



A common nature and a sound encounter The perennial value of the dialogical fundamentals

Giovanni Patriarca * – *Jocelyne T. Thomas* **

Modern secularized society - accusing its predecessors of a blind dogmatism - rejects any personal choice that goes *jenseits der Dinge* (beyond things)¹. The cultural mainstream seems to have generally accepted Wittgenstein's famous proposition², briefly expressed at the end of his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, in which he exposes a kind of condemnation to a pre-logical silence for all the inexplicable metaphysical issues³, reducing the ultimate significance of religious

* Giovanni Patriarca ha collaborato nel Master di Scienza e Fede dell'Ateneo Pontificio *Regina Apostolorum*. Giovanni Patriarca has collaborated in the Master of Science and Faith of the Pontifical Athenaeum *Regina Apostolorum*.

** Jocelyne T. Thomas è una ricercatrice indipendente. Jocelyne T. Thomas is an independent scholar.

¹ "In all theories of secularisation there is also the implicit assumption that, ultimately, science will free mankind from "superstition". Finally, the process of secularization is regarded as being irreversible, and, although many discussions of secularization focus on Christianity, it is also supposed to be global. But there is not religious decline, nor a "come back" of religion. Despite industrial revolutions, the advance of physics and technology, processes of urbanization, and more, religion never went away and is still there." W. HOFSTEE- A. VAN DER KOOIJ (ed.), *Religion Beyond its Private Role in Modern Society*, Brill, Leiden 2013 p. 2.

² "What we cannot speak about, we must pass over in silence." L. WITTGENSTEIN, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, (Trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness), Routledge, New York 1961, p. 151

³ "[...] he combined the thesis that only factual and logical uses of language are meaningful with the view that philosophical insights about ethics, aesthetics and the "mystical" lie outside the language, despite the fact that any attempt to state these insights will lead to non-

beliefs⁴ to a primitive “language-game”⁵, in an apparent confusion of magical practices, witchcraft and psychotic projections⁶. A global result is a conceited and ridiculous invasion of this *monocratic approach*⁷ into not only other domains⁸ but even in intimate decisions⁹.

sense.” D. G. STERN, *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1995, p. 8.

⁴ J. W. COOK, “Wittgenstein and Religious Beliefs”, *Philosophy*, vol. 63, n. 246 (October 1988), pp. 427-452.

⁵ D.Z. PHILLIPS, “Primitive Reactions and the Reactions of the Primitives”, *Religious Studies*, vol. 22, n. 2 (June 1986), pp. 165-180.

⁶ J.W. COOK, “Magic, Witchcraft and Science”, *Philosophical Investigations*, vol. 6, n. 1 (January 1983), pp. 2-36.

⁷ “As a consequence of globalization, modern societies are predominantly multicultural and consequently they are also multi-faith in which the state more and more intervenes to organize and regulate religion through diverse policies [...]. In every multicultural society, there are, almost invariably, many typically large diasporic communities that they held together less by the secular ties of citizenship than by a shared religious culture. However, with the creation of these ethnically complex and spatially diasporic communities, religions are also modified by the diverse processes of exclusion, accommodation or integration. In these transformations, the Internet plays a critical role for displaced communities that would otherwise exist without any formal or established religious leadership. Because labour migration typically involves the movement of young people, there has also been an expansion, with the facility of the Internet, of unorthodox, transient religion that is often referred to as “spirituality”. [...] The result has been a blossoming of post-istitutional, hybrid and post-orthodoxy religiosity.” B. S. Turner, *Religion and Modern Society. Citizenship, Secularization and the State*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011, p. VIII-IX.

⁸ “...una cultura e un pensiero unico tecnico-razionale e materialista e il suo distacco dalla cultura umanistica, che si sono sviluppati nel corso degli ultimi due secoli, ci impediscono di cogliere l'essenza, più metafisica e spirituale che fisica, della crisi in corso, perché è stata legittimata una cultura che afferma come unico principio di verità solo «ciò che si vede, si tocca e si misura». Infatti, se la realtà fisica è misurabile, quella spirituale ed emozionale non lo è, così il suo perimetro definitorio diventa opaco e non rilevante nelle decisioni; termini come etica, solidarietà, equità, rischiano di non essere più compresi dai giovani e purtroppo non solo da loro.” F. PEZZANI, *È tutta un'altra storia. Ritornare all'uomo e all'economia reale*, Itinerari Egea/UBE- Università Bocconi, Milano 2013, p. 15.

⁹ “In recent years, economists have invaded other intellectual disciplines and, in the dubious name of science, have employed staggeringly oversimplified assumptions in order to make sweeping and provocative conclusions about fields they know little about. This is a modern form of “economic imperialism” in the realm of intellect. Almost always, the bias of this economic imperialism has been quantitative and implicitly Benthamite, in which poetry and pushpin are reduced to a single-level, and which amply justifies the gibe of Oscar Wilde about cynics, that they (economists) know the price of everything and the value of nothing. The results of this economic imperialism have been particularly ludicrous in the fields of sex, the family and education.” M. ROTHBARD, “The Hermeneutical Invasion of Philosophy and Economics”, *Review of Austrian Economics*, n. 3 (1989), p. 45.

Throughout human history, there have been ages of instability and transition, which have anticipated paradigm shifts, or changes of perception in the entire spectrum of human relations. These times are coupled with a physiological sense of helplessness or decadence. At present we are able to witness the radical novelty of an epidemic structural crisis on a global scale which condemns one's sense of belonging to an indefinite and uncertain fate. Emerging symptoms include a deep *disaffection* with personal responsibility in a somewhat indifferent inurement to the world¹⁰, exemplified by a growing disconnection between individuals' values and their course of action¹¹. One's personal identity becomes either submissive or akin to that of a prisoner: Freedom itself appears to be a fictitious function and runs the risk of being confused with an irrational licence losing any internal orientation compass. The perpetual *flow of stimuli* in a context of technological opulence causes a sense of defeat thereby by affecting the formation of real ideas and concepts¹², obscuring the traditional channels of socialization and radically changing the collective identity.

This continuous adaptability naturally causes frustration and disaffection which in the long run results in *deconstruction of personality* and a preference for non-binding forms of instantaneous gratification. This paradigm is self-perpetuating and self-referential. It seems that the *freedom of thinking* has been drastically reduced – through a mechanism as subtle as subliminal – by a pathological massification, filling this insurmountable gap with a kind of materialistic narcosis¹³,

¹⁰ G. Patriarca, "I paradigmi dell'incertezza e l'appropriazione indebita del mondo. Una riflessione sull'indifferenza", www.zenit.org, 14 December 2013.

¹¹ Cfr. T. DeLuca, *The Two Faces of Political Apathy*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia PA 1995.

¹² "Finally the fundamental, most cherished of a culture will also constitute a criterion in the choice of technology. Technology, I said, can transform human society. This social transformation will involve changes not only in our ways and patterns of living, but also in our values. But human beings will have to decide whether the (new) values spewed out by technology are the kinds of values we need and we want to cherish. Technology emerges in, and is fashioned by, a culture; thus, right from the outset, technology is driven or directed by human purposes, values and goals. Technology was made by man, and not man for technology. This means that human beings should be the center of the focus of the technological enterprise." K. Gyekye, "Technology and Culture in Developing Countries", in R. Fellows (ed.), *Philosophy and Technology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1995, p. 140.

¹³ Cfr. G. Marcel, *Man Against Mass Society*, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago 1962.

which unnaturally removes the subsequent application of the fundamental virtues such as prudence, temperance and mildness¹⁴. A permanent indifference destroys the realization of any serious endeavour and prefers all kinds of disengaged futile satisfaction nourishing an epidemic “*culture of waste*.”¹⁵

A merely *bio-technical procedure* replaces any critical “spirit of consciousness” leading to a sort of nonsensical contingency¹⁶. This avoidance of concern is supported by an increasingly strengthened and revived political Darwinism. Faced with this omnipotent sense of fluidity, of immanent appeals, in which every thought beyond the material assumes the value of an empty tautology or an insignificant representation, the individual seems to have no choice but to find satisfaction in his basic techno-needs. The new *Prometheus*, amazed and astonished, fails to control his products and thinks that he can reduce the world to an easy instrument of his absolute power:

Technological minds see nature as an insensate order, as a cold body of facts, as a mere given, as an object of utility, as raw material to be hammered into useful shape; it views the cosmos similarly as a mere space into which objects can be thrown with complete indifference¹⁷.

¹⁴ “è emersa la conferma di quanto sia urgente una veritiera educazione alla comprensione dell’altro, guidati dalla bellezza della scoperta e dalla stella polare della prudenza, alla luce della costante preoccupazione di promuovere una cultura dell’incontro fondata sull’umiltà, la mitezza e la pazienza.” Z. GROCHOLEWSKI, “Mitezza e pazienza”, *L’Osservatore Romano*, n. 19- CLV, 25 January 2015 p. 7.

¹⁵ “This “culture of waste” tends to become a common mentality that infects everyone. Human life, the person, are no longer seen as a primary value to be respected and safeguarded, especially if they are poor or disabled, if they are not yet useful — like the unborn child — or are no longer of any use — like the elderly person. This culture of waste has also made us insensitive to wasting and throwing out excess foodstuffs, which is especially condemnable when, in every part of the world, unfortunately, many people and families suffer hunger and malnutrition. There was a time when our grandparents were very careful not to throw away any leftover food. Consumerism has induced us to be accustomed to excess and to the daily waste of food, whose value, which goes far beyond mere financial parameters, we are no longer able to judge correctly.” POPE FRANCIS, *General Audience*, 5 June 2013 www.vatican.va.

¹⁶ Cfr. V. POSSENTI, *La Rivoluzione Biopolitica. La fatale alleanza tra materialismo e tecnica*, Lindau, Torino 2013.

¹⁷ R. GUARDINI, *The Essential Guardini. An Anthology*, Liturgy Training Publications, Chicago IL, 1997, p. 17.

We prefer to be “narcotized” rather than be actively engaged, even at the risk of selling our souls for a few cents in return for a fictitious, sudden and momentary pleasure. The choice of disenchantment, however, testifies to a mental laziness, that shows the need for redemption and idealism which characterizes human action¹⁸ and differentiates humans from all the other living-beings¹⁹.

These flagrant contradictions have appeared, especially in the fields of social sciences, through the reconsideration of the holistic approach of Aristotelian tradition²⁰ – common starting-point in the evolution of Jewish, Christian and Islamic philosophy²¹ – according to which purely technical measures and instruments, albeit important, cannot substitute an integral approach to the so-called *human development*²² whose primary and unifying factor apparently is the *human dignity* in a “productive” interdependence²³ with anthropological and

¹⁸ “The particular form that an individual human action takes is determined by factors that include those making up the specific environmental conditions as well as those that have shaped the character and values of the actor. The conception of sciences of human action recognizes that the form of action, as it unfolds in its historical reality, is the result of influences that range from the physiological to the religious, the social to the geographical.” I. M. KIRZNER, *The Economic Point of View. An Essay in the History of Economic Thought*, Sheed & Ward, Kansas City 1960, p. 149.

¹⁹ Cfr. H. PLESSNER, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Bd. V: *Macht und menschliche Natur*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1981, pp. 135-234.

²⁰ See H. KASSIM, *Aristotle and Aristotelianism in Medieval Muslim, Jewish and Christian Philosophy*, Austin & Winfield, Bethesda MD 1999.

²¹ “Since Judaism, Christianity and Islam are all practical religions, with concern for the goals of the human life in this world and in the next, and for the function of political organization, ethical and political speculation formed an important part of medieval philosophical thought. [...] Again we find some common ground: thinkers within the three traditions found it possible to adopt such notions as Aristotle’s theory of the moral and intellectual virtues, the Stoic account of law, and the neoplatonic doctrine of the ascent of the soul.” A. Hyman- J. J. Walsh- T. Williams (Ed.) *Philosophy in the Middle Ages. The Christian, Islamic and Jewish Tradition*, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis 2010, p. XIII.

²² “Human Capital, even taking into account only matters of economic significance, is a concept of broad moral range. In recent years, in fact, the most interesting developments in the field of economics have come with the new attention paid to moral factors in economic progress. For some generations, so long as traditional Jewish and Christian moral values held sway in the West, such moral factors could operate as silent partners in economic analysis, being everywhere taken for granted. Their current absence has brought to consciousness their earlier unappreciated presence, as economists have rediscovered with a vengeance the moral dimension of human capital in both cultural and personal contexts.” M. NOVAK, “Economics as Humanism”, *First Things*, October 1997 www.firstthings.com.

²³ Cfr. M. C. NUSSBAUM, *Creating Capabilities: the Human Development Approach*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA 2011.

religious elements²⁴. The real personal fulfilment can be only achieved through the freedom to express the natural quest towards the *Absolute* and transcendence²⁵.

Contemporary relativism²⁶ – “recognizing nothing as definitive”²⁷ – links contradictorily any criterion or judgement only to an egoistic and utilitarian final choice with a significant risk of manipulation through external sources²⁸. If everything can be – in general terms –

²⁴ Cfr. G. PATRIARCA, “Oltre l’apatia. La riscoperta di un’identità culturale”, *Angelicum*, Vol. 90/2013, F. 1, p. 129-164.

²⁵ “La consapevolezza della natura inter-personale della persona si accompagna alla constatazione del limite individuale, dell’illusione dell’indipendenza e dell’autosufficienza, della scoperta della condizione di inter-dipendenza che lega ciascuna persona e ciascuna cultura e che orienta alla pratica della cooperazione e della solidarietà. La persona, inoltre, viene intesa nella pluralità delle dimensioni che la costituiscono (corporea, cognitiva, effettiva, sociale, etica, spirituale, religiosa) e chiede il riconoscimento di tali dimensioni, secondo la prospettiva di un’educazione integrale.” I. FIORIN, “Progetto educativo per una educazione al dialogo interculturale”, *Seminarium*, LIII-N.3-4/2014, pg. 137.

²⁶ See M. BAGHRAMIAN, *Relativism*, Routledge, New York 2004.

²⁷ BENEDICT XVI, *Address to the Participants to the Ecclesial Diocesan Convention of Rome*, 06 June 2005 www.vatican.va.

²⁸ “As we all know, the Church is deeply rooted in the world. It exists in the world and draws its members from the world. It derives from it a wealth of human culture. It shares its vicissitudes and promotes its prosperity. But we also know that the modern world is in the grip of change and upheaval. It is undergoing developments which are having a profound influence on its outward way of life and habits of thought. The great advances made in science, technology, and social life, and the various currents of philosophical and political thought pervading modern society, are greatly influencing men’s opinions and their spiritual and cultural pursuits. The Church itself is being engulfed and shaken by this tidal wave of change, for however much men may be committed to the Church, they are deeply affected by the climate of the world. They run the risk of becoming confused, bewildered and alarmed, and this is a state of affairs which strikes at the very roots of the Church. It drives many people to adopt the most outlandish views. They imagine that the Church should abdicate its proper role, and adopt an entirely new and unprecedented mode of existence. Modernism might be cited as an example. This is an error which is still making its appearance under various new guises, wholly inconsistent with any genuine religious expression. It is surely an attempt on the part of secular philosophies and secular trends to vitiate the true teaching and discipline of the Church of Christ. An effective remedy is needed if all these dangers, which are prevalent in many quarters, are to be obviated, and We believe that such a remedy is to be found in an increased self-awareness on the part of the Church. The Church must get a clearer idea of what it really is in the mind of Jesus Christ as recorded and preserved in Sacred Scripture and in Apostolic Tradition, and interpreted and explained by the tradition of the Church under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Provided we implore the aid of the Spirit and show Him a ready obedience, He will certainly never fail to redeem Christ’s promise: “But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you”. (27) The same could be said of the errors we see circulating within the Church itself and to which people are

accepted, the consequence could be a radical moving away from the *natural social norms*. This aspect is an essential contributor to the dismantling of interpersonal relationships and in the obscuration of the basic rules of coexistence.

This becomes evident with the continuous process of infantilization of adults, a clear product of a mass-media society²⁹ where caprice, extravagance and frivolity are considered the most important needs, worthy of being pursued at any cost. Without ideals and “happily” adrift, humanity lacks the highest stimuli and inspirations which, despite their fragile condition, are opposed to a blind pride and, in the long run, to an unsuccessful *self-appropriation (Selbstaneignung)*³⁰ that is inclined to a “*a purely subjective faith whose only interest is a certain experience or a set of ideas and bits of information which are meant to console and enlighten, but which ultimately keep one imprisoned in his or her own thoughts and feelings*”³¹.

The *question of meaning* has lost its inner value being condemned to the level of a trivial philosophy or literature. Especially in the *search of meaning*, which in itself is undoubtedly difficult and demanding, the individual transcends himself and refers beyond himself³². The deprivation of such an effort, which is the basis of human nature, has the depreciable effect of a darkening of reason³³. At this point, the fundamental principles of logic are of inestimable help to avoid presumptuous and conceited pre-judgments and prejudices:

Every material proposition has an intelligible alternative if our proposition can be accurately expressed. Logic thus becomes an instrument for showing us the number of hypotheses other than

exposed who have only a partial understanding of the Church and its mission, and who do not pay close enough attention to divine revelation and the Church’s Christ-given authority to teach.)” PAUL VI, Encyclical Letter *Ecclesiam suam*, n. 26-27, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 1964.

²⁹ See N. POSTMAN, *The Disappearance of the Childhood*, Vintage Books, New York 1994.

³⁰ Cfr E. BISER, *Keine Angst, glaube nur. Das Eugen-Biser-Lesebuch* (Eingeleitet und herausgegeben von M. Albus), Guetersoher Verlagshaus, Guetersloh, 2008, p. 52.

³¹ POPE FRANCIS, Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*, n. 94.

³² Cfr. E. CORETH, *Antropologia Filosofica*, Morcelliana, Brescia 1978, p. 176-178.

³³ G. PICTH, *Wahrheit, Vernunft und Verantwortung*, Philosophische Studien. Klett, Stuttgart 1969, p. 7.

those which are taken for granted. The way to make progress in any field of learning is not by resolving to free ourselves of dogmatic assumptions – such resolutions are vain – but by making clear to ourselves what are the various assumptions that are possible, and thus envisaging our position as one as a great number. This widens our sympathetic understanding and breaks the backbone of fanaticism. It makes us humble [...] ³⁴.

This passage is not only cognitive but emotional³⁵. It is a service offered to reason which becomes “formative”, opening itself to the outside and realizing the person in a “forming” and “revelatory” process³⁶. This “cre-activity” is a desire to improve oneself and has an extremely positive influence on the personal psychology, leading to a mature self-confidence in an “osmotic openness” as a characteristic evolution of being:

The cognitive organism is really not satisfied with the mere fact of knowledge. It needs more than this. We may say the same thing about the object that is known. Its nature is not complete in the intentional mode of existence which it shares with the subject of knowledge, but cries aloud to be absorbed whole and entire and in its proper objective mode of being. And so there is engendered in the cognitive subject a desire to possess the object and hold it as it is in itself. The aspiration thus created, tends to project the soul toward a union which will be real, and not merely intentional. The life of man and beast alike would end in indigence and fatuity unless it could pour itself out in desire. Nature, however, has provided against this need, by supplying us with appetites. Now, the law

³⁴ M. R. COHEN, *A Preface to Logic*, H. Holt and C., New York 1944 p. 187.

³⁵ “The self-foundation of formal logic must be supplemented by another dimension of investigation. The phenomenological treatment of logic has the function of clarifying its basic ideas, and also of providing its very elements by means of the descriptive analysis of such concepts as „judgement“ and „meaning“. The concepts of understanding, and hence all of the ideas used on the higher level of formal reasoning, are traced to their „origin“ in pre-predicative experience. This procedure is designated „genetic“, not in an empirical, factual, or historical sense, but in sense of the intentional reference of all ideas or principles to their „original“ evidences – in the last analysis, to the direct evidence of individuals.“ M. FARBER, *The Aims of Phenomenology. The Motives, Methods, and Impact of Husserl’s Thought*, Harper and Row, New York 1966 p. 28-29.

³⁶ L. PAREYSON, *Existence, Interpretation, Freedom*, Selected Writings edited by P.D. Burgio, Davies Group Publishers, Aurora- CO 2009, pg. 145.

of appetites is the law of love: and love, in turn, begets action. In this wise, then, by knowledge, love, and action, the cycle of conscious life is complete, and the powers of man and the animal are brought to perfect fruition.³⁷

The logical itinerary, within the essence of human nature³⁸ and within the framework of common sense³⁹, has a universal value and acceptance in each latitude albeit anthropological and religious differences. This statement expresses the fundamental need for a commitment against any form of superficial fatalism or reductionism. If we lose the temporal concept of our journey through history in the name of utopia of a new technocratic, materialistic and self-sufficient world⁴⁰, we repeat the same mistake made by the all-embracing ideologies of the last century, which responded with a deep hiatus and arrogance as if “human emancipation” had finally been accomplished. This visceral and searing desire to break away from human nature in order to construct a “new world”, as impersonal and as far from the ultimate meaning of life, is one of the main contributory causes of the current crisis of values with its devastating growing consequences.

This never-ending immanence, united to a still unclear emancipation, forces the individual to either face the dilemma of nonsense or surrender to the lure of nihilism. Though exposed to a purely terrestri-

³⁷ R. E. BRENNAN, *Thomistic Psychology. A Philosophical Analysis on the Nature of Man*, The MacMillan Company, New York 1967, p. 147-148.

³⁸ “La questione della legge naturale, e dei diritti naturali che da essa scaturiscono, come pure dei doveri essenziali dell’uomo, non è solo una lezione cattolica, ma è l’espressione delle inclinazioni innate dell’uomo verso la verità e il bene. In questo senso, essa costituisce la profonda sorgente dell’ispirazione e l’impulso di tutto l’agire umano. Appartenente alla struttura spirituale dell’uomo, essa è il *genio* moral, ovvero il primo e naturale *principio* di ispirazione. Pur non essendo una legge scritta, essa è però “iscritta” in modo da non poter essere cancellata, anzi è “scolpita nell’anima di ogni uomo” (Leone XIII) e come tale risponde alle sue sfide più profonde, precede qualsiasi legge positiva, determinando i diritti dell’uomo e gli imperativi etici che è doveroso onorare.” Z. GROCHOLEWSKI, *La legge naturale nella dottrina della Chiesa*, Consult Editrice, Roma 2008, p. 21.

³⁹ Cfr. A. LIVI, *Filosofia del senso comune. Logica della scienza e della fede*, Edizioni Ares, Milano 1990, p. 157-181.

⁴⁰ “We both [Muslims and Christians] share great concerns about the challenges of living a life of faith today, caused by contemporary culture of materialism and secularism.”, M. A. SHOMALI, *Mary, Jesus and Christianity: An Islamic Perspective*, Islamic Centre of England, London 2007, p. 18.

al eschatology⁴¹, we wait for a meta-historical event of messianic character to happen, thereby losing ourselves in a perceived resignation and renunciation. We have lost the value of a *radiant hope*⁴² that gives lifeblood and vigour to every project, mortifying the creative power of freedom⁴³ and drastically preventing the actual perception of the *Other*.

The anti-metaphysical a-priori paradox deprives and stifles the human experience setting itself as a self-sufficient paradigm – superior to any other form of critical analysis of reality – imposing itself as the only right to be defended⁴⁴. Any constructive effort for a personal discovery, however difficult and challenging, has been replaced by the *idolatry of the world* depriving the individual of any “relation of sense”, which is, as expressed by P. Barcelona,

⁴¹ “Once the truth of the hereafter had been rejected, it would then be a question of establishing the truth of the here and now. The critique of Heaven is transformed into the critique of earth, the critique of theology into the critique of politics. Progress towards the better, towards the definitively good world, no longer comes simply from science but from politics—from a scientifically conceived politics that recognizes the structure of history and society and thus points out the road towards revolution, towards all-encompassing change.” BENEDICT XVI, Encyclical Letter *Spe Salvi*, n. 20. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2007.

⁴² Cfr. G. MARCEL, *Homo Viator. Introduction to a Metaphysics of Hope*, Harper & Brothers, New York 1962.

“Paradójicamente, cuanto mayor conciencia tenga el hombre de la vida como confinamiento, más capacitado estará para experimentar el brote de la esperanza y “ver el brillo de esta luz, velada y misteriosa”, porqué la esperanza es misterio, no problema, y a través de ella, se alcanza la certeza que brota de la participación en el Ser con la totalidad de “mi ser”.”, F. BLAZQUEZ CARMONA, *La Filosofía de G. Marcel: de la Dialectica a la Invocación*, Ed. Encuentro, Madrid 1988, p. 223.

⁴³ Cfr. P. RICOEUR, “Une herméneutique philosophique de l’esperance”, *Lectures 3. Aux frontières de la philosophie*, Edition du Soleil, Paris 1994, p. 19-40.

⁴⁴ “The positivist approach to nature and reason, the positivist world view in general, is a most important dimension of human knowledge and capacity that we may in no way dispense with. But in and of itself it is not a sufficient culture corresponding to the full breadth of the human condition. Where positivist reason considers itself the only sufficient culture and banishes all other cultural realities to the status of subcultures, it diminishes man, indeed it threatens his humanity. I say this with Europe specifically in mind, where there are concerted efforts to recognize only positivism as a common culture and a common basis for law-making, reducing all the other insights and values of our culture to the level of subculture, with the result that Europe vis-à-vis other world cultures is left in a state of culturelessness and at the same time extremist and radical movements emerge to fill the vacuum”. BENEDICT XVI, *Address to the German Parliament in the Reichstag Building*, 22 September 2011, www.vatican.va.

[...] the emotional investment, the creation of desires and passions that allow the construction of ideal goals and objectives; it is a relation between the ego and the world of people and things. The “question of meaning” pushes away from ourselves in search of love and friendship, encourages people to know themselves and others, to learn, to think, to look beyond the surface of events⁴⁵.

On the contrary, only the superficial becomes the *thesis* and the *anti-thesis* of daily life and the only response to this appears to be silent immobility indulging in sensual and lascivious laziness⁴⁶ and radically ignoring the pains and the sufferance of the neighbours⁴⁷.

Such a psychological and existential condition degrades personal will and leads to a self-elected form of *acedia* that invalidates the sources of identity, any sense of meaning and fulfilment. Thomas Aquinas correlates this indolence with the three theological virtues, concluding that it can be defined as a radical opposition to charity, which is considered to be the “root and mother”⁴⁸ of the perfect virtues. According to the *Doctor Angelicus*, since charity has love for fundamental action and peace, harmony and respect as effects, the deplorable result of such an opposition is a sad decadence, an aversion to common sense⁴⁹.

Within this framework of uninterrupted flows of „pseudo-cultural“ impositions, an agglutinating sluggishness reduces the natu-

⁴⁵ P. BARCELLONA (2008), „Narrazione e Senso della Vita“, in P. BARCELLONA- T. GARUFI (eds.), *Il furto dell'anima. La narrazione post-umana*, Bari: Edizioni Dedalo, 57-58 (our translation).

⁴⁶ “El temor de perder las ideas es un signo mortal; no que las ideas se van a perder, es que se va a escapar de nuestro dominio la inteligencia, que no podemos tener ideas cuando queramos porque la inteligencia no quiera fijarse en los objetos. [...] Es también sintoma de la abulia o debilitación de la voluntad, porque en este padecimiento la vida retrograda, no pudiendo vencer la pereza, que le impide continuar asimilándose elementos nuevos para renovar la vida al compás del tiempo.” A. GANIVET, *Epistolario. Obras Completas*, 3rd Ed., Vol. 10, Victoriano Suarez, Madrid 1944 p. 26-27.

⁴⁷ “The personal dimension of rejection is inevitably accompanied by a social dimension, a culture of rejection which severs the deepest and most authentic human bonds, leading to the breakdown of society and spawning violence and death.” POPE FRANCIS, *Address to the Members of the Diplomatic Corps Accredited to the Holy See*, 12 January 2015 www.vatican.va.

⁴⁸ THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, IIa-IIae. 23.8.

⁴⁹ Cfr. R. KONYNDYK DE YOUNG, “Resistance to the Demands of Love: Aquinas on the Vice of Acedia” *Thomist*, 68:2 (April 2004) p. 173-204.

ral „stream of consciousness“ to a series of quick external constraints refusing any serious auto-critique in a pure self-referentiality. In response, there would be no other option except an all-encompassing meaninglessness, distant from a constructive sharing of duties and responsibilities⁵⁰: an *absurd and superfluous man*⁵¹ who prefers to “survive” in an ordinary mediocrity⁵².

It seems that we have described the prototype *par excellence* of the anti-charismatic man, indifferent to calls of conscience⁵³, hermetic⁵⁴, completely incapable of the *gift of self* and arrogant in his confused refusal of his own nature⁵⁵. Withdrawn from oneself and others, the modern anti-hero is a marionette in the hands of a monstrous and horrific Moloch that, with the masterly arts of ideological seduction,

⁵⁰ “The culture of comfort, which makes us think only of ourselves, makes us insensitive to the cries of other people, makes us live in soap bubbles which, however lovely, are insubstantial; they offer a fleeting and empty illusion which results in indifference to others; indeed, it even leads to the globalization of indifference. In this globalized world, we have fallen into globalized indifference. We have become used to the suffering of others: it doesn’t affect me; it doesn’t concern me; it’s none of my business!”, POPE FRANCIS, *Homily in Lampedusa*, 08 July 2013, www.vatican.va.

⁵¹ Cfr. G. PATRIARCA, “L’essere superfluo: l’origine antica di un male moderno” www.zenit.org, 28 October 2014.

⁵² “In a strange way mediocrity, which is accepted as a mass, some average mass mixed to the point that one cannot distinguish its components, is not endowed with a feeling of solidarity. It gives birth to schisms against its will. It requires such a simplification that it is impossible to achieve without cutting off one part after another, leaving variety and complexity, in which everyone should orient themselves according to their own discretion. In this way all the newer and newer cut-off – “erroneous” – parts are formed.” O. A. SEDAKOVA, *Freedom to Believe. Philosophical and Cultural Essays*, Associated University Presses, Cranbury-NJ 2010, p. 215.

⁵³ “Jews, Christians and Muslims are called upon to pursue justice no matter how remote the possibility of achieving it or overcoming injustice. Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel wrote “*Indifference to evil is more insidious than evil itself.*”, M.S. DAJANI DAUDI, *The Holy Books as Guiding Lights*, Wasatia Academic Institute, Jerusalem 2015, p. 5.

⁵⁴ “Un hombre hermetico, que no esta abierto de verdad a ninguna instancia superior”, J. ORTEGA Y GASSET, *La Rebellion de las Masas*, Prefacion, Clasicos Castalia, Madrid 1998, p. 119.

⁵⁵ “The prevailing moral code of the West was informed for centuries by the wisdom of our forefathers, but in the new vision developed by secular humanism that old code is no longer relevant. The biting challenge of Nietzsche still nags at us: If God is really dead, by what authority do we say any particular practice is prohibited or permitted? In the resulting moral disarray in our society, the most immediate of moral questions has become unsettled: How shall we raise our children? What kind of moral example should we set? What moral instruction should we convey?” M. NOVAK, “Remembering The Secular Age”, *First Things*, June-July 2007. www.firstthings.com.

reduces his liberty, or even his consciousness, to psychological tinsel, manipulable according to the most evaporable fashions. But even in a voluntary delegitimization of his own nature or in the moment of deepest depression, there is the possibility to reconstruct or retake the lost path because, as Martin Buber affirms:

Of course, in many cases, a man knows his strongest feeling only in the shape of a particular passion, of the “evil urge”, which seeks to lead him astray. Naturally, a man’s most powerful desire, in seeking satisfaction, rushes in the first instance at objects, which lie across his path. It is necessary, therefore, that the power of even this feeling, of even this impulse, be diverted from the casual to the essential, and from the relative to the absolute. Thus a man finds his way⁵⁶.

This path is a continuous effort to overcome one’s own limitations. It is also a constant renewal of the individual who becomes far-sighted, contemplative and ready to accept challenges and sacrifices and who is open to rediscovering the virtues and understanding the *Other* in a dialogical vision⁵⁷. In the passage that leads from the deconstruction to reconstruction, the individual moulds and forms his own “trajectory” without putting himself in antithesis and by also accepting his limits. Focusing a bit longer on this aspect, it becomes quite clear that when we perceive the *alterity*⁵⁸ in an interpersonal perspective, a service is offered to reason itself which becomes formative by maintaining contacts with the outside world and opening itself to other horizons⁵⁹. The individual realizes himself in a constructive way

⁵⁶ M. BUBER, *The Way of Man. According to the Teaching of Hasidism*, Routledge, London- New York 2002, p. 11.

⁵⁷ Cfr E. BACCARINI, “La persona come struttura dialogica”, *Dialeghetai. Rivista telematica di Filosofia*, 1-1999 (<http://mondodamani.org/dialeghetai/eb04.htm>).

⁵⁸ See E. LEVINAS, *Alterity and Transcendence*, Columbia University Press, New York 1999.

⁵⁹ “Ogni operazione umana è sempre formativa, e anche un’opera di pensiero e un’opera pratica richiedono l’esercizio della formatività. Un’azione virtuosa deve essere inventata come quella che è richiesta dalla legge morale in quella determinata circostanza e deve essere eseguita e realizzata con un movimento che insieme inventa il modo migliore per attuarla; nel porre e risolvere un problema, nel dedurre da un principio le conseguenze, nel condurre una dimostrazione, nel connettere ragionamenti in un complesso sistematico, bisogna compiere ed eseguire movimenti di pensiero e con atto d’invenzione scoprire quelli che la

projecting his vision beyond his own space in a shared sequence of receptivity and activity⁶⁰.

This process generates a substantial and fundamental bilateral contact with all its unpredictable yet fruitful variables and challenges. On the basis of such an encounter, there is the acceptance of a common belonging to the human nature in spite of its limits, contradictions or anthropological differentiations and distinctions. This “shared sense” is, first and foremost, a dialogical scattering of seeds of mutual comprehension on an arid and desolate field. If it were possible to use “human qualities” to define such an ample concept, the dialogue would be extroverted, friendly and congenial⁶¹. It does not mean to be completely or subliminally absorbed in the other’s sphere⁶² or accept an empty and false syncretism⁶³; it is rather in a gradual involvement, engagement and participation⁶⁴ that the ideas can be developed without the final and inappropriate option of self-destruction. It is *a return to the basics*⁶⁵ and a real openness to a comprehensive and empathetic

ragione richiede nel determinato caso, e formulare espressamente i pensieri.” L. PAREYSON, *Estetica. Teoria della Formatività*, Bompiani, Milano 2002 pg. 23.

⁶⁰ Cfr. P. CARAVETTA, “Form, Person and Inexhaustible Interpretation: Luigi Pareyson, Existence, Interpretation, Freedom”, *Parrhesia*, n. 12-2010, pg. 101.

⁶¹ Cfr. G. PATRIARCA, “Against Apathy: Reconstruction of a Cultural Identity”, *Journal of Markets & Morality* 16, no. 2 (Fall 2013), p. 543-568.

⁶² „Here the dialogical relationship is thus exemplified in its highest peak: because even on this height the essential difference between the partners persists unweakened, while even in such nearness the independence of man continues to be preserved.“ M. BUBER, *Meetings. Autobiographical Fragments*, (ed. By M. FRIEDMAN), Routledge, New York 2002, p. 66.

⁶³ “A facile syncretism would ultimately be a totalitarian gesture on the part of those who would ignore greater values of which they are not the masters. True openness involves remaining steadfast in one’s deepest convictions, clear and joyful in one’s own identity, while at the same time being “open to understanding those of the other party” and “knowing that dialogue can enrich each side”. [196] What is not helpful is a diplomatic openness which says “yes” to everything in order to avoid problems, for this would be a way of deceiving others and denying them the good which we have been given to share generously with others. Evangelization and interreligious dialogue, far from being opposed, mutually support and nourish one another.” POPE FRANCIS, Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*, n. 251.

⁶⁴ “Dialogue needs sincerity, esteem between the interlocutors, and, above all, a true understanding of the other.” Z. LOUASSINI, “The Only Possible Interlocutors”, *L’Osservatore Romano (English Edition)*, n. 5, 30 January 2015, p. 14.

⁶⁵ “One needs to pay attention to avoid falling into the snare of a facile syncretism which would ultimately be an empty harbinger of a valueless totalitarianism (*EG.*, nn. 251, 253). A soft and accommodating approach, “which says ‘yes’ to everything in order to avoid problems” (*EG.*, n. 251), ends up being “a way of deceiving others and denying them the good which we have been given to share generously with others” (*ibid.*). This invites us, first-

listening because – as Pope Francis clearly states – “*dialogue, thus, begins with encounter. The first knowledge of the other is born from it. Indeed, if one begins from the premise of the common affiliation in human nature, one can go beyond prejudices and fallacies and begin to understand the other according to a new perspective*”⁶⁶.

M. Buber has precisely underlined these important point in his writings:

In genuine dialogue the turning to the partner takes place in all truth, that is, it is a turning point of being. Every speaker “means” the partner or partners to whom he turns as this personal existence. To “mean” someone in this connection is at the same time to exercise that degree of making present which is possible to the speaker at that moment. The experiencing senses and the imagining of the real which complete the findings of the senses work together to make the other present as a whole and as a unique being, as the person that he is. But the speaker does not merely perceive the one who is present to him in this way; he receives him as his partner, and that means that he confirms this other being, so far as it is for him to confirm. The true turning of his person to the other includes this confirmation, this acceptance. Of course, such a confirmation does not mean approval; but no matter in what I am against the other; by accepting him as my partner in a genuine dialogue I have affirmed him as a *person*.⁶⁷

This possible “*meeting of the contraries*” should not be viewed as a clash or a failure of individual identities, but rather as personal growth, tending to gradually and visibly revitalize all the sensitive and intellectual aspects. Here an essential and clear communication, “purified” of any ambiguous excess of voluntary misinterpretation, is strictly necessary. It is an “interdisciplinary” approach open to psychological analysis and the “contemplative” acceptance of the other’s per-

ly, to return to the basics.” POPE FRANCIS, *Address to the Participants in the Meeting sponsored by the Pontifical Institute of Arabic and Islamic Studies on the 50th Anniversary of its Establishment in Rome*, 24 January 2015, www.vatican.va.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ M. BUBER, *The Knowledge of Man*, (ed. by M. FRIEDMAN), Harper and Row, New York 1965, p. 85.

spective. It is a renewed “way of trust” towards the inaccessible paths beaten by ignorance, prejudice and pride:

What we are called to respect in each person is first of all his life, his physical integrity, his dignity and the rights deriving from that dignity, his reputation, his property, his ethnic and cultural identity, his ideas and his political choices. We are therefore called to think, speak and write respectfully of the other, not only in his presence, but always and everywhere, avoiding unfair criticism or defamation.⁶⁸

The acceptance of our own nature is not only open to higher elaborated mental processes but it also understands that our existence is characterized not only by rights and particularly by obligations and duties in a structurally ethical perspective⁶⁹. This positive tendency can survive only in a context closely linked to respect and responsibility where the *moral traditions* are not delegitimized or seen with resentment and rancour, the fundamental human rights – like *religious freedom* – are protected⁷⁰, appreciated and admired as a peculiar richness⁷¹ in a framework of a general legal and interpersonal fecundity⁷².

⁶⁸ POPE FRANCIS, *Message for the End of Ramadan ('Id Al-Fitr)*, 10 July 2013, www.vatican.va.

⁶⁹ “Unsere Fähigkeit zur Verantwortung ist somit nicht etwas, das durch Philosophen, Politiker oder Geistliche quasi von außen in unser Leben hineingebracht würde, sie gehört vielmehr zum Grundbestand des Humanum. Wir verlieren uns selbst, wenn wir diesem Prinzip nicht zu folgen vermögen.“ J. GAUCK, *Freiheit. Ein Plädoyer*, Kösel Verlag, Munich 2012, pg. 36.

⁷⁰ “Reason recognizes in religious freedom a fundamental human right which reflects the highest human dignity, the ability to seek the truth and conform to it, and recognizes in it a condition which is indispensable to the ability to deploy all of one’s own potentiality. Religious freedom is not only that of private thought or worship. It is the liberty to live, both privately and publicly, according to the ethical principles resulting from found truth. This is a great challenge in the globalized world, where weak thought — which is like a disease — also lowers the general ethical level, and in the name of a false concept of tolerance, it ends in persecuting those who defend the truth about man and its ethical consequences. Legal systems, therefore, whether state or international, are called upon to recognize, guarantee and protect religious freedom, which is an intrinsic right inherent to human nature, to the dignity of being free, and is also a sign of a healthy democracy and one of the principal sources of the legitimacy of the State. Religious freedom, acknowledged in constitutions and laws and expressed in consistent conduct, promotes the development of relationships of mutual respect among the diverse Confessions and their healthy collaboration with the State and political society, without confusion of roles and without antagonism. In place of the global clash of values, it thus becomes possible to start from a nucleus of universally shared values, of global cooperation in

Such a dialogical man – open, patient and responsible – embodies an inner need for *higher instances* in a process, as mysterious as it is real, from which corporeality leads to the *Absolute*⁷³. This description gives us the opportunity for a brief comparative analysis of mystical experience in which – through silence, observation, meditation, contemplation and prayer⁷⁴ – a unitive complex of gradual passages is common to all the Abrahamic religions⁷⁵. Behind and beyond this

view of the common good.” POPE FRANCIS, *Address to the Participant in the Conference on “International Religious Freedom and the Global Clash of Values”*, 20 June 2014, www.vatican.va

⁷¹ “Interreligious dialogue is a necessary condition for peace in the world, and so it is a duty for Christians as well as other religious communities. This dialogue is in first place a conversation about human existence or simply, as the bishops of India have put it, a matter of “being open to them, sharing their joys and sorrows”. In this way we learn to accept others and their different ways of living, thinking and speaking. We can then join one another in taking up the duty of serving justice and peace, which should become a basic principle of all our exchanges. A dialogue which seeks social peace and justice is in itself, beyond all merely practical considerations, an ethical commitment which brings about a new social situation. Efforts made in dealing with a specific theme can become a process in which, by mutual listening, both parts can be purified and enriched. These efforts, therefore, can also express love for truth.” POPE FRANCIS, Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*, n. 250, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2013.

⁷² “Perhaps there has never been a greater need, since the most effective antidote to violence is teaching the discovery and acceptance of difference as richness and fruitfulness.” Pope Francis, *Address to the Participants in the Meeting sponsored by the Pontifical Institute of Arabic and Islamic Studies on the 50th Anniversary of its Establishment in Rome*, 24 January 2015, www.vatican.va.

⁷³ G. MARCEL, *The Mystery of Being. Faith and Reality*, The Harvill Press, London 1951.

⁷⁴ “The particular force of religious experience both by those who suffer and those who manage it, to derive from the power that caused it; the experience is conditioned by whatever causes the sufferer fear and trembling. The reason for the suffering is absolutely new for the sufferer at the moment of the experience. In a second step, the believer remembers the absolute novelty of his experience and, in this act of memory the intensity of the first experience is weakened. This process of weakening persists in act of commemoration. In this way, through ritual memorizing, the original experience becomes worship and theology. This is the characteristic way of managing experience that would otherwise be unbearable, and it is through this ritualized memories that a fantastical world emerges, making up the imagery of spirituality.” W. SCHMIDT-BIGGEMAN, *Philosophia Perennis. Historical Outlines in Western Spirituality in Ancient, Medieval and Early Modern Thought*, Springer, Dordrecht 2004, p. 6.

⁷⁵ “The very fact that Catholic, Sufi and Jewish mystics have apologized for experiences that they did not wish to experience, indicates that the experiences were real. Deification is not an overestimation but the actual phenomenon or experience of impersonal theistic unions. Indeed, it can not be otherwise. Impersonal theistic mysticism is invariably a conjunction of the senses of self and God.” D. MERKUR, *Mystical Moments and Unitive Thinking*, State University of New York Press, Albany 1999, p. 16.

“progression” into the human depths⁷⁶, is a *quest of truth* strictly connected to a *quest of love*⁷⁷ in a real and metaphysical journey towards the *Divine*⁷⁸. It is an exercise of extreme humbleness⁷⁹ as Rumi poetically expresses in his marvellous verses:

If you don't know Love, question the nights, ask of the pale cheek and dryness of the lips.

Just as the water relates about the stars and the moon, even so the physical forms relates about intellect and spirit.

From Love the soul learns a thousand manners of culture, such culture as cannot be found from schools.

Among hundred persons, the lover stands out as plain as the shining moon in heaven amid the stars.

The mind, though it be apprised of all the doctrines of the sects, knows nothing and is bewildered by the doctrine of Love⁸⁰.

This humble perception is an invitation to establish “laboratories of humanity”⁸¹ that can build – with the power of understanding, pa-

⁷⁶ “Hence, the „depth“ of ontology is horizontally realized through community and vertically actualized in relationship to God. The depth of being is realized in the creative capacity for becoming, which allows the individual to transcend and exceed previously self-determined parameters of being. Being belongs to spheres beyond self as actualized in present.” E. L. Nix, *Ernst Troeltsch and Comparative Theology*, P. Lang Publishing, New York 2010, p. 125.

⁷⁷ “Mystisches Denken und Mystische Wege aus verschiedenen Traditionen können Menschen dazu bewegen, in der Liebe als Lebensprinzip zu leben.“ A.C.B. Sihombing, *Mystik und Dialog der Religionen. Ein Vergleich mystisches Denkens im Protestantismus, im Sufismus, und in der Keбатinan und seine Bedeutung für die interreligiösen Dialog in Indonesien*, LIT-Verlag, Berlin 2012, p. 276.

⁷⁸ “Unter Liebe wird dabei gewöhnlich nicht die Liebe des Wohlwollens oder der Freundschaft verstanden, sondern die Dankbarkeit gegenüber Gott, der Gehorsam gegen Gottes Gesetze (*ta'a*) und die Resignation (*sabr*) gegenüber den göttlichen Anordnungen. Liebe heißt den Gehorsam umarmen.“ T. Ohm, *Die Liebe zu Gott in den nichtchristlichen Religionen*, E. Wewel Verlag, Freiburg 1950, p. 310.

⁷⁹ “In der Liebe liegt die höchste und tiefste Mystik, und es gibt eigentlich keine Mystik ohne Liebe. Mystik stellt in Bildern und Symbolen die Entstehung, den Fortgang und die Vollendung der Liebe dar [...]“ J. L. Ewald, *Briefe über die alte Mystik und den neuen Mysticismus*, F. A. Brokhaus, Leipzig 1822, p. XXI.

⁸⁰ Jalal-Al Din Rumi, *Mystical Poems of Rumi*, (translated by A.J. Arberry. Edited by E. Yashater), University of Chicago, Chicago 2008, Poem 28 p. 59-60.

⁸¹ Benedict XVI, *Address to the Participants in the World Congress for the Pastoral Care of International Students*, 2 December 2011 www.vatican.va

tience, forgiveness and enthusiasm⁸² – a shared identity of *love, hope and trust*. Miguel de Unamuno, in his philosophical masterpiece, defines this essential intrinsic necessity stating that “*hope in action is charity, and beauty in action is goodness*”⁸³ and adds that:

To love with the spirit is to pity, and he who pities most, loves most. Men aflame with a burning charity towards their neighbours are thus enkindled because they have touched the depth of their own misery, their own apparentiality, their own nothingness, and then, turning their newly opened eyes upon their fellows, they have seen that they also are miserable, apparential, condemned to nothingness, and they have pitied them and loved them.⁸⁴

Phenomenologically interpreted, this personal – as well as rational – engagement is a creative, meaningful, pro-positive and motivational “dragging” to the rediscovery of a common identity. This view goes beyond the natural limitations in an interpersonal proceeding, which does not confine the person in a paradoxical and contradictory “jail of irrationality”⁸⁵.

Summary: In a secularized society all metaphysical issues seem to be refused in name of a scientific approach that rejects any other interpretations of reality. Purely technical measures and instruments, albeit important, cannot substitute for an integral approach to the *human development*, whose primary and unifying factor is human dignity in a rich interdependence with anthropological and religious elements. In a context of intercultural and interreligious relations, a rediscovery of our common nature can be a first step towards a better mutual un-

⁸² “The dialogue we engage in must be anything but complaisant. The lack of trust permeating our Western Societies and the situation of religious conflict throughout the world mean that our task must be far-reaching, exacting and rigorous. First of all, dialogue must be based on mutual knowledge achieved by our seeking to make clear our shared convictions, values and hopes, while clearly defining and circumscribing our specificities our differences and what may even be our disagreements.” T. Ramadan, “Interreligious Dialogue from an Islamic Perspective”, in C. Timmermann & B. Segaert, *How to Conquer the Barriers to Intercultural Dialogue. Christianity, Islam and Judaism*, P. Lang, Brussels 2007, p. 95.

⁸³ M. De Unamuno, *The Tragic Sense of Life*, Collins- The Fontana Library, London-Glasgow 1962, pg. 202.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁸⁵ See R. De Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotions*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA, 1987.

derstanding and a sound encounter. On this basis, dialogue plays a fundamental role and it can be developed in the light of trust, shared values and responsibilities.

Key words: Philosophy and Sociology of Religion, Phenomenology, Existentialism, Interreligious Dialogue, Cultural Anthropology

Sommario: In una società secolarizzata ogni richiamo metafisico sembra essere rifiutato in nome di un approccio scientifico che rigetta qualsiasi altra interpretazione della realtà. L'uso di misure e strumentazioni puramente tecniche, sebbene importante, non può sostituirsi a un approccio integrale allo *sviluppo umano*, il cui fattore primario è la dignità umana in una proficua interdipendenza con elementi religiosi e antropologici. In un contesto di relazioni interculturali e interreligiose, la riscoperta della nostra comune natura può essere un primo passo verso una migliore comprensione reciproca e un incontro profondo. Su questa base, il dialogo è di estrema importanza e può svilupparsi alla luce della fiducia e nella condivisione di valori e responsabilità.

Parole chiave: filosofia e sociologia della religione, fenomenologia, esistenzialismo, dialogo interreligioso, antropologia culturale