

# 道場



創刊期

二零零九年十月

道家場有學會出版

Published by The Society for Daoist Field-Being

# 道場創刊期目錄

## 編輯的話

道家場有學會出版《道場》

湯偉俠 頁3

## 名譽會長致辭

創刊辭

湯偉奇 頁4

## 唐力權專欄

場有回憶錄(1)——從回港說起

唐力權 頁5

## 會員談心

場有哲學與道家的非實體思想  
道學偶遇

林漢標 頁12  
張惠蘭 頁13

## 學者專訪

李仕澂教授談當今的太極圖  
專訪韓星教授  
專訪詩麗亞·格勞普博士  
專訪劉連朋教授

謝永昌 頁14  
林漢標 頁16  
陳曉平 頁20  
林漢標 頁25

## 活動資訊

第十一屆場有哲學研討會圓玄學院舉行  
道學茶敘逢周六於香港道教聯合會舉行

羅志強 頁30  
羅志強 頁34

## 編輯委員會

顧問Advisor：唐力權 Tong Lik Kuen  
總編輯Chief Editor：湯偉俠 Tong Wai Hop  
副編輯Executive Editor：林漢標 Lam Hon Piu  
編輯委員Editors：李潤新Li Yan Sun 羅志強Lo Chi Keung

地址Address：九龍深水埗青山道156號永基商業大廈8樓  
8F, Wing Kee Commercial Building, 156 Castle Peak Road,  
Shamshuipo, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

電話Tel：(852)2396 4881 傳真Fax：(852)2391 2001

電郵Email：taofb@hktaoist.org.hk

網址Website：http://www.field-being.org

出版日期Date：二零零九年十月Oct 2009

出版Publisher：道家場有學會The Society for Daoist Field-Being



## 專訪詩麗亞·格勞普博士

陳曉平整理

**Dr. Graupe, You specialize in economics, while keeping a strong interest in philosophy and religion. Admittedly, these fields seem to be at least on the surface very different. What in your view are the connections between them?**

It is true that today most economists consider their subject to be independent from both philosophy and religion. This, however, has not always been the case. For example Adam Smith, the founder of economics as science, held a chair in moral philosophy at the University of Glasgow. The idea of economics as an independent science is actually quite a recent one. It only developed when in the late 18th century economists tried to emulate mechanics in order to turn economics into a science that resembles the physico-mathematical sciences in every aspect. The legacy of these economists has come to be our burden today. Let me try to put it this way: Over the last hundred years or so, economics has become identified with a certain way of looking at the world. It no longer has to do merely with a certain sphere of social life, namely the production and distribution of goods, but with a certain attitude: It demands us to consider everything under the aspect of utility and profit maximization. It wants us to compute the use both of things and our fellow men in order to gain control over them. Seen from this perspective, both the natural and social worlds appear as functioning like giant machines which people can design and manipulate at their will from an outside position. At the same time, however, everything inside this machinery appears to work according to the laws of causal necessity: human beings are reduced to mere cogs in the wheel that blindly react according to a given system of incentives. Over the past decades or so,

economists have elaborated this worldview in ever more minute detail, especially seeking to express it in very complex mathematical and statistical terms. At the same time, this worldview has become a basic fact of our everyday life as we have become more and more accustomed to considering everything from the viewpoint of utility. To my understanding, neither religion nor philosophy should try to reinforce this conviction. Rather, they should make us turn around so as to ask the all important question that remains hidden in the back of the economic worldview: why have we come to consider everything under the aspect of utility in the first place? Philosophy and religion are geared, as the Japanese philosopher Nishitani Keiji puts it, to assist us in breaking through both the economic worldview as well as the ordinary modes of being associated with it in order to overturn them from the ground up: Can we really predict and control the social world as economics tacitly assumes? How have we come to believe in the control of economic events, despite all the suffering caused by unpredicted economic crises? Can we truly act

as social engineers so as to manipulate life on our planet according to our own independent will? Can human behavior be computed at all? These are, very roughly speaking, the questions I want philosophy and religion to not only make us ask but also answer. As such, they are not to be seen as fields apart from economics but as ways of thinking that make us question the very foundations of the latter science itself.

**When did you first get in contact with Field-Being philosophy?**

**Why are you interested in it? What's the connection between Field-Being philosophy and Economics?**

I first met Professor Lik Kuen Tong in 2005 at a conference in Cologne, Germany. As you might know, Professor Tong has a background in economics as I do. So he introduced me to Field-Being philosophy while we were discussing economic issues. What fascinates me about Field-Being philosophy in general is that it does not only encourage us to view the world in entirely new ways but also helps us to understand what is wrong with our habitual worldviews on a very foundational level. This also holds true for economics in specific. Let me give an example: In most cases economics considers the individual as a given entity endowed with given preferences and an endless desire for more. In this way, it completely fails when it comes to asking why individuals have these desires and preferences, how they acquired them and, even more importantly, how they can act so as to change them. Indeed, it's a very static view of the human being, which leads to a very static conception of the economy. Over against this Field-Being philosophy can help us to better and more creatively deal with these questions. This is because from its perspective the attribution of thinghood or substantiality to economic agents comes to be seen through as the product of a profiling delusion, a mistaken identity brought about by the

lure of definiteness, control and craving. Conventionally we might think of an economic man as being ineluctably defined by his greedy and self-centered nature. As such, we are prone to see him primarily as an independent ego center, which only interacts with others if this promises to suit his own interests. Though Field-Being philosophy does not deny this worldview, it reveals it as a very superficial one. This is because it sees through each ego-centre as a surface phenomenon that in truth is in itself empty, devoid of self-nature. Economic man is, in its view, not primarily a substance or entity that controls experience but an enduring centre of activity that is itself tacitly shaped by experience. As consumer, manager or employee I am not what I think I am, but I am what I do. I do not control my activity but, right to the contrary, my activity shapes me. For example, I do not first exist and then start to trade with other people. Rather, I have become the economic agent that I am because of finding myself immersed in a field of interdependent economic activities. In the West, this insight is prone to be misunderstood as a kind of mere passivity: If I do not control my experience as economic agent, then a social nexus (the market for example) must have control over me. To my understanding, Field-Being philosophy can help us to avoid this extreme, which also is deeply rooted in substantialist thought. This is because it does neither treat individuals nor the field of interdependent activity as something given or fixed. Rather, it assures us that both we as economic agents and the field of economic activity move; there exists no prime-mover neither within nor without us. Thus, it encourages us to view the economy as a functional and relational world of both habitual and creative activity outside the scope of any mechanical laws economics so far has taken for granted: We can, and in fact do, change the course of the economy in creative, dynamic and unpredictable ways, if we work at changing ourselves – and vice versa.

**You have done much research in Japanese philosophy. Is there any connection between Japanese philosophy and Field-Being philosophy?**

In the case of Japanese philosophy, I am very much fascinated by Nishida Kitaro's "logic of field" (*basho no ronri* in Japanese). Actually, I used both this logic as well as Field-Being philosophy in order to rethink the process of economics from Asian perspectives in my book "The Basho of Economics: An Intercultural Analysis of the Process of Economics". Most tellingly, Nishida uses the same Chinese character for "field" as Field-Being philosophy does. (only that it is pronounced differently as "ba"). But the connection goes, of course, much deeper than mere words. In the parlance of modern Japanese philosophy, the term 'Ba' denotes a field of experience that underlies all conceptions of reality, while remaining itself conceptually ungraspable. It is the tacit or hidden experiential ground, which (Western) science as well as modern life always takes for granted but can never explore. As such, 'ba' denotes not something which we could ever control, but the ungraspable and unspeakable ground out of which all possibilities dynamically and interdependently arise. In "The Art of Appropriation" Professor Tong states a very similar idea: To him, the Field is also the source of all possibilities which makes room for all particularity – all particular roles or functions – and, hence, cannot be identified with any particular roles or functions. Both Nishida and Tong speak, in this connection, of Nothingness. Not in the sense of nothing to exist but in the sense of the ultimate activity as the articulate source and ground of all existence. Besides this similarity, I believe a connection to exist between Japanese philosophy and Field-Being philosophy on a more general plane. This is to say that both attempt to directly confront the powerful tacit assumptions of Western philosophy and science in order to break through their narrow substantialist and atomistic conceptional foundations. As such, they are a great help for us in the West to transform our own ways

of thinking within the scope of intercultural and cross-cultural dialogue.

**You pointed out that in the teaching of Economics, Buddhism should also be introduced to students apart from the factual economic knowledge in your paper "Which Freedom? Re-orientating Economic Education in the Light of Asian Traditions of Non-Substantialist Thought". Will other forms of non-substantialist philosophies like Daoism or Field-Being philosophy also be helpful to students in learning Economics? Why?**

To be honest, I didn't really want to say that Buddhism should be introduced to students APART from factual economic knowledge. My point was, rather, that Buddhist teachings should not introduce new and independent subject matters to economic education but should, rather, intimate new means and meanings of virtuosity within the economic tradition. This is to say that they are not to teach something new about Buddhism, as if we could effect factual change simply on the basis of new prescriptions and set perspectives taken from outside economics, but to teach with these traditions how to revise economics' deeply ingrained patterns of understanding, as well as the worldviews and attitudes associated with them. Said differently, I am not so much interested in introducing new content to economic education through Buddhism but, rather, in teaching with its help entirely new ways of knowing, of criticizing, of raising awareness. It is to encourage students to do what they to, i.e. economics, most proper, right and appropriate to itself; to do economics not only in a reflective but also self-reflective way that carries knowledge far beyond the limits economics has set to it over the last two centuries. I think it is precisely this goal that Buddhism shares in common with Dao-Learning as practiced both by Daoism and Field-Being philosophy.

詩麗亞·格勞普博士，您專門研究經濟學，但對哲學與宗教又有濃厚的興趣。表面看來，經濟學與宗教及哲學似乎十分不同。您認為它們有甚麼關連嗎？

今天有許多經濟學者的確認為經濟學是獨立於哲學與宗教的，但這並非事實。像把經濟學視為科學的始祖亞當·史密夫〔Adam Smith〕，便在格拉斯哥大學開了一個道德哲學的講座。事實上，把經濟學視為獨立科學是近世紀才有的想法。這種想法起源於十八世紀末，經濟學家試圖模擬力學，將經濟學轉化為各方面均與物理數學相似的科學。這些經濟學家遺留下來的東西卻成了我們今天的包袱。讓我嘗試以另一種方式來說明。過去數百年來，經濟學已被等同為一種特定的觀察世界的方式，再不只屬於特定的社會生活範疇，即貨品的生產與分配，而屬於一種特定的態度：經濟學要求我們從功利及利潤最大化的角度去思考一切事物，要求我們去計算事物的應用及人與人之間的關係，藉以控制他們。從這方面來看，自然與社會世界就像是巨型機器般運行，人可以從一個外在的位置依照自己的意願去設計及操控。與此同時，機器中的所有事物卻依照因果的必然規律而運作：人類被化約為輪子中的輪齒，根據特定的意向系統盲目地反應。過去幾個世紀，經濟學家將這種世界觀進一步延伸至更細微的範疇，更特別通過十分複雜的數學與統計學去表達它。同時，這種世界觀亦隨着我們越來越習慣於從功利的角度去思考一切事物而變成我們日常生活的基本事實。我的理解是，無論是宗教還是哲學都不應該鞏固這種信念，而應該幫助我們去反思，提出經濟世界觀背後隱藏的重要問題：我們是怎樣開始從功利的角度去思考一切事物的？正如日本哲學家西谷啟治指出，哲學與宗教是幫助我們打破經濟世界觀及與之相輔的一般存在模式，從基礎而上推翻之，即：我們是否真如經濟學不言自明的假設般，可以預測與控制社會世界？我們如何可以在遭遇許多不可預知的經濟危機的情況下仍相信能控制經濟活動？我們是否真如社會工程師，可以根據自己獨有的意願而操控地球上的生命？人類的行為是否完全可以計算？粗略地說，這些都是我希望哲學與宗教能令我們去思考甚至是回答的問題。因此，哲學與宗教並非

與經濟學互不相干的範疇，而是一種讓我們對經濟學的科學基礎提出質疑的思考方式。

請問您何時開始接觸場有哲學？為甚麼您會對場有哲學感到興趣？場有哲學與經濟學之間有甚麼關連嗎？

二零零五年，我在德國科隆舉行的會議上第一次遇見唐力權教授。你可能知道，唐教授和我一樣有經濟學的背景，當我們討論經濟議題的時候，他向我介紹場有哲學。總體來說，場有哲學吸引我的地方是其不單止鼓勵我們從全新的角度去看世界，而且從根本上幫助我們明白我們習慣性的世界觀有何誤差。這也適用於經濟學。舉例說，經濟學通常認為個人是一個實體，生而具有某些被賦予的喜好與永無止境地追求更多的慾望。當被問及個體為何會有這些慾望與喜好，它們是如何獲得的，更重要的是，我們如何可以以行為去改變它們的時候，這種思想便會完全失去效用。事實上，這是人類十分滯固的觀念，由此帶來十分滯固的經濟概念。相比之下，場有哲學可以幫助我們更好及更有創造性地處理這些問題，因為從場有哲學的觀點來看，賦予經濟主體以「物自性」〔thinghood〕或「實體性」〔substantiality〕被視為是一種在確定性、控制性、與欲執的誘惑下所產生的「身份錯置」〔mistaken identity〕，一種「形象幻覺」〔profiling delusion〕的產物。我們可能習慣上認為經濟人是必然地為其貪婪與自我中心的特質所界定的，因此我們傾向將他們視為基本上各自獨立的自我中心，只因符合自己的利益才與其他人交往。場有哲學雖然不否定這種世界觀，但視之為十分膚淺的看法。因為場有哲學視各個自我中心僅為表面現象，其本身是空無自性的。在它看來，經濟人基本上不是控制經驗的物質或實體，而是一個持續的活動中心，默默地受經驗所塑造。作為消費者，經理或僱員，我並非我所想的，而是我所做的我。我不控制我的活動，相反地，我的活動塑造我。舉例來說，我並非先存而後與其他入開始貿易，而是，因為我發現自己身處於一個互相倚賴的經濟活動的場域，才因此成為一個經濟主體。西方世界傾向於誤解此種想法為一種純粹的被動：如果我不像經濟主體般控制我的經驗，則社會連鎖〔social nexus〕（例



如市場)一定會控制我。我認為場有哲學可以幫助我們避開此種深深地植根於實體論思想的極端，因其不把個體或互相倚賴的活動場域視為是被賦予的或固定的東西，而是肯定作為經濟主體，我們與經濟活動的場域都在運動，我們之中或之外沒有原動者。因此，場有哲學鼓勵我們把經濟視為一個功能性及關連性的世界，一個在經濟學認為理所當然的機械定律之外的習慣性及創造性活動的組合。如果我們努力改變自己，我們可以，事實上也正如此，以創造性、能動性及不可預測的方式改變經濟的進程。

您對日本哲學進行了不少研究，可否告訴我們，日本哲學與場有哲學有關連嗎？

對於日本哲學，我非常崇拜西田幾多郎提出的「場域邏輯」。我在著作《經濟學的場域：一個經濟學進程的跨文化分析》（“The Basho of Economics: An Intercultural Analysis of the Process of Economics.”）中引用了此邏輯及場有哲學去從亞洲的觀點去反思經濟學進程。最顯著的是西田幾多郎與場有哲學採用相同的中文字去指涉「場」或「場域」（只是前者讀音不同，讀「巴」「ba」）。兩者之關連當然不止於用詞。按照當代日本哲學的說法，「ba」指構成所有真實概念的經驗之場，一個隱藏的、被默認的、不能為概念所掌握的經驗始基。這個經驗的始基雖為（西方）科學與現代生活經常視為當然卻永遠不能探索。換言之，「ba」所指的並非我們能控制的東西，而是一個不能掌握、不可言傳、卻由此動態地及相互倚賴地萌生所有可能性的元始之場。在《化裁的藝術》（“The Art of Appropriation”）中，唐教授提出一個非常相似的構想：在他看來，〔元始〕場域〔the Field〕也是所有可能性的源頭，為所有的特質—所有特定的角色或功能—提供存有的空間，因此並不同於任何特別的角色或功能。在這關連上，西田幾多郎與唐力權教授都是說無。這種無並非指沒有東西存在，而是指為一切存有的連接的源頭和根基的終極活動〔the ultimate activity〕。此外，我相信日本哲學與場有哲學在大體的建構上亦有相似之處。因兩者都試圖直接面對西方哲學與科學強而有力、明而不宣的假設，藉以打破其狹窄的實體

主義與原子論的概念基礎，能幫助我們的西方世界在不同文化之間與跨文化的對話中轉變思考的方式。

在您的論文「何種自由？依據亞洲傳統的非實體思想重新定立經濟教育的方向」中，您指出在經濟學的教學中，除了現實的經濟知識外，也應該向學生介紹佛家思想。除了佛家思想，其他非實體的哲學如道家思想或場有哲學對學習經濟學有否幫助呢？為甚麼？

坦白說，我的真正意思並非指除了現實的經濟知識外，也應該向學生介紹佛家思想。我想說的是，在經濟學的教學中，佛家思想不應被當作一種新的及獨立的課題來學習，而應該在經濟的傳統中提示新的成就技藝的方法及意義。這並非說教師要教授有關佛家思想的新課題，好像單憑新的處方及建立於經濟學之外的觀點，便可以達到事實上的轉變；而是要在這些傳統中學習如何可以修正經濟學根深蒂固的理解模式，以及與之相輔的世界觀與態度。換句話說，我對於在經濟學的教學上引入佛家思想的新課題並沒有太大興趣，而是希望透過佛家思想可以在教學上幫助啟發新的認知、批判方法以及提高學生的關注，鼓勵學生做應該做的事，即對經濟學最適當、最正確及最適合的東西。學習經濟學不但要以反思而更要以自我反思的方式來幫助我們學習更多知識，俾能遠遠地超越於過去兩個世紀經濟學為自己設定的限制。我認為這正是佛家思想與道家思想及場有哲學提倡的「道學」〔Dao-learning〕所共有的目標。