

Literature, Society and the Creative Public Sphere: Towards a New Art of Cross-Fertilization

ANANTA KUMAR GIRI

We seek certainly for that sort of expression which is self-expression. When an individual feels himself hedged in he recognizes the necessity of getting a situation in which there shall be an opportunity for him to make his addition to the understanding, and not simply to the conventionalized 'me.'

G.H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society*

Who is my audience? It took me a long time to understand that the "public" I am waiting for is the same that I am living for: humanity at large.

Raimon Panikkar, *A Dwelling Place for Wisdom*

Literature and Society

Exploring and realizing creative relationship between literature and society is an adventure in co-realizations and transformations going beyond the logic of the fields of both literature and society. It also calls for understanding their manifold conceptualizations and realizations. Our conventional understanding of literature is that it is created by men of literature. It is not always realized that literature is part of life and society; when it is done so it is usually conceptualized and represented in a language of mirror and adaptation: literature is either a mirror of society or it adapts to the logic of society. But literature is not only a mirror of society but also a field of creative expressions and confrontations which breaks existing mirrors of society and creates new languages of self and social realizations and new landscapes of imaginations. Both literature and society are not only fields of adaptation but also fields of transcendence and transformations in which individuals and groups strive to go beyond adaptation and create new conditions of self-realization, co-realizations and social realizations. These are fields in which there is interrogation and confrontation of the existing logic of

literature and society. Literature is thus not only a field of murmuring but of grumbling and a field of contestation and confrontations of the existing grammar of society based upon a higher grumbling of self and awakened social groups and movements.¹

In exploring relationship between literature and society, the language of interdisciplinary transaction, as it happens in conventional academic corridors, is not enough. We need a new language and practice of transdisciplinary cultivation, beyond adaptation and meditative verbs of transformations. In this striving for a new language and relationship, realizing the distinction between noun and verb is crucial. In our conventional languages, literature, society as well as such important terms of personal, cultural and national identity as person, nation, writer, India, Shakespeare etc. come to us as nouns which we also uncritically use, adopt and adapt to. These nouns already from the beginning are imprisoned in a logic of possessive pronouns—this is my self, this is our literature—and any foundational critique of such possessive pronouns are met with resistance and sometimes violent annihilation. But literature, society as well as such fundamental fields of life as self are not only nouns but also verbs. They embody verbs of unfoldment, emergence and realizations.² But as verbs they are not only activist (which is the way verbs are constructed and realized in modernity) but also meditative (Giri 2009). But these meditative verbs of action, expression, communication and co-realizations are manifold-sitting, walking as well as dancing verbs of life. Literature and society are verbs of co-realizations and meditative transformations involving walking, sitting and dancing verbs (Giri 2011b). Public sphere is an important sphere in which such verbs of co-realizations and transformations are at work.

And in such transformative co-realizations, the nature of "and" plays an important role. If we conceptualize

Ananta Kumar Giri is Associate Professor at Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai.

“and” in a logic of juxtaposition, as it mostly happens in the logic of interdisciplinarity, the terms and fields on both sides of “and” do not get mutually interpenetrated and transformed. “And” becomes a helpless presence repeating the logic of “end” (which simultaneously means end of meaning as well as ultimate end or purpose). But if our conception and realization of “and” is one of mutual interrogation, transmutation and mothering bridge then our inhabitation, meditation, dance, walk and work in the space of the “and,” the space of the middle, becomes a work of transformation—transforming a one-sided conceptualization, realization and organization of fields such as literature and society.³ While our conventional understanding and work in the space of “and” reproduces a logic of “end” and “noun,” in beyond adaptation and meditative, interrogating and mothering verbs, “and” is a space of transformations. “And” is a space of quest for infinity from the actors and fields on its two sides rather than a reiteration of the totalizing logic of totality of either of them.⁴ “And” is a mothering ground and bridge of quest for and embodiment of responsibility. In his work, *Sahitya O* [Literature and..] Chitta Ranjan Das (1923-2011), a creative seeker, writer and experimenter from Odisha, who has written more than two hundred books on different aspects of literature, society, education, and social criticism suggests such a transformative, interrogative and mothering meaning and realization of “and” (see Das 1989a, Giri 2011b). This also comes out in a joint work of co-creation in which the poetic critic and essayist Chitta Ranjan Das and poet Srinivas Udgata co-create poems and reflections on poetry together in the work *Ebam* which also means “and” (Das 2009b).⁵

Public sphere helps us in realizing such a meaning of “and” beyond the adaptive, already determined and ultimate logic of “end.” Literature helps us to express ourselves to ourselves as well as to the others and the public. Expression in the field of literature is simultaneously self, mutual and public and helps in the creation of public spheres in societies. In the creation of modern public spheres, as Jurgen Habermas (1989) himself tells us, literature has played an important role. He calls it literary public sphere. But it is one thing to talk about literary public sphere as a type of public sphere or even as a segment of public sphere and it is another thing to realize the integral literary dimension of public sphere itself. In later conceptualizations and realizations, literature becomes an integral part of public sphere through work of rhetoric, language, style of argumentation and mutual co-presence in such modes as co-walking and co-labouring.⁶ In their vision and practices, writers such as Chitta Ranjan Das, U.R. Ananthamurthy and Mahesweta Devi from India

embody this later realization of public sphere. They are tireless participants in public discourses and public spaces through speech, writing and in case of Das through regular columns in newspapers. They not only help us realize the literary dimension of public sphere but also recreate public sphere through creative and critical literary interventions.

Unfortunately our understanding of public sphere in social sciences does not fully appreciate its literary dimension and constitution. It has a very prosaic and intellectualist rendering of public sphere without realizing public drama and public poetry in it. The other limitation of contemporary social science understanding of public sphere is that it is part of an uncritical telos of modernity; originating in modernity, it can only become part of an “unfinished agenda of modernity.” Such conceptualizations of public sphere do not help us realize the work of public sphere in pre-modern and non-modern societies (cf. Giri 2002; Giri 2008; Uberoi 1996). But literature in all societies have created public spaces and public spheres for mutual communication though depending upon the nature of social arrangement and mode of government, the nature of such social manifestation of creativity has varied. In societies where creators of literature seeking critical public dialogue with their literature of protest and alternative imagination are not tolerated, humiliated and killed, meditative verbs and streams also dry up and die. Such conditions existed in the past in many societies, especially those under authoritarian regimes, and they continue to exist even in liberal modern democracies.

Literature and Society: Beyond Adaptation and Dynamics of Creative Expressions

In order to understand the relationship between society and literature, we need to understand the transformed understanding of both these fields. Society is a field which helps individuals to come together and express themselves. In sociological theorization of society, there is an acknowledgement of the fact that society is not just a field of *a priori* determination and embeddedness but also a field of self-realization, co-realizations and creative emergence (cf. Sunder Rajan 1998). G.H. Mead, one of the pioneers of modern sociological thinking and author of *Mind, Self and Society*, helps us realize the limits of the social and urges us to realize that neither “I” nor “me” is a reiteration of the existing conventions of society. As Mead tells us:

[..] me may be regarded as giving the form of the “I.” The novelty comes in the action of the “I,” but the structure, the form of the self is one which is conventional.

This conventional form may be reduced to a minimum. In the artist's attitude, where there is artistic creation, the emphasis on the element of novelty is carried to the limit. This demand for the unconventional is especially noticeable in modern art. Here the artist is supposed to break away from convention; a part of his artistic expression is thought to be in the breakdown of convention (1934: 209).⁷

Among contemporary philosophers and sociologists we also get an intimation of a post-conventional and post-social conceptualization of society. Jurgen Habermas (1990) tells us that morality is not just reproducing the conventional logic of society rather it is to learn how to think and act in post-conventional ways taking into consideration the calling of universal and universalizable justice. Alain Touraine (2007) tells us about sociology beyond society which explores the way individuals become subjects. For Touraine, becoming a member of society is integrally linked to the process in which one becomes a subject but to be a subject is to have the ability to say "no" to the existing logic if this does not allow creative self-realization. But what Touraine and Habermas have not explored sufficiently is how by cultivating the literary field on the part of self and society one can realize the post-conventional dimension of society, have the capacity to say "no" in the face of an overwhelming compulsion for "yes," and go beyond the logic of an *a priori* social. What they have not explored is how practice of creative literature can contribute to co-creating society as a field of creative expression, co-realizations and confrontation. This we find in the works of seekers and experimenters such as Chitta Ranjan Das.

From the field of literature, we also have a connected move to realize society as a field of self-expression and co-realizations. Das, for instance, urges us to realize that society has been built by those who do not conform. Personality and self for him is not just a logic of adaptation and socialization; it is a field to realize an emergent wholeness building upon one's quest for self-realization, co-realization and world realization (Das 2010). Touraine's appeal for sociology beyond society finds a creative resonance in Das who urges us to realize how boundaries of sociology are now being transcended in creative experiments and adventures.⁸

The Calling of Creative Public Spheres

We usually look at literary creativity in an individualized way but now we need to link both to fields of creative public spaces and spheres. For our *tapasya* of creativity in literature and society, we need the spheres of the creative self, intimate groups of mutuality as well as public spheres. But in each of these spheres, we continue

the modernist logic of linearity. Despite the language of sphere in public sphere our conceptualization and organization of it is linear. It is hardly a sphere where the spherical nature of our being is at work or finds an expression.⁹ In this context, we need to conceptualize and realize public spheres as manifold circles and *chakras*. Public spheres as *chakras* bring interested people together where people through creative sharing and contestation generate mutual energy. Literature can help realize public spheres as *chakras* where individuals and groups can express themselves and through processes of communicative dialogues and contestations can generate mutual energization. These *chakras* can inspire and enable the participants to bring together their vertical dimension such as quest for transcendence and horizontal dimension such as commitment to fellow beings and realizing solidarity in praxis with others.

The concept and organization of public sphere in modernity is also bound to a logic of double contingency and dualism. For example, we look at self, other and society through the logic of what Strydom (2009) calls "double contingency" of self and the other. This double contingency is also imprisoned within dualism. But now we need to bring the concept of "triple contingency" to each of these spheres. In triple contingency, along with self and other, there is also a public (Strydom 2009). But this public is not fixed, it is emergent, it is not only observing but also participating. Triple contingency does not lie only outside but also works inside. Triple contingency is also a bearer of transcendence as it transcends the dualistic logic of double contingency of self and the other.

In literature, spiritual traditions and creative imaginations we are familiar with the concept and reality of third eye. This third eye exists not only in Shiva, the meditative *tapaswee* and dancer, but also in all of us.¹⁰ Triple contingency can be linked to the work of third eye. Literature and creative public spheres can help us realize and cultivate not only the triple contingency of life thus going beyond the arrogance and exclusionary assertion of either self or other but also develop and realize our third eyes, a challenge missing in contemporary theorization of society and public sphere. Public sphere and creative meditation can help us realize both triple contingency and third eye and then move it further to the fourth, fifth and further dimensions of our contingencies, aspirations and struggles.¹¹

Life Worlds and Living Words

But for this we would have to recreate the link between what is called life worlds and system worlds through the

categories of lived worlds and living words. Our lived worlds every where are multiplex and plural but the language of life worlds and system worlds as it comes in sociology and in the works of critical theorists such as Habermas usually present a one-dimensional logic and rationality such as the primacy of rational in modernity and hierarchy in traditional societies. Life worlds every where are also subjected to dominant logic of the system world such as market, state, caste and gender. In this context, to cultivate lived worlds with their creativity, courage, transcendence and multidimensionality is a challenge which calls for us to go beyond the existing logic of life worlds and system worlds. The challenge of creativity is simultaneous: simultaneously nurturing lived worlds of vibrancy, energy, soulful togetherness and meditative solitude and living words which move us not to hatred and annihilation but to mutual blossoming and co-realizations. Both lived worlds and living words do *tapasya* for and with beauty, dignity and dialogues in the face of and in the midst of ugliness, indignity and violence.¹²

Living words work as new *mantras* of life, to put in the words of Sri Aurobindo, and embody what Martin Heidegger (1994) calls "way making movement." They just do not mirror "forms of life" but create new ways of life. They just do not reproduce existing language but create new languages of self and social realizations.¹³ They just do not reproduce the rationality of either tradition or modernity but possibly embody strivings towards what Latin American thinker Enrique Dussel (2010) calls "transmodernity."¹⁴ They are not just part of either the logic of transcendental awe in tradition or "linguistification of the sacred" in modernity (see Das 2004).¹⁵ While they seek to make the Divine and Nature part of the communicative field of humans and express it in ways understandable to modern rational mind, it nonetheless does not reduce either of them only to what is comprehensible in the language of modern rationality. It seeks to cultivate the ineffable and ever-present and dynamically moving Beyond in both lived worlds and living words while at the same time making them part of our everyday conversations. Both lived worlds and living words become sites of courage, creativity and transcendence working in between and in the margins of fear, drudgery and pull towards an imprisonment in closed walls which is often justified in the name of immanence.

Going beyond the "linguistification of sacred" (cf. Habermas 1990) in modernity and the consequent disenchantment and dualism between the religious and secular, both life worlds and living words embody new border crossing between rational and emotional, religion

and reason, nature and human, mental and supramental. The life worlds and living words embody such a new border crossing among human, nature and divine in continuously emergent ways.

Towards a New Art of Cross-Fertilization

Literature, society and public spheres are fields of lived and living worlds which have the potential of a new creativity. While our existing space and time are empty and continuously being emptied out with the logic of the system such as money, market and capital, life worlds and lived worlds help us cultivate pregnant spaces and pregnant times. Both lived worlds and living words work as seeds for a new pregnancy. Our living words can impregnate us as our lived worlds of *tapasya* can make each other fertile which is an embodiment of a new spiritual eroticism.¹⁶ Our compassion and confrontation can make us conceive new ideas and new relationships.

Our fields of literature, society and public sphere have become dry and deserted and we need to make these fertile. But for this available fertilizers from the market and external world are not adequate. We need to make them fertile through self, mutual and cross-fertilization in which our quality of life, relationships and living words play a crucial role.

It is earthworms which make the land fertile but today we need to be earthworms to each other as well as to ourselves. But once the land is fertile we would have to cultivate the land as a garden for which we need to be gardeners. But both earthworms and gardeners can remain bound only to the field thus uncritically reproducing the logic of embeddedness which also becomes hostile, opposed and violent not only to forces of emergence from the field itself but also to other fields. In this context the calling of cross-fertilization and cross-pollination calls us to grow wings and be simultaneously birds and bards, fly and sing together, wonder and wander.¹⁷ Literature, society and creative public spheres can help us simultaneously become earthworms, gardeners and birds.¹⁸ It can also help us become Socratic gadflies, as Socrates, Antigone, Gandhi, Chitta Ranjan and many other seekers and fighters of humanity have exemplified, striking the powers that be which hinders our potential, aspiration and efforts for self-realization, blossoming and world transformations.

Notes

- * Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the National Seminar on "Literature and Society: Interdisciplinary Transactions," North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong, March 2010 and the workshop on "Philosophy, Literature and Social

Transformations," Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai, Feb. 2011.

1. In our seminar at Shillong Professor Mrinal Miri, in his keynote address said that literature is an act of murmuring. In my presentation, I said that literature is also an act of grumbling, especially higher grumbling of self and awakened social groups. In offering this argument I am building upon the work of Chitta Ranjan Das (2010) who talks about the work of higher grumbling in personality and society based upon the work of Abraham Maslow
2. We may note here that in different philosophical, cultural and spiritual traditions, body, mind and Being are considered verbs. As Tu Wei-ming writes about body in Chinese culture and philosophy: "There's a beautiful term, *ti*, which means the body. But, that word, *ti*, can also be used as a verb. It means just my body, but also to embody. The embodiment is a process of understanding other human beings experientially as well as intellectually and spiritually" (Weiming 2000: 50). In his *Art and Experience*, John Dewey also writes about mind: "Mind is primarily a verb" (quoted in Elbridge 2000: 244-245). And theologian and philosopher Raimon Panikkar writes about Being: "Being is a verb, an action, and it has rhythm" (Panikkar 1995: 26).
3. We can note here what Deleuze and Parnet write: "It is not the elements or the sets which define the multiplicity. What defines it is the AND, as something which has its place between the elements or between the sets. AND, AND, AND [...]" (quoted in Nathan & Smith 2011).
4. This resonates with the thoughts of Emmanuel Levinas. Franson Manjali (2001) also explores such pathways in his *Literature and Infinity*.
5. So does poet and novelist Rabi Narayan Dash (2008) in his book of poems, *Ebam Kadha* (and buds).
6. While Habermasian public sphere is mainly one of sphere of argumentation I make it plural by bringing such activities as love and labor in to it. Cf Giri 2008.
7. As Mead (1934: 221) tells us:
The value of an ordered society is essential to our existence but there also has to be room for an expression of the individual himself if there has to be a satisfactorily developed society. A means for such an expression must be provided. *Until we have a social structure in which the individual can express himself as the artist and the scientist does, we are thrown back on the sort of the structure found in the mob, in which everybody is free to express against some hated object of the group.* (emphasis added)

Tabish Khair (2011: 236) from the field of literature also tells us the following which resonates with Mead's spirit:

Thus the 'individual' who is indivisible from society but this is also [...] the individual' who cannot or should not be reduced to or conflated with 'society.' It is in this creative tension that we, as creative writers and 'individual' readers, have to trace out or locate a value for literature.

8. Note what Touraine, a sociologist, and Das, a creative practitioner of literature, write about sociology. For Touraine,

One of the main themes of sociology is therefore the reversal of the conception and role of institutions. These were defined by their function in the integration of a social system. They defined and

imposed respect for the norms and instruments for the defense of individuals which enable them to defend themselves against norms. Our society is less and less a society of the subjected and more and more a society of volunteers (Touraine 2007: 191).

About sociology Chitta Ranjan shares with us the following:

The story of all real sociology is one of breaking open the boundaries. The discipline was originally bound strictly to its specific lines and limitations, and it is great that transgressions have been happening all the time. It is becoming more and more clear that society, people, do always matter more than the study of society. The older definitions and contours are fast changing and there are more and more people who are less shy and hence willing to transgress the boundaries. More mature days are in the offing and the recluses till now working in the laboratories are becoming more courageous. Yes, courage, more than anything else, always helps us to ask questions and rewrite our canons of enquiry. Intellectuals are rethinking and as it were from within more ready to revise their roles. Albert Camus has once made a remark that the intellectual's role will be to say that the king is naked when he is and not to go into raptures over his imaginary trappings. And look, all around now there are hegemonies, kings all round who are visibly naked! The intellectual's laboratory has now to come down in proximity to people where they really are, move and have their beings, suffer all the time waiting for an appropriate remedy. The academics could not as a rule do that. Shri Ramakrishna of India had once observed that "some people climb the seven floors of a building and cannot get down." But some can, he did hope, really climb and then come down. They are always of greater worth (Das 2009: 579-580)

9. Philosopher Peter Sloterdijk urges us to realize the distinction between a spherical approach and a linear approach.
10. In this context, what Troy Wilson Organ writes below deserves our careful consideration:

In India looking at something from a different point of view is called 'seeing with the third eye.' Augustine, in the midst of an analysis of the nature of memory, abruptly asked: 'What third view is this?' Ad Plotinus advised, 'You must close the eyes and call instead another vision which is to be walked within you, a vision, a birth right of all which few turn to use (Organ 1987: 2).

11. This calls for cross-cultural dialogue and border-crossing dialogue between critical theory and religious and spiritual ways of thinking. It would be interesting to explore further dialogue between the concept of triple contingency in critical theory and trinity in Christian religious and spiritual tradition. For Panikkar, "Trinity is not a number but the depth and unfolding of the riches of reality, which is a living relationship" (Pikaza 2010: 119). "Panikkar thereby seeks to move beyond a form of dualism, following the best *advaita* experience (of non-dualism), opening a way to dialogue [...]" (ibid). In the same way we can realize triple contingency not as a number but as the depth and creativity of relationship beyond the dualistic logic of self and other. But triple contingency also urges us to realize that Trinity whether it is in Christian tradition or Hindu tradition is also confronted with the challenges of public—an observant and meditative public.
12. In this context, what Margaret Chatterjee tells us about different lifeworlds that we inhabit is touching:

On this side of the wall children have milk to drink at least once a day. On the other side, one *pawa* of milk has to stretch for glasses of tea for five adults plus children. A six year old girl told me this. Near the milk stall there are *mithai* [sweet] shops. This is where the bulk of the milk goes. Consciousness cries out for transformation, a consciousness imbued with conscience. Such a consciousness would grow laterally, horizontally, turning the searchlight of attention on the endless anomalies around us, the endless injustices, the lack of any sense of priorities (Chatterjee 2005: 16).

In the above paragraph, Chatterjee talks about the growth of consciousness horizontally and this resonates with Husserl's emphasis on horizontal ontology (see Mohanty 2002).

13. As expressed in the following poem:

Oh friend
You said
We need a new language
A new *sadhana* of words and *tapasya* of worlds
This is not a language of victory
Nor is one of self-advertisement and aggrandizement
Neither is it a language of doomsday
This is a language of walking our ways together
Walking our dreams, *sadhana* and struggle
(author's translation of his original poem in Odia)

14. The following quotation from Dussel (2010) helps us to understand transmodernity

Europe began to function as the "center" of the world market (and therefore to extend the "world system" throughout the world) with the advent of the industrial revolution; on the cultural plane, this produced the phenomenon of the Enlightenment, the origins of which, in the long run, we should look for (according to the hypothesis of Moroccan philosopher Al-Yabri, who we will discuss later) in the Averrīst philosophy of the caliphate of CŪrdoba. Europe's crucial and enlightened hegemony scarcely lasted two centuries (1789-1989).¹⁵ Only two centuries! Too short-term to profoundly transform the "ethico-mythical nucleus" (to use Ricoeur's expression) of ancient and universal cultures like the Chinese and others of the Far East (like the Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.), the Hindustanic, the Islamic, the Russian-Byzantine, and even the Bantu or the Latin American (though with a different structural composition). These cultures have been partly *colonized* (included through negation in the totality, as aspect A of Diagram 1), but most of the structure of their values has been excluded—*scorned, negated and ignored*—rather than annihilated. The economic and political system has been dominated in order to exert colonial power and to accumulate massive riches, but those cultures were deemed to be unworthy, insignificant, unimportant, and useless. The tendency to disparage those cultures, however, has allowed them to survive in silence, in the shadows, simultaneously scorned by their own modernized and westernized elites. That negated "exterior," that alterity—always extant and latent—indicates the existence of an unsuspected cultural richness, which is slowly revived like the flames of the fire of those fathoms buried under the sea of ashes from hundreds of years of colonialism. That cultural exteriority is not merely a substantive, uncontaminated, and eternal "identity." It has been evolving in the face of Modernity itself; what is at stake is "identity" in the sense of process and growth, but always as an exteriority.

These cultures, asymmetrical in terms of their economic, political, scientific, technological, and military conditions, therefore maintain an alterity with respect to European Modernity, with which they have coexisted and have learned to respond in their own way to its challenges. They are not dead but alive, and presently in the midst

of a process of rebirth, searching for new paths for future development (and inevitably at times taking the wrong paths). Since they are not modern, these cultures cannot be "post"-modern either. They are simultaneously pre-modern (older than modernity), contemporary to Modernity, and soon, to Transmodernity as well. Postmodernism is a final stage in modern European/North American culture, the "core" of Modernity. Chinese or Vedic cultures could never be European post-modern, but rather are something very different as a result of their distinct roots.

Thus, the strict concept of the "trans-modern" attempts to indicate the radical novelty of the irruption – as if from nothing – from the transformative exteriority of that which is always Distinct, those cultures in the process of development which assume the challenges of Modernity, and even European/North American Post-modernity, but which respond *from another place, another location*. They respond from the perspective of their own cultural experiences, which are distinct from those of Europeans/North Americans, and therefore have the capacity to respond with solutions which would be absolutely impossible for an exclusively modern culture. A future *trans-modern* culture – which assumes the positive moments of Modernity (as evaluated through criteria distinct from the perspective of the other ancient cultures) – will have a rich pluriversality and would be the fruit of an authentic intercultural dialogue [...]

15. Habermas (1990) talks about "linguistification of the sacred" where sacred becomes part of ordinary language and conversation. But in this there may be a danger of reduction of sacred to language that Habermas does not explore.
16. Note here what philosopher Luc Irigaray (2002: 115-117) writes:

Carnal sharing becomes then a spiritual path, a poetic and also a mystical path [...] Love takes place in the opening to self that is the place of welcoming the transcendence of the other. [...] The path of such an accomplishment of the flesh does not correspond to a solipsistic dream [...] nor to a fin-de-siecle utopia, but to a new stage to be realized by humanity. [...] Nature is then no longer subdued but it is adapted, in its rhythms and necessities, to the path of its becoming, of its growth. Caressing loses the sense of capturing, bewitching, appropriating [...] The caress becomes a means of growing together toward a human maturity that is not confused with an intellectual competence, with the possession of property [...] nor with the domination of the world.

For Irigaray, "sharing breath" is an important aspect of this aspired for spiritual eroticism, giving birth to life and each other and making of a spiritual community. For Irigaray, "This proto-ethical plane of shared breath is the eternal germ of a spiritual community, i.e, a community of embodied individuals, caring for each other" (quoted in Skof 2011: 136).

17. A poem written by my friend Francis Regis Bouquiza about "Le Trdoubador," the wandering musicians in medieval France can be of interest. The following line from the poem in French tells us how the troubader visit from place to place:

Je suis le troubader du chemin qui me mene vers Lui
Et le passager des temps visibles, invisibles [...]

Also this poem "On Wings" by Rabi Narayan Dash (2007) can help us realize many meanings of growing wings:

When I emerged
Broken and aimless

She came out on to her terrace
 To ask if I had seen a flying cat
 And a little sparrow crying in sorrow
 If I knew leaves are already yellow.
 The world I came of, seeking
 Care, if I am I love with
 Money or work with a
 Passion for becoming
 Somebody and something
 I have already read
 'the child is the father to man'
 Sharing her words and unending dream
 I started to scream:
 'God! Return me to her,
 To child, the mother!'

About wings, Rumi tells us about its significance in the following ways: "Something open our wings, something makes boredom and hurt disappear."

18. When I present these three modes of being, I always ask for equivalent words in the local mother tongue. A Vietnamese scholar in Hanoi told me that the word for earthworm is *Konchin*, for gardener is *Kechia* and for bird *Lantivuan*. During our conversation we created a symphony of *knocking*, *kechia* and *lantivuan*.

Works Cited

- Buber, Martin. 1958. *I and Thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Chatterjee, Margaret. 2005. *Lifeworlds, Philosophy and India Today*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
- Das, Chitta Ranjan. 1989a *Sahitya O.. [Literature and..]. Berhampur: Pustaka Bhandar.*
- 1989b "Ethara Udiba Neta." In Chittaranjan Das & Srinivas Udgata, Ebam. Cuttack: Books & Books.
2004. *Mahimandalara Gita: Sri Arakhita Das, Eka Adhyana [The Mahimandala Gita of Sri Arakhita Das, A Study]*. Bhubaneswar: Odisha Sahitya Akademi.
- 2009 "Afterword." In *The Modern Prince and the Modern Sage: Transforming Power and Freedom*. Delhi: Sage Publications.
2010. *Byakti o Byaktitya [Person and Personality]*. Bhubaneswar: Pathika Prakashani.
- Dash, Rabi Narayan. 2008. *..Ebam Kadha [..And buds]*. Balasore, Odisha: Samara Graphics.
2007. *On Wings and Other Poems*. Huddinge, Sweden: Prima Verba & Balasore, India: New Race.
- Dussel, Enrique. 2010. "Transmodernity and Interculturality: An Interpretation from the Philosophy of Liberation." Paper presented at the International Symposium on "Learning Across Boundaries," University of Luxembourg, June.
- Elbridge, Richard. 2000. "Dewey's Aesthetics." In *Cambridge Companion to John Dewey*, (ed.) M. Cochran. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Giri, Ananta Kumar. 2002. *Conversations and Transformations: Towards a New Ethics of Self and Society*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
2008. "Civil Society and the Calling of Self-Development." *Sociological Bulletin*
- 2009 "Beyond Adaptation and Meditative Verbs of Co-Realizations: Toward Creative Nurturance of "I," "Me," and "You" and the Transformative Fellowship of Non-Duality." *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research* XXVI (3): 109-130.
- 2011a. "With and Beyond Plurality of Standpoints: Sociology and the *Sadhana* of Multi-Valued Logic and Living." In idem, *Sociology and Beyond: Windows and Horizons*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- 2011b "A New Morning with Chitta Ranjan: Adventures in Co-Realizations and World Transformations." *Social Change* 41 (3): 359-380.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
1990. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1994. "The Way to Language." In idem, *Basic Writings: Revised and Expanded Edition*, pp. 393-426. Edited by Farrell Krell. London: Routledge.
- Irigaray, Luc. 2002. *Between East and West*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Khair, Tabish & Sebastien Doubinosky. 2011. *Reading Literature Today: Two Complimentary Essays and a Conversation*. Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Mead, G.H. 1934. *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manjali, Franson. 2001. *Literature and Infinity*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
- Mohanty, J.N. 2002. *Explorations in Philosophy: Western Philosophy*. Delhi: Oxford U. Press.
- Nathan, Jun & Daniel W. Smith (eds.) 2011. *Deleuze and Ethics*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Panikkar, Raimon. 1995. *A Dwelling Place for Wisdom*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.
- Pikaza, Xavier. 2010. "Raimon Panikkar (1918-2010)." *Concilium* 2010 (5): 117-120.
- Strydom, Piet. 2009. *New Horizons of Critical Theory:*

- Collective Learning and Triple Contingency*. Delhi: Shipra.
- Sunder Rajan, R. 1998. *Beyond the Crises of European Sciences: New Beginnings*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Skof, Lenart. 2011. "Pragmatism and Deepened Democracy: Ambedkar Between Dewey and Unger." In *Democratic Culture: Historical and Philosophical Essays*, (ed.), Akeel Bilgrami, pp. 122-142. Delhi: Routledge.
- Touraine, Alain. 2007. "Sociology After Sociology." *European Journal of Social Theory*
- Uberoi, J.P.S. 1996. *Religion, Civil Society and State: A Study of Sikhism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Vatsayan, Kapila. 2010. *Sui Dargha: Crossing Boundaries, The Needle and Thread*. Delhi: India International Center and Wisdom Tree.
- Wei-ming, Tu. 2000. "The Complex Bridges between China and the West." In *A Parliament of Minds: Philosophy for a New Millennium* (eds.), Michael Tobias, J. Patrick Fitzgerald & David Rothenburg, pp. 46-59. Albany: State University of New York Press.