

### REASONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENTALISM

The precocious development of science, especially as far as experimental sciences are concerned, and the subsequent disruption of the premisses on which science has been founded, have caused a deep distrust in any positivistic view of the world, be it of a materialistic or idealistic type.-

To an interested observer of the development of thought in the early 20th century, it will have not passed unnoticed that the differences between the idealistic and materialistic point of view were more of a kind of fiction than of any difference of real content. Both these classical views assumed the existence, implicite or explicite, of an existing body of laws which govern the World. This assumption was, of course, founded on the notions of science deeply rooted in the mind of every Westener. When infra-molecular physics put such an existence of laws in doubt and even made them look highly improbable, this faith in the law-fulness of the World was seriously shaken and made all speculations with regard to the nature of the World secondary to the Noetical question about the possibility to grasp the World at all. Thus philosophic speculation ended the vicious circle it has started with Descartes, with the difference that there was no common ground nor common language for philosophers to start any cooperative effort.-

Humanity was only wiser in one respect: it had seen the philosophic efforts of Western civilisation degenerate into the absurds of German idealism and the Anglo/German materialism and found itself, again, in front of a "Terra incognita", without any indication to lead the way.-

A completely new approach to all the questions involved was called for and as far as I can see two such approaches were found, although it must in truth be said that none of them satisfy the human urge to understand prophesy. One of these approaches which originated in England reduced practically all problems to mere questions of grammar. It does confess that philosophic problems can be grasped only in symbols such as words or figures, which do not bear any, unless a very artificial, relation to what we feel to be reality. By that new stoic method many previous problems may be shown to be only apparent and many previous mistakes can be avoided. But it does not seem to me that such a system can lead us to anything but

./.

the mefistophelian advice : " Im gänzen haltet euch am Worte, dann geht Ihr durch die sicher Pforte zum Tempel der Gewissheit ein".-

The second approach has been tried by Instrumentalism in America. Although it appears to me that this approach tacitly presumes unwarranted premises I can see that no thinking can be started without assuming something. The assumption which Instrumentalism does is that the human process of thinking has a purpose, namely to keep men alive. In other words: thinking is an instrument for survival just as stomach or the lungs. If this point of view be accepted, the whole body of Instrumentalism follows logically.-If thinking has a purpose such as the radio for instance, it cannot be expected to register facts completely alien to its purpose. We cannot expect the radio receiver to register earthquakes and thinking to register God. The whole territory which thinking can cover, consequently, will be vastly diminished and any excursion beyond its limit will result in meaningless sounds, if spoken, or symbols, if written. At this point the new logietic system created by Russel in England will be of great help to Instrumentalism. Within its proper territory, however, thinking may be expected, if conducted with the proper system, to produce results.-

The whole question reduces itself to a question of technique. It is still too early to be able to judge whether in scientific technique will be applied with success in a discipline so difficult for experiment and induction, but even if scientific technique should prove unfeasible, it will at least be possible to imagine that another process will be found which will eventually lead to results.

In my view, of all the present currents of thoughts this is the only one which has some bearing on reality and offers any hopes for progress, even if, as I said before, it restrains the territory of Philosophy to such an extent as to make the present of Philosophy less than satisfactorily to human curiosity.-

VILEM FLUSSER

tic" or "Schaunder" or "fear and trembling" which accompanies the vision of the "new", of, (to put it unreligiously), "emergence".

The purpose of this paper, let me repeat it, is to report on the qualitative jump as it appeared in my recent experience, not to give a phenomenology of New York. This is a difficult task, and it is being tackled at present by many, (artists, writers, thinkers and so forth). The much more modest purpose of this paper is to suggest that the experience of the qualitative jump ("Umschlagen"), might contribute to a new vision of dialectics as a model. Dialectics "explains" emergence, and thus "explains it away": it is no longer mysterious. But dialectics fails to capture the existential aspect, of it. If we concentrate on the "jump", we might give dialectics new depth, in fact: we might provide it with a "third dimension".. Thus dialectics might be transformed from a "discourse" into a better model of the world. "Better", not only in the sense of "having one parameter more", but also in the sense of "admitting a mysterious background".