into a system of human thought. Furthermore, if we focus on the interaction of the various science disciplines, the field of between serves to promote dialogue between, for instance, physics and philosophy.

Apart from scientific research, we may empirically consider the living world, which is relevant to everyone. The field of encountering self and others, dialogue, and communication, shape the field of between. The failure of dialogue, the isolation of self from others, the cessation of a relationship or of common interest between people or institutions. All this is a consequence when the field of between decays towards the negative.

The main characteristic of this logic lies in the correlation of the following three

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

factors:

a) the [thinking consciousness of ourselves], b) the [other as an object of reflection], c) the [surrounding world and co-being] (Cf. the 3 factors in the chapter “Logic of Nishida)

These factors mutually form a topos (*ba* 場): the topos of thinking and producing cognition. The thinking subject a) engages in clear thinking by maintaining a rich natural abundance of sensations and feelings. If the latter is ignored, the humanity of a human being degenerates to the level of a performance-oriented robot or artificial intelligence. In the case of the latter, increased performance is quantitatively calculable. The following factor is ignored: the experience of life. Living one’s own human life is independent of self-interest and competitive advantage. Human existence is different from that of a robot or an AI. Because we are driven to survive, human beings have another factor to consider: the lives of others. In this manner we enable a co-existence of self and others. – Compassion and empathy; the feeling that the misfortune of others is unbearable.

Conclusion

In the foregoing, I have mentioned the three basic elements of basho / place / field logic. 1. [I]: the first person singular pronoun; 2. [You]: the second person pronoun, needed to form the relation of I and you; 3. [It]—the things and people needed to build up the objective view. These three elements ultimately belong together in the field of philosophy.

If each element is determined and treated as the [object] separated from our being through an objective observation, a position in natural science arises.

The [Field of Between] is a philosophical logic that facilitates interdisciplinary interaction. At the same time, it transcends this framework and extends into the *logic of experiencing life*.

In our global world, digital networking is highly developed and widespread. Advances in information technology are utilized in advertising tactics. However, the goal is determining which consumers may be made into objects of maximum profit as well as determining which marketing techniques achieve the widest reach. The interest of consumers is directed toward satisfying their desires and cravings to the maximum extent possible by utilizing media as the carriers of a concentrated mass of information.

In globalization progresses in this direction, reflection on one’s co-existence with the

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

environment and with others is often ignored. In contrast to this, the extension and further development of Hattori’s [Logic of Included Middle] is indispensable. Berque’s Mesology is equally essential. Resulting from a one-sided perspective of marketing and commercialization, the co-existence of oneself, others, and the environment is made almost impossible.

What role can the field of between play in this case? Our clear consciousness shifts *between* utilitarian greed and the *objects* that satisfy it. Accompanied by this insight, we determine the future course of our thinking and acting. Our thinking-acting self looks attentively at this field of life in the topos of the correlation between [I – You – Other], and [Environment]. It carries forward our life as a part of the Earth, accompanied by an encompassing view of the system of the global world as a whole.

Endnote

¹ Albert Menne, *Modallogik und Mehrwertigkeit*, Hildesheim 1988: Olms

² Nishida’s terminology “field/*basho*” first appeared in: “*Basho* 場所”, in: Nishida, *Complete Works*, vol. 4, p. 215ff. Tokyo 1965: Iwanami

³ Nishida, 善の研究 (An Inquiry into the Good), in: *Complete Works*, vol. 1, Tokyo 1965

⁴ Nishida, *Complete Works* vol. 1, p. 9

⁵ The pure experience is not merely sensual nor empirical but a “pure” experience, in which the experiencer experiences the good of the whole and is granted the given truth. There has been no thematization or preference for subjectivism, objectivism, sensuality, or empiricism.

Agreeing with Varela, Maturana took the following position: “Even a cognitive scientist or epistemologist accomplishes his thesis by activating his cognition with regard to himself as a subject: a kind of cognitive-scientific subjectivity.” (emphasis Hashi), in: Maturana, *Kognitive Strategie*, in: *Erkennen: Die Organisation und Verkörperung von Wirklichkeit*, Braunschweig / Wiesbaden 1982, p. 309

⁶ Ueda, Shizuteru. In explanations of “pure experience” in the talks, he emphasized “opening to an unrestricted truth”(無限の場所への開け). In it, the opening consciousness of a bodily self and the truth opening itself are situated in one field (*basho*).

Recently, there has been a movement to narrow down place of Nishida’s philosophy to its connection with the historical phenomenon of World War II, during which Nishida, in his twilight years, merged selflessly under the regime with the militaristic fascism of the Japanese state. The text “The Problems of Japanese Culture”/「日本文化の問題」 contains in some places the slogans

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
 In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
 Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

commonplace in all of Japanese society during that period. At the same time, one has to reflect on whether Nishida’s works since his creative middle period (ending in the last half of the 1920s) should not be categorically condemned as a whole as a product of philosophers, intellectuals and the state regime during wartime while a protest of any kind against the state politic was under the militaristic regime absolutely impossible.

⁷ Augustin Berque, Tetralemma and mesology – focusing on Yamauchi Tokuryû’s *Logos and lemma* – 四句と風土. 環世界学– 山内得立著『ロゴスとレンマ』を中心に–, written in 2020 and dedicated to the “Verein für Komparative Philosophie und Interdisziplinäre Bildung /KoPhil”, Vienna

⁸ Laozi, *Tao Te Ching* (daodejing), chap. 1, 老子道德経, in: Ogawa, Ramaki (Ed.) 『老子・莊子』, Tokyo 1978: Chūō kōronsha

⁹ Eiji Hattori 『地球倫理への旅路—力の文明から命の文明へ』 (Toward the Global Ethics – from the civilization of force to the civilization of life), p. 260, 2020: University of Hokkaido Press

¹⁰ Haruhide Shiba 「仏教思想と認知科学」 Cognitive Science von Varela und psycho-physische Philosophie im Buddhismus - Zur Phänomenologie der Erfahrungen, in: H. Hashi (Ed.), *Denkdisziplinen von Ost und West. Interdisziplinäre Philosophie in einer globalen Welt*, Nordhausen 2015: Bautz. H. R. Maturana, F. J. Varela, *The Tree of Knowledge. The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*, 1998.

¹¹ See note 7

¹² Eiji Hattori, *ibidem*, 2020, p. 47

¹³ Eiji Hattori, *ibidem*, p. 47, 259, 260

¹⁴ See 13, *ibidem*, p. 43-45

¹⁵ Herbert Pietschmann, *Quantenmechanik verstehen*, p. 62, Berlin 2003: Springer.

Hisaki Hashi, 「矛盾と向きあう現代の自然科学」 Coping with Contradictions in the Contemporary Natural Sciences, chap. 2.1. in: *The Bulletin of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*, vol. 15, Tokyo 2020: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

¹⁶ Hashi, “The Field of Between: A Concept of Truth for Interdisciplinary Epistemology”, in: Hashi Hisaki, Józef Niznik (Eds.), *What is Truth? In Philosophy and in Different Scientific Disciplines*, Vienna 2011: Polish Academy of Sciences

¹⁷ Nishida thinks in his “Logic of Field” that the activity of our consciousness is shown in reflecting given things clearly *as they is*; i.e., it receives and reflects the being and the thought to be as they is. The field / basho is that which enables this activity and encloses given things and thoughts in itself. See Nishida, Complete Edition vol. 4, “basho”.

¹⁸ Nishida, *Complete Works*, vol. 11, 「物理の世界」, The World of Physics p. 62

¹⁹ Hashi, “The Field of Between”, See note 16

H. Hashi, „The Field of Between – Toward a Logic for a Global World”
In: *The Bulletin (Annals) of The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics*
Vol. 17, pp. 37-44, Tokyo, Nov. 2022: The Japan Society for Global System and Ethics

²⁰ Nishida, *Complete Works*, vol. 11 (1965), p. 416; vol. 12, p. 289