

Beyond dualism — philosophy, religion, science

A divergence in Western philosophy occurs in early Greek philosophy (6th century B.C.) as Heraclitus asserts that things are in flux whereas Parmenides advances the argument that the universe is static. The latter argument seems to be confirmed by quantum physics: 20th century research in the field of physics establishes that the cosmos is static. Eastern epistemology affirms what to the Western mind appears to be a paradox: Phenomena in the external world exist in a state of flux, yet everything is one, and there is no difference between inside and outside. With attempts being made to transcend dualist thought in Christian theology and other religious tradition the third interdisciplinary *Ereignis* conference (June 10-11, 2023) seeks to investigate how science and religion have questioned the status of dualist thought, and how they have influenced the development of each other.



The conference will be held on-site at [Hotel Antares](#) in Gdynia, Poland, and on-line, on the Zoom videoconferencing platform, on June 10 and 11, 2023. Registration will be required.

Keynotes

- Dr. Jeremy Fernando, European Graduate School, Switzerland: “on translation & love”;
- Prof. Lucy Huskinson, Bangor University, UK: “Psychoanalysis and Architecture: mediating our connection to the material world”;
- Prof. Vivek Narayanan, George Mason University, USA: “Trapped Between History and the Transcendent”;
- Prof. Dr. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland: “Spacetime in Søren Kierkegaard’s Repetition”;

Sessions

Papers are timed to 20 minutes and followed by a Q&A with the audience. Each session is moderated. See the conference programme for details.

Organisers

This event is hosted by [Inscriptions](#) — a journal for contemporary thinking on art, philosophy and psycho-analysis, and [Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts](#).

Scholastic committee



- Dr. Demaine Solomons, University of Western Cape, South Africa;
- Prof. Dr. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland;
- Dr Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts.

Saturday 10 June: on-site in Gdynia, Poland

All times CET (Warsaw)

Time	Content
09h45	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Dr. Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts</p>
10h00	<p>Keynote</p> <p>Prof. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland: “Spacetime in Søren Kierkegaard’s Repetition”</p> <p>Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld.</p> 
11h00	<p>Session 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alberto Oya, Instituto de Filosofia da Nova (Universidade Nova de Lisboa), Portugal: “Neither Realism nor Idealism: José Ortega y Gasset on the Task of Philosophy” • Dr. Gorica Orsholits, European Graduate School, Switzerland, and Dr. Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts: “Beyond Dualism: Homo Generator, antagonism, agonism” <p>Moderator: Jørgen Veisland.</p>
12h00	<p>Break</p>
13h00	<p>Session 2: Student session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qingxuan Wang, CUHK-Shenzhen, China: “On translation and the ethics for/of the Other” • Lichen Yuan, Colby College, USA: “On Arendt and Agamben” <p>Moderator: Lucy Huskinson.</p>
14h00	<p>Keynote</p> <p>Prof. Lucy Huskinson, Bangor University, UK: “Psychoanalysis and Architecture: mediating our connection to the material world”</p> <p>Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld.</p> 
15h00	<p>Roundtable: Beyond Dualism</p> <p>To the extent that the relationship between physics and metaphysics is entering a new phase in philosophy (e.g., by introducing indeterminacy to physics) and in psychoanalysis (by reconsidering the effects the built environment may have on the mind) in the 21st century, how may this new relationship lead to a different and more constructive world view?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland. • Prof. Lucy Huskinson, Bangor University, UK. <p>Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld.</p>
15h45	<p>Day 1 ends</p>

Sunday 11 June: online on Zoom videoconferencing platform

Time	Content
10h45	Welcome
	Dr. Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts
11h00	Keynote
	Dr. Jeremy Fernando, European Graduate School, Switzerland: “on translation & love”
	Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld
	
12h00	Session 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Franco Manni, Philosophy Department of Liceo Scientifico Leonardo in Brescia (Italy): “Truth and opinion” • Gregorio Fracchia: “Aquinas’ ‘intensive’ esse as the basis for a Thomist Parmenidism”
	Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld
13h00	Break
14h00	Session 4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Antolínez: “The rejection of cognitivism and the risks of ethno-psychiatry: Bruno Latour’s non-dualist proposal for psychology”
	Moderator: TBA
15h00	Keynote
	Prof. Vivek Narayanan, George Mason University, USA: “Trapped Between History and the Transcendent”
	Moderator: Torgeir Fjeld
	
16h00	Concluding words
	Dr. Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts closes the conference.
14h15	Conference ends

Keynotes

Jeremy Fernando

on translation & love

Abstract. This talk meditates on the possibility that not only is love a fundamental aspect of translation — after all, what even compels one to do something like that, particularly in this day and age where such endeavours barely count in accounting ledgers, hardly register as productive, are often even frowned upon as indulgent — and that there is no love without translation (as all attempts to connect to another entail, or even are, moments of reading), but that translation — being the most sensitive of readings, in which one is opening oneself to the possibility of the text, the possibility of another — and love, whilst not quite the same thing, are potentially inseparable from each other.



Which also means that translation, even when done out of love, while attempting to have as much care for the text, for another, as possible, always also runs the risk of transforming the text: changing it in ways that might fundamentally alter it, for better or worse.

Where the translator is always also potentially a traitor.

Who (s)he betrays though — the text, herself, the other, their relation — that might be the question.

Though, as my dear friend Neil Murphy once told me, « reading literature with your head is always a mistake ». So, instead of attempting to rationalise a text — and by extension, reign it in, make it safe, tame it — perhaps all we can do is to open ourselves to a work. And listen. And hope that, as Berlin might sing — along with all the risks that it might just — « take my breath away ».

Dr. Jeremy Fernando reads, writes, and makes things. He is the general editor of *Delere Press*; curates the thematic magazine *One Imperative*; is the Jean Baudrillard Fellow at The European Graduate School; co-creator of the private dining experience, *People Table Tales*; and the writer-in-residence at *Appetite*, the sensorial laboratory exploring the cross-roads of food, music, and art.

Lucy Huskinson

Psychoanalysis and Architecture: mediating our connection to the material world



Abstract. The position of psychoanalytic theory in relation to dualistic thought is not clear cut. Freudian psychoanalysis demonstrates that the Cartesian two-world hypothesis which splits the human organism into a mind and body and ascribes to each a different mode of Being, is alien to our everyday experiences of living. According to Freud, life is a negotiation of causal relationships between body and mind, and it's often when we're frustrated in life that we experience this relationship most viscerally through psychosomatic complaints. Nevertheless, Freudian psychoanalysis is often so preoccupied with the workings of the mind that it sometimes seems to have forgotten about the body, and as I will argue, also the nonhuman environments we live and dwell in. For Freud, the places we inhabit are themselves psychologically uninteresting and wholly irrelevant to our mental or spiritual lives, even if we were to feel strong emotional attachments to them. If places are mentioned by Freud, they are treated arbitrarily as backdrops to dreams.

While psychoanalysis may seek to go beyond the Cartesian split of body and mind, it draws its own lines of division, splitting the mind into two-worlds of ego-conscious and unconscious, each with their own ways of Being and rules of behaviour. In this respect, Freud remained wedded to Cartesian dualism in his desire to provide a metapsychology or metaphysical framework for his *praxis*. The psychology of C.G. Jung could be similarly charged. However, Jung's extension of the unconscious world — from the merely personal unconscious proposed by Freud to a collective and autonomous unconscious that seeks purposely to bring humans into harmonious relationship with the cosmos at large — suggests greater scope for uniting body, mind, and the wider non-human environment.

This paper looks more closely at their models of the unconscious in relation to the non-human environment to begin to reconsider the significance of the built environment for their theories. I start with a discussion on the relevance of symbolic imagery more generally before assessing some of their architectural metaphors and self-disclosed personal experiences of architecture. I conclude that Jung's approach to the built environment is perhaps more defensive or closed off to the 'outside' world than one might ordinarily assume, while Freud's by contrast could be construed as more open to it, and probably more than he himself realized or was willing to accept.

Lucy Huskinson is a professor at Bangor University and an elected Fellow of the Learned Society of Wales, and Visiting Professor of Instituto de Filosofía, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Her research interests are principally in theories of philosophy and psychoanalysis and their application to cultural phenomena, especially to the built environment and architecture, and to the psychological motivations for religious belief and experience. Her recent monograph *Architecture and the Mimetic Self* was shortlisted for an international award. Her books have been translated into several languages.

Vivek Narayanan

Trapped Between History and the Transcendent

Abstract.

Vivek Narayanan is a Professor of Creative Writing at George Mason University, USA. His latest publication is *After*.



Jørgen Veisland

Spacetime in Søren Kierkegaard's *Repetition*

Abstract. In *The Order of Time* (2018) physicist Carlo Rovelli states that when we observe the microscopic state of things the difference between past and future disappears. Quantum mechanics has concluded that time consists of dots, grains, i.e. quants, meaning that time dissolves into spatial quantities that are discontinuous. Further, it is not possible to predict where an electron will appear tomorrow. A state of indeterminacy prevails in the cosmos, single entities are dispersed in a cloud of probability only. And finally, everything is interrelated. Electrons are concrete only in relation to the other physical objects they are interacting with.



These discoveries have profound implications for our examination of Kierkegaard's *Repetition* (1843). The grains, or dots, constitute exactly the points that make up Constantin Constantius' *Øieblik*, the moment or instant that emerges in a wink of the eye. We are dealing with a reversal of time into space. This occurs at unpredictable, indetermined intervals when objects, or subjects, interrelate with one another.

A doubling or mirroring is taking place here. We may trace this mirroring in F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* (1925) where Gatsby claims that you can repeat the past; in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Unconsoled* (1995) where the protagonist Ryder finds himself in a hotel room in a Central European city that is a duplicate of his bedroom in England; and in Laus Strandby Nielsen's book of poetry *Halvvejs gennem uendeligheden* (2021) where a poem records how time is tying knots in spring.

Professor Veisland will among other things discuss Chinese director Wang's Online Theater Manifesto. It is available for free on [this link](#).

Jørgen Steen Veisland is associate professor of Scandinavian, American and Comparative Literature at the University of Gdańsk, Poland, where he has been employed since 1992. Previous appointments include The University of California, Berkeley, and Fudan University, Shanghai. He is a member of The International Association for Scandinavian Studies and The International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism. He is the author of numerous articles on Scandinavian and American literature and of several books.

Abstracts

David Antolínez, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (Bogotá, Colombia): “The rejection of cognitivism and the risks of ethno-psychiatry: Bruno Latour’s non-dualist proposal for psychology” — Throughout his whole body of work, Bruno Latour made several comments and assessments of psychology as a modern sciences – most of them being highly condemnatory. In this paper I propose a transversal lecture of the Latourian corpus to provide a tryptic of the French philosopher’s conception of psychology. First, during an early period, Latour rejected cognitivism as an explanatory resource of scientific activity, since he advocated for socio-semitic descriptions of laboratories and specialized literature. In this period, Latour saw psychology as a handmaid of epistemology. Second, in the change of century, Latour stopped doing science and technology studies, to expand his philosophy to the domains of law, art, and religion. Within his philosophy of religion he worked closely with Tobie Nathan and his idiosyncratic clinical model of ethno-psychiatry. As a result of this collaboration, Latour proposed the concept of ‘modern factish’, a quasi-theological entity produced by the encounter between scientific settlements and non-western beliefs. Third, Latour advanced a general critique of social sciences, in which he includes psychology, for using categories such as ‘Society’ or ‘Culture’ to bypass the composition of the social fabric and to reductively explain human behavior. Despite never conducting a systematic research on psychology itself, this scientific discipline was within the scope of the French’s philosopher main project: to produce a symmetrical anthropology of the modes of existence of modernity. The three stages sketched are not entirely coherent, since they reveal changes of the Latourian philosophy and a somehow ambivalent relationship to several branches of psychology. However, the main thread common in those three moments is a marked discomfort with psychology for heavily relying in the modern dualisms (inner world/outside world, mind/body, nature/culture, object/subject, thing/sign, etc.) that Latour aimed to dismantle.

Gregorio Fracchia, IUSS Pavia-University of Turin: “Aquinas’ “intensive” esse as the basis for a Thomist Parmenidism” — My paper intends to address the solution offered to the problem of the One-Many relationship by Thomism. In particular, I will focus on the fourth way (quarta via), the so-called via ex gradibus, as the fundamental theoretical way to prove the existence of God. This way, as has been demonstrated by distinguished Thomists of the second half of the 20th century (especially Cornelio Fabro), hinges on the notion of participation, which allows St. Thomas to explain the relationship between creature and Creator in terms of the intimate presence of God as the first foundational act in the created entity. The real composition of essence and actus essendi in the created entity says at once the radical dependence of the finite on the Infinite and the absolute transcendence of God as esse subsistens in which pre-exist in eminent form all the perfections found in creatures. This Thomistic conception of the “intensive” esse is the true original discovery of St. Thomas, who not only combined in a superior synthesis the Platonic couple of participated and participant and the Aristotelian couple of power and act, but also definitively reorients the speculative framework of Neo-Platonism (Pseudo-Dionysius, *De causis*). In this sense, it is necessary to analyse the semantics of the relationship between finite entity and God from the point of view of the analogy of intrinsic attribution. Thomistic esse thus stands in direct continuity with the $\delta\upsilon$ of Parmenides without, however, sacrificing either the experience of becoming or multiplicity. On this, too, I propose to show with direct references to Parmenides’ poem (taking advantage of Mario Untersteiner’s studies) the validity of a ‘Thomistic Parmenidism’. St. Thomas can therefore be said to have satisfied the instance of Parmenides just as Heidegger hoped, without any concession to essentialism, which instead has “obscured” in later rationalisms the authentic conception of being as an emergent intensive act. By the way, Cornelio Fabro was among those who most studied the relationship between Heideggerian denunciation of the forgetfulness of being and the originality of St. Thomas’ system. I therefore want to argue that St. Thomas has indeed realised the foundation of the finite in the Infinite on which the main immanentist systems of modern and contemporary times have worked.

Franco Manni, Philosophy Department of Liceo Scientifico Leonardo in Brescia (Italy):

“Truth and opinion” — Plato thought that ideas and their relations (theories) were timeless and subsistent. Hegel was the philosopher who most powerfully sought to refute Plato: in the third part of the “Philosophy of the Absolute Spirit” he argues that philosophy is nothing but the history of philosophy. However, the Platonic idea is powerful and has had a greater following, at least up to the present time, than Hegel’s. Whereas “philosophy” is seen as the realm of absolute and immutable truth, “history” is seen as the realm of relative and mutable opinion. Influential and long-lived 20th century philosophies have argued and argued for this: I cite Bergson’s Spiritualism, the Existentialism of Sartre and Heidegger, Husserl’s Phenomenology, the Neopositivism of Carnap and Neurath, and the Analytic Philosophy of the later Wittgenstein, Ayer and countless others. I would like in this paper to dwell on this last philosophical school so widespread and powerful in the English-speaking world, under which the study of the History of Philosophy has been slowed down and sometimes blocked for decades in hundreds of philosophy departments across the World. Not everywhere, however. In my paper I would like to present how some Anglophone philosophers, the British R.G. Collingwood, and the Americans David D. Roberts and Claes Ryn, all three influenced by the thought of the neo-Hegelian philosopher Benedetto Croce, have discussed and pointed out how theory without history is empty and how history without theory is blind. They did so with particular acuity and depth, with particularly sophisticated arguments, because they found themselves speaking and writing in an intellectual environment strongly inclined to dualistically separate the two disciplines.

Dr. Gorica Orsholits and Dr. Torgeir Fjeld, European Graduate School, Switzerland, and Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts: “Beyond Dualism: Homo Generator, antagonism, agonism” — From Plato’s famous dualism of body and soul we are today confronted with a plethora of perspectives promising to overcome historical dichotomies, and putting in their place a promise of social unity and reconciliation. This paper takes a critical stance to the technological utopianism and its dystopian twin, so prevalent in today’s discussion on media and technology. What we suggest to bring to the table is a renewed attention to Wolfgang Schirmacher’s concept of Homo Generator, founded on a distinction between an instrumental, craft-oriented definition of technology, underpinning the dominant mode of contemporary approaches to technology, and what he calls life technologies. Nevertheless, what typifies his notion of life technologies to the greatest extent is this concept’s ability to overcome the sort of dualist thought characteristic of 19th century European modernism. In Schirmacher’s Homo Generator, the artist of life technologies, what we have is a vigorous, compelling attempt to ground a novel notion of a post-utopian order. Conversely, in Alain Badiou and Chantal Mouffe’s call for the return of the political there is an emphasis on the importance of antagonism/agonism which must not and cannot be eradicated or suppressed by any society/social order. The second aim of this paper is therefore to question whether Badiou’s call for political antagonism is in fact a call to overcome the historical principle of dualism. How does Badiou’s post-utopian subject employ the idea of antagonism in the in-between space of the virtual–real and the symbolic–actual? Chantal Mouffe posits that social antagonism transforms into agonism and that societal conflict is accepted as an inevitable constituent of society. However, is Mouffe’s agonistic model of public space an attempt to go beyond the dualistic configurations of the past century? And can the notions of antagonism/agonism give to technology the ontological importance necessary for the creation of a new world?

Alberto Oya, PhD, Instituto de Filosofia da Nova (Universidade Nova de Lisboa): “Neither Realism nor Idealism: José Ortega y Gasset on the Task of Philosophy” — The aim of this talk is to discuss Ortega’s conception of philosophy, formulated in his *El tema de nuestro tiempo* (1923) [The Theme of Our Time] and *¿Qué es Filosofía?* (1964) [What is Philosophy?], as the task of formulating an understanding of the world which, despite being a subjective reaction on the part of the concrete individual, is nonetheless evidentially grounded and aims to exalt the world “to the fullness of itself”. Ortega’s way of conceiving of Philosophy is linked to one of the main philosophical theses he defended, which is that

of conceiving “mi vida” (“my life”) as the most fundamental and primary fact. In this way, Ortega aimed to put an end to the philosophical controversy between realism and idealism. To the classic controversy between naive realism, which claims that the world is a reality subsistent in itself and so completely independent of the concrete subject, and idealism, which claims that the conscience, the thinking I, is the most primary reality, Ortega responded by arguing that the most primary and fundamental fact is neither the world nor the I, but the coexistence between the world and the I. According to Ortega, “mi vida” (and each one’s life) is the most fundamental ontological category, “the most radical way of being” (“el modo de ser más radical”). Everything I can relate to, be it theoretically or practically, is determined by the primary given fact of the coexistence between myself and the world. Besides, “mi vida” (and each one’s life) is not an abstraction but a concrete fact, consisting in my engaging with and relating to the world I coexist with. However, Ortega’s claim that the most fundamental ontological category is “mi vida” does not imply, according to him, that the reality of things, what they are, is exhausted by our relation to them. Philosophy constitutes the effort of attempting to discover what things are “por sí y no para mi vida” (“for themselves and not for my life”). It is to contemplate the things that are there in the world while attempting to conceive them abstractly, as they would be with independence of my (each one of us) subjective relation with them—it is the act of “putting things apart from me”. This exercise of ceasing to be interested in things is, Ortega argues, a giving oneself over to the whole world, and as such it constitutes an act of love, since it amounts to the effort made by the concrete individual to (virtually) deny himself with the sole purpose that things may become what they are independently of his concrete relation to them. According to Ortega, therefore, philosophizing is an act of love that requires the intellectual to conceive the world as an end in itself, with its own dignity and autonomy.

Qingxuan Wang, CUHK-Shenzhen, China: “On translation and the ethics for/of the Other” — Faced with the fact that there will always be certain kernels of culture in the other’s speech that remain as untranslatable and inexhaustible as the face of the Other, by formulating a coexisting structure based on the sheer asymmetry between the self as manipulator and the Other as being manipulated and distorted in translation, a new paradigm of care ethics emerges in this translative experience. Following the Levinasian insight into the face-to-face condition, Derrida concludes that the act of translation is not simply an equivalent reproduction of the source text, but a dynamic process of forgiving/being forgiven and a posture of response-responsibility towards the foreign Other. This paper attempts to show that translation (as well as interpretation), involves not only a discursive faithfulness, but also, prior to that, an ethical commitment to the original text as the Levinasian Other.

Lichen Yuan, Colby College, USA: “On Arendt and Agamben” —

Speakers

David Antolínez, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (Bogotá, Colombia): I am a psychologist from the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (Bogotá, Colombia) and Mg in human sciences from the Universidad de la República (Montevideo, Uruguay). My research interests include psychoanalysis, history of psychology, philosophy of science and science and technology studies. A list of my publications can be found at <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/David-Antolinez>.

Torgeir Fjeld is Head of the Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts, Publisher at Tankebanen forlag/utopos, and Editor-in-Chief of *Inscriptions*. He has taught at several world-class universities, including the University of Minnesota, Roehampton University, and the University of Gdańsk. Fjeld is the author of *Rock Philosophy*, *Perversion's Beyond*, *dressage and illusio*, and many articles on technology, presencing, and the event of salvation.

Gregorio Fracchia, IUSS Pavia-University of Turin: Born in 1996, I am a PhD student in philosophy at IUSS Pavia-University of Turin. My area of research is classical metaphysics: in particular, I deal with the relations between the Neo-Thomistic movement and Eleatism. Following the position of G. Bontadini, my interest is oriented towards the metaphysics of transcendence as a constructive mediation of experience (where the most rigorous notion of experience was given by idealism, and in particular by Italian 'pure' idealism).

Professor Lucy Huskinson (Bangor University) is an elected Fellow of the Learned Society of Wales, and Visiting Professor of Instituto de Filosofía, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Her research interests are principally in theories of philosophy and psychoanalysis and their application to cultural phenomena, especially to the built environment and architecture, and to the psychological motivations for religious belief and experience. Her recent monograph *Architecture and the Mimetic Self* was shortlisted for an international award. Her books have been translated into several languages.

Franco Manni, Philosophy Department of Liceo Scientifico Leonardo in Brescia (Italy): Since my youth, I have studied the humanities in various fields: history of philosophy, political philosophy, history, literary criticism (especially on Tolkien), theology, and modern-day cultural debates. I thought that studying various humanities fields and not just one was a strength and not a weakness. So in fact my teachers of philosophy had done: Aristotle, Benedetto Croce, Sigmund Freud, Karl Popper, and various others. I got my MA in Philosophy at Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa. I got my PhD in Philosophical Theology at King's College London. My fields of interest are Italian Political Philosophy, Thomistic and Neo-Thomistic philosophy, Literary criticism of JRR Tolkien's works, moral and political phenomenons and issues of today's world. I wrote three books, edited five, and wrote dozens of journal articles and book chapters.

Vivek Narayanan is a poet and professor at George Mason University, USA.

Dr. Gorica Orsholits is an independent multidisciplinary researcher, artist and musician. She studied at the University of Toronto and the European Graduate School from which she received a PhD. Her research interests are in poetry and poetics, literary theory, cultural studies, media, and continental philosophy.

Alberto Oya, PhD is a Research Fellow (Investigador Doutorado Contratado) at the IFIL-NOVA – Instituto de Filosofia da Nova (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal) and Senior Member (Membro Integrado) of ArgLab – Lisbon Mind, Cognition and Knowledge Research Group. Oya is the author of the monograph *Unamuno's Religious Fictionalism* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020). He has published about thirty papers in professional philosophical peer-reviewed journals, including such well-known international journals as *Metaphilosophy*, *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, *Sophia*, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* and *Teorema*.

Jørgen Steen Veisland is associate professor of Scandinavian, American and Comparative Literature at the University of Gdańsk, Poland, where he has been employed since 1992. Previous appointments include The University of California, Berkeley, and Fudan University, Shanghai. He is a member of The International Association for Scandinavian Studies and The International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism. He is the author of numerous articles on Scandinavian and American literature and of several books.

Qingxuan Wang is a senior undergraduate majoring in Translation Studies at CUHK-Shenzhen. He is interested in the role of translation/translating in the works of 20th century continental philosophers. He has presented papers on philosophy and linguistics at several university conferences in Hong Kong, mainland China, and the Netherlands.

Lichen Yuan attended United World College of the Adriatic for two years in Italy, traveled through the Balkans and central Europe, delighted to see the intersection of different cultures and have a strong passion in further investigate inside. My hobby is to create art with various of materials and techniques for self-expression and relaxation. I'm an incoming freshman in Colby College, Maine, United States this fall.

CfA: Beyond dualism — philosophy, religion, science: the third Ereignis Conference

June 10-11, 2023

Submission deadline: 1 May, 2023 (guidelines below).

A divergence in Western philosophy occurs in early Greek philosophy (6th century B.C.) as Heraclitus asserts that things are in flux whereas Parmenides advances the argument that the universe is static. The latter argument seems to be confirmed by quantum physics: 20th century research in the field of physics establishes that the cosmos is static.

Discoveries in the natural sciences and epistemology are bracketed by a general philosophical divergence between Eastern and Western intellectual trends. Eastern epistemology, e.g. Buddhist and Taoist thought, affirms what to the Western mind appears to be a paradox: Phenomena in the external world exist in a state of flux, yet everything is one, and there is no difference between inside and outside. By contrast, Western thought seems to be adamantly anchored in a dualism which manifests itself in and is corroborated by Christian theology and psychoanalytic theory and practice.

Attempts are made, however, to transcend the forcefully maintained dualism of body and soul. There are several examples of dualist and nondualist notions being contested in both Christian theology and other religious traditions. Among these we find Søren Kierkegaard, who resolved the dualism by stating that the synthesis of body and soul is spirit, and that the chasm between time and eternity is braced by the moment, an instant out of time which becomes a fragment of eternity. Further, Kierkegaard states that *being* corresponds to *becoming* and that the road of being towards the so-called fullness of time, *Tidens Fylde*, is arduous and reserved for those who embrace a faith which transcends reason.

While the issue of dualism transcends religion, it seems clear that science and religion have served each other well; they have indeed influenced the development of each other in areas such as our thinking about the mind-brain question and body-soul dualisms. Thus, dualism remains a topical issue, including, but not limited to, the interdisciplinary nature of neurophilosophy.

Several questions arise at this point:

- Is Kierkegaard's concept of faith an answer to the dilemma of dualism, the divided mind?
- Is Martin Heidegger's concept *Dasein* a path to full being in a sense which approximates Eastern epistemology?
- Is G.W.F. Hegel's dialectical resolution of the binary opposition the movement forward of the world, the end of history, a Utopian illusion or a genuine social and political settlement of pressing problems in our time?
- Does Sigmund Freud's work on *Eros* and *Thanatos* signal the end of dualism or a continuation of it?
- Is C.G. Jung's *archetype* a unifying psychic and cultural theory which comes close to Eastern thought?
- Is Jacques Derrida's concept of *Differance* an answer to the self-other dualism or a continuation of it?
- Do the Romantic poets, such as William Wordsworth and William Blake, participate in a dualistic view of nature and mind or do they transcend dualism?

- Do the modernist poets, e.g., T.S. Eliot, Wallace Stevens and William Carlos Williams create a poetry, a *poiesis* expressing a new unity of mind and nature?
- In what manner have science and religious thought influenced each other with regard to dualist and nondualist thought?

For this conference/special issue we welcome proposals that address any of these or other relevant questions.

Confirmed keynote speakers

- Prof. Paul Bowman, Cardiff University, UK: “Orientalist Physical Culture”;
- Prof. Lucy Huskinson, Bangor University, UK: “Psychoanalysis and Architecture: mediating our connection to the material world”;
- Prof. Vivek Narayanan, George Mason University, USA: Title: TBA;
- Prof. Dr. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland: “Spacetime in Søren Kierkegaard’s Repetition”;

Invitation

We invite papers from all traditions and schools of philosophy, as well as adjoining disciplines, to address any of the topics and questions above. Submissions should be structured, well-argued, and show evidence of rigorous scholarship. Include an abstracts (max. 300 words) and a short author bio (max. 50 words) along with the author’s or authors current affiliation and interest.

Send proposals/abstracts via e-mail by **May 1, 2023** to ereignis@tankebanen.no. We will return in early May with a notification on acceptance.

Hybrid format

The conference will be held on-site at [Hotel Antares](#) in Gdynia, Poland, on 10 June, 2023, and on-line on the Zoom videoconferencing platform on 11 June. [Get in touch](#) with the conference organisers for assistance in finding reasonable accommodation in the vicinity. Registration will be required.

Publishing opportunities

All presentations will be considered for publication in a special section of our peer-reviewed journal [Inscriptions](#).

Conference fee

- General attendance: €120 (standard fee);
- Reduced fee: €80 (students and the unwaged).

Organisers

This event is hosted by [Inscriptions](#) — a journal for contemporary thinking on art, philosophy and psycho-analysis, and Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts.

Scholastic committee

- Dr. Demaine Solomons, University of Western Cape, South Africa;
- Prof. Dr. Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdańsk, Poland;
- Dr Torgeir Fjeld, Ereignis Center for Philosophy and the Arts.

Deadlines

- Proposals/abstracts to be submitted via e-mail to ereignis@tankebanen.no by **May 1, 2023**;
- Notifications by May 10;
- Registration for the conference by June 1, 2023.

To learn more about our previous conferences visit our events page at <https://www.ereignis.no/events.php>.