Knowledge - Relativity - Truth - Wisdom



Murat Özgen Ayfer

(1989)

This article is an abridged free translation from Turkish.

Prior to attempting to examine the relativity of knowledge, it is of great use to agree on conceptual meanings of both the terms “knowledge” and “relativity”.

WHAT IS RELATIVITY?

The literal meaning of the term “relative” indicates a relation between two or more issues. Best substitutes are “related” and “associated”.

Synonyms of “relativity” can be given as “relationship” and “association”.

Once having mentioned these vocabulary substitutes, we can now trace the significance of relativity as a concept.

The word “relative” as an adjective refers to the one that is insufficient by itself, and can be defined only with something else connected to or in comparison to itself, in order to attain validity or be confirmed.

In other words, by mentioning anything as relative is to state that it cannot exist solely on its own but together with something else that is separate from or comprising itself.

Simply, “relativity” determines that something is relative in principle.

The term relative is contradictory to “absolute”.

If something is said to be absolute, this is to indicate that it is not bound to any condition, it is just complete and perfect by itself, definite and final without necessitating any relation or dependability whatsoever.

Stating in any issue that an event, an occurrence, a process, a matter, a thinking is definite and unalterable means placing a limit to eternity, and have already been reached entirety.

However, stating that the same is relative, means that it is yet incomplete and approximate with respect to the absolute.

In fact, the concepts of both “absolute” and its contrast as “relative” are defined and explained differently in diverse grounds (e.g. in mathematics, philosophy, theology, sociology, economics etc.). The definition and explanation we submitted so far applies in general to a scientific-logical-philosophical area.

WHAT IS KNOWLEDGE?

Of course, everyone knows what knowledge is but defining it may be a little complicated.

Research on the source, essence, quality and limit of knowledge caused appearance of numerous teachings.

Some of these asserted “impossibility of knowledge”, concerning divine matters in particular.

Whereas, those arguing that knowledge is possible have adopted the necessity of different methods and approaches on how to acquire it.

Our subject interest is not the properties of such teachings. Nevertheless, it can certainly be said that the majority of disagreements between such teachings emanate from the definition of the concept of “knowledge”. Therefore, the first thing to do is to agree on the meaning that we assign to this term.

If we first can reveal THE TYPE OF KNOWLEDGE to be discussed, we can then examine more easily whether this is relative or not.

By this means, we’re in fact leaving the arguments of the teachings that claim the impossibility of knowledge aside from the very beginning of our study. Because, if knowledge is impossible, then there is no point in examining whether it is relative or not.

Knowledge that exists or that is claimed to be possible can be classified into a number of different types.

In each of these, the concept and properties of knowledge have to be well-defined.

However, before moving on to what these types are, we can suggest a common definition that may be applicable to all.

This common definition can be made as KNOWLEDGE IS THE RELATION BETWEEN “THE KNOWING ONE” AND “THE ONE THAT IS KNOWN”.

If we try to resolve this definition through a logical rule of grammar, we can say that “the knowing one” here is the subject and “the one that is known” is the object.

For the purpose of simplicity, let’s use the terms “the knower” and “the known”.

As regards its character, object is passive. Thus the one that we refer to as “the known” is over there, it exists, it is real but doesn’t perform any activity in letting itself for being known; it is in a static stand-by situation for being known.

On the other hand, subject is active. Thus the one that we refer as “the knower” is in a state of continuous observation, watching, searching, and evaluation.

“The knower” and “the known” are in contrast with each other due to the former being in action and the latter just prospective. The inevitable relationship between these two emanates from being in opposition or conflict.

The status of being in opposition or conflict shouldn’t be regarded as negative. Occurrence of everything in the universe requires the development of a synthesis through a conflict between a thesis and its adversary, the antithesis. Each synthesis in turn being a new thesis looks forward to finding its antithesis; the outcome of this search appeals the law of improvement for everything in the universe.

If such a contraction between “the knower” and “the known” doesn’t exist, then knowledge shall not emerge. In such a case, the object referred to as “the known” shall remain all alone by itself in a state of awaiting to be known. This status is the drag of matter towards being “not known”, ultimately getting captivated as unknown.

On the other hand, being in lack of this contradictory status causes obstruction against the potential, i.e. the static power of “the knower” for getting in action. Therefore the subject that we refer to as “the knower” turns out to be a “one that cannot know” by useless observation and search.

There’s a relation between the unknown and the one that cannot know. However this relation is just hypothetical by not having a positivity and feasibility like the relation between “the knower” and “the known”, which is **knowledge**.

The name of this negative or unfeasible relation is IGNORANCE.

Now, let us return to the very start of this expression chaos that we attempted to put into a logical sequence…

From this viewpoint, the teachings claiming the impossibility of knowledge defend ignorance. Thus these teachings obstruct development in the evolutionary direction.

However, this process of obstruction or trend is against the universal law of nature. Evolution and improvement continued until our age and persists. The relation between “the knower” and “the known” is established perpetually without any loss of liveliness, re-formed as well as being re-established.

Knowledge increases in parallel to evolutionary development, and improvement in the line of evolution accelerates by the increase in knowledge.

“THE KNOWER” AND “THE KNOWN”

At this stage, in order to clarify the conceptual meaning of knowledge, we need to give an explanation regarding the subjects and objects that we refer to.

Some philosophers have defined knowledge as “the relation between the human being and his environment”. In accordance with this definition, “the knower” turns out to be the human being, and “the known” as the environment of human being.

In this approach of definition, there are two errors of limit.

If “the knower” is the human being, the environment of the human being, i.e. those perceivable by organs of sense are only a part of things that the human being can get in relation with for the purpose of knowing or acquiring the concerned information.

Whereas, the human being acquired knowledge throughout history on various things that can’t be perceived through sense organs. For this purpose, other things that were known are used as tools of obtaining knowledge. This action is being sustained.

Therefore, if “the knower” is the human being, the context of “the known” has to be much larger than the environment of the person concerned.

The second error in limit is considering the concept of “the knower” as the human being only. Some contemporary branches of science propound that in addition to just human beings and even living creatures, the non-living substance also perform an action for acquiring knowledge.

Nevertheless, when we extend the concept of “the knower” to other objects as well as the human being, we extremely complicate the discussion on our basic subject matter of interest. Consequently, we can state through a relative preconception that «As far as we’re concerned, “the knower” in the formation of knowledge is the human being». On the other hand, we can comfortably accept the whole nature and the equivalent or perspective of the concept of “the known”.

That nature as “the known” comprises in its core the human being, i.e. “the knower” as well.

Hence, in this study in which we unavoidably have defined knowledge of which we’re going to mention the types as “the relation between the human being and all nature”.

TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE

The initial type of knowledge is **“information by observation and practice”**. This type of knowledge depends only on senses, perceptions, natural observations and daily experiences.

For example, when a dry piece of wood is burned, it produces heat and smoke. This is knowledge that the human being acquires without need to using capability of thinking and not necessitating any experiment or evaluation.

By means of using the capability of thinking, carrying out certain experiments as well as making evaluations, the information by observation and practice converts itself to **“scientific information”**

For example, the burning process of a piece of wood is explained through certain chemical

and physical theories, having been connected to definite conditions. By this means, scientific information includes objective, methodical, general, definite and foreseen relations.

In spite of the fact that scientific information provides relationship of “the knower” and “the known” concerning facts of nature, a third type of knowledge surpasses these by establishing the relationship with the information by observation and practice, and collects all in a universal aggregate. This is **“philosophical information”**.

Philosophical information explains the relationships between causes and results, appearance and content, general and special.

The description that we just stated as the “relationship between the human being and all nature” both applies to and encompasses all of these three types of information.

FORMATION OF KNOWLEDGE

For the purpose of analysing whether knowledge is relative or not more clearly, it is helpful first to give a glance to how it gets formed in human mind.

Knowledge as the relation between the human being and nature gets formed in four successive stages:

1. Perception,
2. Thinking,
3. Understanding,
4. Explanation.

Perception is creation of a design in human conscious through means of sense organs getting affected from nature. This design is an image of objective reality of nature.

As soon as the formation of this image, mind becomes activated and compares this design with others in the conscious. Mind in the stage of thinking that starts by this means, establishes a connection between this last perception and informative collection that is in a state of orderly accumulation in the memory.

When the thinking stage is over, numerous designs that have been perceived from nature concerning objective reality are united, and all are brought into a new informative collection. Mind places this informative collection among others that are already present in the most convenient location. This third process is the stage of understanding.

Information by observation and practice gets formed in these three stages. There’s no explanation in this type of knowledge. Whereas, scientific knowledge and philosophical knowledge cannot be realized without explanation. On the other hand, due to its property of getting formed, philosophical knowledge doesn’t need the stage of perception.

In the stage of explanation, all informative collection in the memory is removed by mind and separated into elements, connections are established among them, other newly perceived information by observation and practice are added, and all are collected as complete as possible and exhibited.

Consequently, an appearance, an occurrence or a process in nature is comprehended together with causes, connections, laws and results. In other words, the relation between “the knower” and “the known” are established including all available aspects.

IS KNOWLEDGE RELATIVE OR NOT?

Knowledge that we defined as the relation between the human being and nature, get formed by starting from the nature, not the human being.

Knowledge, while passing though the stages of formation, is subject to various processes of abstraction and synthesis in human conscious. After the stage of understanding is completed, knowledge again becomes abstracted and return to nature.

This return to nature is mandatory in order for the knowledge to be confirmed. Knowledge that cannot show perfect conformity with nature cannot reflect the objective reality of nature. In other words in short, nature is both the source of knowledge and its and its touchstone.

Knowledge that passes through a process of testing by applying to nature after having been concreted, cannot embrace full objective reality of nature even if it is fully compatible. The largest of numbers that we can write or say is not the last one. Because nature is endless.

If nature is endless, then knowledge process shall be endless.

Knowledge coming to an end means attaining the end of endless. In such a case, one should admit that knowledge shall always be deficient and incomplete.

In other words, the characteristic of knowledge is such that it proceeds towards the absolute, and continues this procession as long as the relation between the human being and nature is perpetually established, thus momentarily obtains an approximation, i.e. always RELATIVE, and shall be so in the future.

Regardless of its type and subject matter, knowledge is relative.

However, the status of knowledge being relative shouldn’t be considered as absolute knowledge can’t be acquired. Because every incomplete knowledge that is confirmed upon being applied to nature carries its completeness within itself.

This means that each relative knowledge comprises its entirety.

All relative and confirmed knowledge that leave their place to those that follow by time are in connection with absolute knowledge of objective reality of nature. Only that knowledge that cannot be confirmed upon being applied to nature is a relative one that doesn’t comprise its entirety.

If such a knowledge is asserted to reflect the objective reality of nature, this cannot be proved. Not being able to be designated by a proof, is indicative of that claimed to be a “knowledge” is actually just an image.

KNOWLEDGE IN HISTORY

The first knowledge acquired by man in history was visual and experiential. From the moment man began to acquire this first knowledge until our age, -in whatever filed- he could not help falling into a great misconception from time to time.

This great misconception of man was assuming that most of the knowledge he has acquired about the objective reality of nature is certain and unchangeable.

In other words, from time to time, man forgot or not even realised that he is also an element

of nature, and has been proud of himself as a being super creature outside the nature, thus has ascribed himself an attribution of perfection.

The same man, who thinking that he himself is greater than what he actually is, realised at another stage of time and under other influences or conditions how erroneous his convictions were, he began to see himself as more deficient than he in reality is.

When this assumption of inadequacy turned into a complex of inferiority, he attempted to take his revenge on knowledge. Consequently, he attempted to stamp knowledge as "impossible".

Has man never realised that knowledge of the objective reality of nature is relative?

Has he never and nowhere been able to grasp on a relative scale what is the most approving place for him in nature?

Has he never been able to use his mind and utilise knowledge with wisdom in any period of his life?

These questions cannot be answered negatively. Man has pirformed great efforts to acquire knowledge concerning the objective reality of nature.

He exhibited even greater resistance against the forces trying to prevent him from improving his knowledge.

There were times that he had to hide knowledge.

Contemporary man must be able to benefit from these experiences of the past of humanity.

If we review some historical examples of scientific knowledge, we clearly will observe that man has not failed at all in his endeavour to acquire knowledge concerning the objective reality of nature, and that his knowledge at every stage has a relative characteristic, including its absoluteness.

EXAMPLE 1 - "MATTER" IN THE STRUCTURE OF NATURE

Man found it necessary to learn how and from what "matter" in the structure of nature is composed of. He referred to each object he perceived as a homogeneous phenomenon different from the other. Later, he realised that they all consisted of atoms which in fact were identical, but which apparently assumed different forms. Advancing a step further, he divided the types of atoms that make up the diversity of matter into four: **Stone, water, air and fire…**



Upon learning that metal when molten change their form and properties extremely, man realised that the number of atomic species is actually much more than the assumed.

He further comprehended that not only solid objects but also liquid and gaseous substances form physical and chemical compounds that consist of separate atoms.

He attained the knowledge of preparing, modifying and distracting these compounds.

By saying that «Each of the atoms that are more than a hundred types is the smallest structure as being the essence of matter in nature», he managed entering into the structure of the atom. He found out that it actually has different elements in itself.

Smashing the atom in particular, he discovered the existence and properties of rays that are outside of matter in nature, notwithstanding closely related to matter.

Today man is interested in particles that are referred to as "mesons", get born and die in a period that is hundred millionth of a second.

Man, who once upon a time endeavoured to discover the basic structure of matter, now tries to understand the existence of "antimatter" which is opposes matter.

Man couldn’t yet attain absolute knowledge of matter in the structure of nature. Every knowledge he acquired was relative and included its absoluteness; in the next stage of time, provided light for comprehension of knowledge approaching the absolute. Even the most primitive knowledge could be put in practice in nature and indicated harmony with nature and its objective reality.

EXAMPLE 2 –SIZE OF THE UNIVERSE

Man wanted to know how big the universe is, in which he lived as well.

Initially, he assumed that the world is flat like a tray, and that those who reach the end would fall down from there.

Even this assumption shows that man has acquired a relative knowledge about the universe, which actually includes the absolute, because even at this primitive stage he has realised that the universe does not end with the earth but in fact is much larger.

During the initial stages of man's knowledge concerning the size of the universe, he assumed that all stars are revolving around a fixed centre, the earth. In this assumption, there was a relative knowledge in line with the absolute knowledge of the universe as well and in harmony with the objective reality of nature: "The bodies in the universe are continuously in motion."



Later on, man learnt that the earth has a spherical form, it revolves around itself, and there are many other planets revolving around the centre as satellites like the earth.

When he started to study the stars outside this system, he determined that there are about 100 billion stars in our galaxy called the Milky Way, which is about 100 thousand light years in length, and that the sun does not stay where it is but moves within this galaxy. He found that the Milky Way is only one of the members of a 16-element galaxy group, and that there are thousands of such galaxy groups beyond it.

This knowledge of man is neither a guess nor a fairy tale created by his imagination... Man has acquired a great deal of knowledge about the size of the universe through observation and evaluation devices he made by using his intellect, but has not yet attained its absolute knowledge.

Man today is in a status of having acquired a great deal of knowledge with respect to his knowledge in the past, but perhaps what we call "a great deal of knowledge" is actually "very little knowledge" in comparison with absolute knowledge of the size of the universe.

Human knowledge in this regard is also relative; there is no degree of relativity.

INTERIM CONCLUSIDN

Scientific knowledge is relative regardless of the subject matter.

Visual and experimental knowledge that is deprived of an explanatory phase is also necessarily relative.

Philosophical knowledge that combines all scientific knowledge of the objective reality of nature into a universal whole and then evaluates is in the same situation; it will remain relative unless all relations and connections of every event, phenomenon and process in nature are fully explained.

The absolute and relative aspects of knowledge of the objective realities concerning nature are inseparable. If a person minimises or denies relative knowledge, and on the other hand, if he characterises and glorifies the absolute content of knowledge as "the one and only true knowledge", he tends towards dogma. If one considers absolute knowledge as impossible and contemplates relative knowledge as independent of the absolute, one falls into a scepticism that is incompatible with nature.

Man can only have knowledge to the extent that he can explain what he can perceive. such knowledge will always remain relative in the infinity of nature.

TRUTH

Truth is that exist as an object, a quality or a state. It expresses a phenomenon opposed to images, appearances, comprehensions, fabrications, misconceptions and illusions.

We observe that the concept of “truth” is divided into four types:

1. Objective Truth: This is something that exists independently of man in the process of acquiring knowledge, and that man cannot change as he wishes.
2. Subjective Truth: This is the truth only in thought.
3. Absolute Truth: This is the perfect, complete and unalterable one.
4. Relative Truth: This is the one that is constantly changing, associated and correlated with others.

Whichever of these is adopted as the real and correct definition of the concept of "truth" in the start, the acceptance of something as truth or untruth is also under the influence of this primary definition. If a mistake is made in the definition of the concept, one cannot avoid to be in misconceptions instead truth, to lean towards superstition, and to get stuck in dogmas.

Let us leave conceptual definitions aside, and look forward to how to search and find facts.

In order to search facts in a positive and effective manner, one should first be able to recognise and criticise his own being.

To know one's own being means to believe and trust in oneself, and to determine the magnitude of this belief and trust. This is possible only by studying and analysing his physical and mental powers, and making an impartial evaluation.

Once able to do this, he realises what kind of mistakes he has made and what sort of misconceptions he fell into. Even unable to correct and eliminate these, as long as he is aware of them, he can endeavour to search facts.

Another individual qualification required for search of facts is the ability to distinguish between opposing concepts such as good and bad, right and wrong, without prejudice. This ability enables one to evaluate and use knowledge.

Along history, some people who were able to influence the society in some way, were also able to take advantage of the ignorance of large masses that constitute the society, then of their fondness in superstitious beliefs and dogmas, just for their own benefits.

Despite their infinite ability to think, instead of using this facility, human beings tend to adopt what is simple and easy. Sovereign powers, in turn, have presented their similarities of facts to people, and ensured that these are adopted by them and even sincerely believed in.

For ages, a certain number of philosophical systems of thought have been established to be used in the searching the truth. To follow any one or a few of them is to fulfil the requirements of a compulsory exercise in improving thought and intelligence.

However, we must be careful so that such an exercise does not have the effect of restricting the freedom of thought that we have. Otherwise, a particular philosophical system of thought may also cause us to fall behind or outside facts.

Furthermore, adherence to any single philosophical system of thought can drag one into dogmas.

If a person starts to defend his dogmas that he holds as "truth", he inevitably falls into bigotry. Then, he can only arrive at subjective truths. This subjectivity results in regarding one’s facts as absolute. It compresses one into a mould, a frame. From now on, he is not interested in the facts that are outside this mould or frame, because as far as he’s concerned there are no other fact.

None in his regard; because truth is relative.

On the other hand, in order to grasp the relativity of truth and to be able to ascend towards such a way of thinking, it is necessary to get rid of centuries-old habits.

DIALECTICAL WORLD VIEW

In order to reach facts, cases and information must be grasped in all their aspects and with all their relations. We can call this a "dialectical approach".

When “dialectics” is mentioned, primarily Materialism of Karl Marx is recalled.

For this reason, many people refrain from even talking on dialectics. In their concern, Materialism and Communism, i.e. a regime based on it, are evil and to be afraid.

But if you ask them, they can describe neither Materialism nor Communism properly. The denigration of what one does not know well is the product of prejudices acquired through uninformed influence.

Dialectics is much earlier than the emergence of Materialism. Whereas, it is much, much older than Communism. The fact that it has been used by Materialists and Communists to strengthen their doctrines does not mean that it is bad or wrong at all.

Of course, if Materialism and Communism are bad and wrong…

To review these doctrines and develop a judgement are beyond our current scope...

Let us make some quotations from the dialectical world view in relation to facts:

- The universe is a whole in which everything depends on everything else and everything mutually influences each other.
- The universal interconnection between events results from the mutual interaction of causes and results.
- Nothing is stationary; everything is in constant change and motion.
- Any event or phenomenon can only be grasped in conjunction with the conditions under which it exists or with those that surround it; it cannot be abstracted. Moreover, such events and phenomena are affected not only by external circumstances but also by interior contradictions.
- Those that were recognised as "law" yesterday, are no longer valid today. Similarly, today's laws may be invalidated by new and more realistic laws of tomorrow.

The dialectical world view envisages a rational and scientific approach to the search for truth.

In such a manner that, according to this view, dialectics will also change and renew itself.

For the time being, operation of the universe seems to be in accordance with dialectical laws.

Again for the time being, in the study for searching the objective facts of the universe, it is necessary to look at it with a dialectical consciousness.

Searching the facts by the dialectical method, is unfavourable to those who define the concept of "truth" by abstracting it from the whole. This is because the revelation of the facts leads to the destruction of the assumptions that some people have adopted as "the truth" and try to impose this on others.

If we wish to investigate and find the truth, we need to think about what we should do, leaving aside the pressures that those who will try to dissuade us from this endeavour and to lead us to deviated paths that they want to place over us.

First, we must know how to get rid of scholastic thought and dogmas, be careful against superstition, and to avoid bigotry.

Then, we should try to be brave and conscious, with all our freedom and sincerity through self-criticism.

After that, we must consider objects and phenomena in all their concreteness and abstract smaller particles of truth from them. We must study the relations and contradictions within and between the facts we have abstracted.

Next, we must re-construct all these that we have abstracted, again into the complete.

We have to regard this as insufficient, and must put these outcomes into practice, thus see that they prove to be correct under the conditions in which they stand.

Not giving an end to this study, we have to start once again towards the absolute truth.

The truths that we will arrive by this means shall be objective and relative truths, indicating that there are others that are related to them.

WISDOM

Those that are extremely deficient in knowledge are compelled to remain as spectators in against events and phenomena of the universe, and to be crushed under them.

These persons are unable to comprehend the causes of natural and social phenomena, their interrelationships, and the truths underlying their laws.

Therefore, those that are extremely deficient in knowledge can only achieve a limited level in personal development.

Even in that level, they can provide positive contribution in the line of evolution neither for themselves nor their community.

One should labour in order to acquire knowledge; labour by reading, listening, observing, analysing... Then he must evaluate the data he has collected and acquired through scientific method, in freedom and with reason.

In order to be really a man of knowledge, he must be able to getting rid of arrogance, pride, boasting, and the desire for superiority. He must be able to put himself into test. He should not pretend to know what he doesn’t, and certainly avoid deceiving himself.

He must know what he knows, and he must also know what he doesn’t.

This is wisdom.

A person of person is the one who is able to combine knowledge with virtues, thus creating integrated personality.

That person who tries to complete what he knows and endeavours to learn what he doesn’t is aware of his faults, misconceptions and shortcomings; he avoids insisting on the truth of what he knows.

The most strong obstacle of knowledge is bigotry.

Whereas, the most dangerous form of bigotry is "bigotry of knowledge".

One wishing to develop and mature, one seeking truths, must trust his knowledge, but he must also recognise its relativity and incompleteness, and may even be wrong.

One of the qualifications of an informed and virtuous person that is able to do this, i.e. a man of wisdom is to "knowing to keep silent".

Silence is first of all a requirement of respect. This respect is an inevitable requirement of recognizing the freedom one wishes for himself to others as well, and the tolerance in both thought and speech.

Silence is also a product of knowing deficiency and awareness of insufficiency.

As a matter of fact, an ignorant person who doesn't know his lack of knowledge, speaks and writes unnecessarily, out of place and out of time, without properly analysing what is true according to himself.

In order not to be one of that disrespectful ones who talk too much and act as a man of knowledge, it is also necessary to know how to keep silent.

This is also wisdom.

Silence is a precaution. If one doesn't know the opinions, beliefs, dispositions, level of knowledge, understanding and comprehension abilities of those around, and how tolerant they are concerning new or different ideas, one should be precautious.

If one puts own thoughts beliefs, tendencies, knowledge and findings forward without taking any precaution, suffering from a lot of damage may occur. Coming across with negative reactions may rise to the extent of causing to lose life. Even if not to such an extent, one may be humiliated and placed under the pressure of certain prejudiced attitudes. At the very least, one will be recognised as an evil or dangerous person.

A person who arrives at certain truths as a result of his researches can adopt and implement two different courses of action: He can either keep them to his own or he can present them for the common benefit of people other than himself, of his society, and gradually of mankind.

If a person is prefers to be unselfish and share his knowledge with others, to ensure that the society also benefits from the truth, but if he fails to take precautions, all his initiatives and endeavours may be in vain. Those who do not know how to keep silent in time and place are silenced in such a way that perhaps he will never be able to tell or explain again.

Unfortunately, human history is full of various examples of this phenomenon.

Nevertheless, always reading, always listening, always watching, always analysing, always investigating, always researching, and then always remaining silent cannot be considered affirmative at all.

If everyone always listens keeping silent, always reads, watches and does not write, if always keeps what they know and have learnt without transferring to others, societies that constitute humanity will remain dependent only on the knowledge and experience of their predecessors. In such a case, as regards scientific, cultural, social and philosophical terms, leaning first to stagnation, then to declination, and then to collapse occurs.

Hence, it is necessary not to be excessive in silence, whereas to be moderate. To know how to be silent means to speak and write at the right time and place, to speak and write properly and harmoniously, being able to avoid unnecessary and out of order words.

Knowing how to keep silent means that thoughts, information and truth can be received at any time and in any place, but not to be indiscriminately transmitted to everyone under any circumstances whatsoever.

Men of wisdom who searched for universal truths found a way to come together with select individuals like themselves in order to share and develop their thoughts, knowledge and findings. They established the esoteric system and practised it throughout ages. In this way, the evolution of man and humanity may have been delayed, but knowledge and truth have been preserved against dogmas and bigotry, and evolutionary development has been placed on solid foundations.

We must therefore recognise that we owe most of our current knowledge concerning the facts of the universe to the men of wisdom who established the esoteric system and have transmitted their knowledge to us over time in stages, as necessary and as appropriate.