

**IN MEMORIAM:
ABDULAH ŠARČEVIĆ (1929-2021)**



1

Abdulah Šarčević (1929 - 2021) was one of the leading philosophers, sociologists, and essayists in former Yugoslavia. After his retirement, he was Professor Emeritus at the Faculty of the Philosophy in Sarajevo, as well as a professor at Pima Community College in Tucson (Arizona, USA). He had been the regular member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences of Bosnia and Herzegovina (since 1981), member of the International Parliament of Writers (1992), member of the Writers' Society of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1971-1992), member of the editorial board and editor-in-chief of the Logos Edition Series (1984-1992), founder and director of the Centre for Philosophical Studies (1990-1992). His vast opus was the main topic of this paper.

In his works he was dealing with a range of phenomena of the culture and philosophy of the East and the West, but was also interested in theoretical problems of contemporary philosophical trends, particularly in Europe and the United States. He had begun publishing reviews, essays, studies and articles in 1949 on issues concerning the basic questions of the history of philosophy, and, also, of Eastern philosophies, of contemporary philosophy from Modernism to Postmodernism; as well as on ontology, philosophical anthropology, philosophy and the sociology of culture, the philosophy of language and hermeneutics, aesthetics and ethics, sociology and theories of culture, and the spiritual or cultural sciences. His meetings with Theodor W. Adorno in Frankfurt am Main (1963), K. O. Apel, as well as the correspondence with Hans Jonas (1991, New York) and Jürgen Habermas had left significant impressions on him. He published 28 books that covered a wide range of topics across diverse philosophical disciplines. Finally, for the past 60 years, he co-created and influenced the development, modernization and scholarly and critical conscience in the complex field of humanistic, social and cultural studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina and former Yugoslavia.

Contrary to his numerous fellow-philosophers, sociologists and university professors in general, who have worked a better part of their creative lives within the imposed ideological framework of the former Yugoslavia and the system within which they pursued their academic careers, in the situation when we try to evaluate the overall opus of Academician Abdulah Šarčević,¹ we can say without any reservation and testify the obvious fact that this prolific writer of philosophical works and a great thinker, who himself had been writing about fateful persons, having become one of them as well, has never paid even a symbolic tribute to the contemporary ruling ideology. Professor Abdulah Šarčević has, indeed, belonged to such faith-making persons about whom he has been writing in his views about the leading minds in philosophy of both the East and the West to whom, really, belong the transcendent primary origin with which they happen to surpass the world in all its insufficiency and exhaustion. In addition, what is common to all such fateful transcendent primary origins is that “surpassing the existing in an empirical manner, is to reach the freedom in the world above the world.” I happen to use here, once again, and in a rather clear way redefining defining philosophy of Karl Jaspers, having been expressed by Šarčević; but many more in this plethora of leading Western and Eastern minds, among whom his own thought had been in an unrelenting dialogue. It was Šarčević who, as a matter of fact, introduced them among the first not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also in the former Yugoslavia. It was a consistent effort in the dialogue of diverse cultures and religions within the context of the spiritual situation of our times, where his own thoughts beyond any doubt represented the true dialectic of intercultural logos.

It is a well-known fact to all of us who have been associated to the Department of Philosophy and Sociology, that, after he had become Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Sarajevo, in 1959; Abdulah Šarčević introduced a number of disciplines into the existing curriculum, such as Ontology, The Sociology of Culture, Introduction to Philosophy, and, particularly dear to me and which makes me personally obliged in that sense – Eastern Philosophy (Filozofija istočnih naroda) in Philosophy Department. He remained forever in touch with them in the continuing dialogue that resulted in the best works and his extraordinary projects as the editor of the *Logos* Edition Series in Philosophy, and, afterwards, as the Head of the Center for Philosophical Research. In essence, it meant a gradual introduction of the most recent accomplishments of the world philosophy, which happened to be his personal goal to establish the dialogue between the East and the West, or the whole of the world philosophy. In short: the best accomplishments of contemporary philosophy using the means of free communication that would encompass the whole humankind. It was the new principle of responsibility for the multicultural world, which have been articulated in the constellation of dialogue for the entire intellectual, cultural and spiritual world of the East and the West. Some of the contributors to such a dialogue have been late

¹ <<https://www.unsa.ba/en/novosti/abdulah-sarcevic-winner-world-award-humanism-2021>>; <<https://www.ohrid-academy.org/news/academician-abdulah-sarcevic-recipient-of-the-world-prize-of-humanism-2021>>.

Čedomil Veljačić, Rada Iveković, late Hasan Sušić, late Ismet Kasumović, Nenad Fišer, Mislav Ježić, Dušan Pajin, and many others.

2

In regard to the pluralistic situation of philosophy today, where the discourse of dialogue is highly necessary and in which diverse philosophies reveal that they have been dependent of each other, instead of excluding one another and trying to push each other out of the picture; the book by Abdulah Šarčević (1972, 2000), *The Sphinx of the West* (Sfinga Zapada: Na putevima izricanja neizrecivog, Zagreb: Studentski centar Sveučilišta)¹ and a number of his other works, including (2005) *Selected papers of Modern Philosophy* (Odabrani spisi moderne filozofije) in eight volumes,² represent the necessary places for understanding of meetings, opening and widening of philosophic horizons in our parts, and, no doubt, the inspiration for embracing such intercultural meetings and a promotion of true dialogue and the recognition of the importance of the Other. As a matter of fact, it is all about the imperative of understanding, and not about a mere intellectual curiosity (see: On-Cho Ng (ed.) 2009, *The Imperative of Understanding: Chinese Philosophy, Comparative Philosophy, and Onto-Hermeneutics*, New York: GSP). Moreover, it seems that his contributions in

² Abdulah Šarčević (2005a), *Povijest filozofskog mišljenja / Egzistencijalistička filozofija i pitanje o istini* (The History of Philosophical Thought / Existentialist Philosophy and the Issue of Truth) - Plotinus, Soeren Kierkegaard, Jean-Paul Sartre, Gabriel Marcel, Nicola Abbagnano, Friedrich Nietzsche (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005b), *Čovjek u suvremenoj filozofiji Zapada / Filozofska antropologija / Smisao ljudske egzistencije / Istina, sloboda i egzistencija* (Man in the Contemporary Philosophy of the West / Philosophical Anthropology / The Meaning of Human Existence / Truth, Freedom and Existence) - Helmuth Plessner, Erich Rothacker, Arnold Gehlen, Karl Marx, Elias Canetti, Edgar Morin, Eugen Fink (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005c), *Odvažnost istine i slobode. Um. / Svjetska filozofija / Istok / Zapad / Kritika* (The Courage of Truth and Freedom. Reason / The World Philosophy / The East / The West / Critique) - Karl Jaspers (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005d), *Metafizika Zapada i njezino prevladavanje / O bitku u vremenu, o prostoru / Tehnika i znanost* (Metaphysics of the West and its Overcoming / On Essence and Time, On Space / Technique and Science) - Martin Heidegger, Edgar Morin (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005e), *Filozofska hermeneutika i esejistička teorija / Ontologija i filozofija jezika / Etika: Drugo drugoga* (Philosophical Hermeneutics and Essayistic Theory / Ontology and the Philosophy of Language / Ethics: The Other of the Other) - Hans-Georg Gadamer (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005f), *Suvremena esejistička teorija / Negativna dijalektika / Ideja spasonosnog / Transformacija filozofije i teorija znanosti* (Contemporary Essayistic Theory / Negative Dialectic / The Idea of Saving-like / Transformation of Philosophy and the Theory of Science) - Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Karl-Otto Apel (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005g), *Filozofija i etika / Suvremena fenomenologija svijeta života / Kritika filozofije povijesti i metafizike Zapada* (Philosophy and Ethics / Contemporary Phenomenology of the World of Life / Critique of the Philosophy of History and Metaphysics of the West) - Joachim Ritter, Hans Jonas, Otfried Hoffe, Karl Loewith, Bernard Waldenfels (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

- (2005h), *Kritika moderne / Socijalna filozofija / Filozofija znanosti / Teorija racionalnosti : otvoreno društvo* (A Critique of Modernism / Social Philosophy / Philosophy of Science / The Theory of Rationality: Open Society) - Hans Lenk, Carl Friedrich von Weizsaecker, Paul Feyerabend, Richard Rorty, Peter Sloterdijk (Sarajevo: "Bemust").

such a sense have a lot to offer to the global philosophy with an enormous diversity of cultures and civilizations as the new sources for the world philosophy that happens to be a disorderly play of the human spirit – both the East and the West – and, as I am personally convinced, that after some of his books become translated into English, at least some of them (I am particularly pleading for *The Sphinx of the West*), will become a part of such an agenda. Nowadays, when there has been more and more dialogue between philosophical and religious traditions across the world, and when philosophy is becoming more and more comparative, as well as intercultural, intercontextual and transcontextual in its features, and, by the virtue of it, more and more rooted in the fundamental human togetherness that enables pluralistic approach and expression. We must never lose from sight such promoters for such a subject-matter and multiple philosophical heritage, as well as persons acquainted with such challenges that professor Šarčević has, without any doubt, remained faithful to. He had done it, at the times, even at a price of being called because of his model of thinking, as somewhat ‘reactionary,’ despite the fact that it was “in its essence, a grand talk with philosophers, on the heights where those who have been courageous to pursue the truth, and the freedom of creativity, in fact, resided.” These are the words from the Introduction to his *Selected Papers* (2005), and without any dishonest simplification, a submission to the pathology of time, schizophrenia, both moral and aesthetic, or political one – in the plagues of the age of globalization processes.

3

Besides, I feel obligated that, in this place, I should try somehow to clarify the syntagmatic phrase by James W. Heisig “Redefining Defining Philosophy” that will, I am totally convinced, allow me to, in a sufficient degree and in a valid manner, determine pioneering contributions of Šarčević within the framework of former Yugoslavia. It is difficult even to imagine today any serious philosopher who can object to the attempt to widen the horizons and to understand different philosophical traditions, especially in the world of our mutual global interdependence. For, philosophy needs to open itself up to other traditions, and some monolithic determinations, such as the West or the East, have become questionable in our parts, too, thanks to a great extent to the opus of Šarčević; and a mere expression of parochialism in the age of globalization processes. That is why it should be quite obvious that what we advocate here is that the world philosophy cannot be limited exclusively to a single tradition that had started with Thales. In fact, it must be sufficiently wide-ranging as to encompass any act of philosophizing, every single form of searching for wisdom, since we do not necessarily need to be Westerners in order to engage ourselves in the process of philosophizing. His contributions to overcoming the general culture of xenophobia in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former society in Yugoslavia have been immense in such sense. Unfortunately, these contributions have been, at the same time, pushed aside with mythologizations and the techniques of deforming the reality in the period of dishonor that persists in continuing, and in which to be urban can only mean eo ipso to be weak.

4

Therefore, I have chosen on purpose this expression “redefining defining philosophy”, when the Western philosophy had started to polish up its own views and to observe its own parochialism in a different way. For, Heisig (2006) would say, “the underlying assumption that defining philosophy, however one denies it, remains a western prerogative is as tacit as ever. The spectrum of opinions regarding the inclusion of nonwestern philosophies reaches from the overtly intolerant to the extremely generous, but the overall effect on philosophies outside the western tradition is still disabling” (Odjek [Ecco], Fall-Winter, 72). Having been inspired by the work of Wilhelm Halbfass and his influence on intercultural studies (Wilhelm Halbfass 1988, *India and Europe*, New York: SUNY Press), it was Rada Iveković who wrote about these issues in a rather brilliant and inspirational manner.

As a matter of fact, professional philosophers and philosophy had become too specialized and, by the very virtue of it, parochialism and intellectual myopia became their constituent part in thinking. Heisig’s observation, and we are referring here about a brilliant philosopher and comparatist and one of the three leading contemporary knowers of Japanese philosophy (Jim Heisig / John Maraldo / Tom Kasulis (eds) (2011), *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press), goes to such a direction that he, without any hesitation, says that as carefully as we diagnose it and as offensive as it is to the founding principles of critical thinking, it is so deeply rooted in the dominant institutions that allow philosophers to do what they do in a public forum that even the mildest suggestion of reform makes it impossible. So, he speaks openly on liberating the definitions of philosophy from the Western control, because there is no way to avoid the reform of philosophical academies as a cultural reality, and as sooner we begin to talk about of de-administration of our university centers, we would be in opportunity to overcome the well-known assumption: *Extra academia, nulla philosophia*. As long as we accept that philosophy is a western discipline and that therefore the West holds the copyright on definitions and redefinitions of it, philosophy’s universality remains radically unphilosophical. And, it is exactly however freely philosophies from the east are allowed to blow freely through the thick iron bars of the western academy, Heisig would say, philosophy itself remains imprisoned. A change of reasoning has not been effected by reason itself; it always implies a change of heart. And the requisite change of heart, a metanoia, is not the fruit of legislation or institutional reform; but, rather, the opposite. (Heisig, *op. cit.*, 73)

It seems, then, that redefining philosophy is the primary issue of making the inclusive definition. It is, rather, the instigation of the highly necessary process that will have as its result redefining. It is quite natural, since in the case of thinking what can be included into philosophy, and what not, should be decided through a discussion of the highest degrees. It is more likely that permanent changes in philosophy will take place on the outer fringes of tradition and not in their very core (I paraphrase here the well-known view of Nishitani Keiji). What has been referred here to, therefore, is that what had been made institutional in the center, does not possess the same sense of the natural development and it has been predisposed against the change. Nevertheless, a kind of new incentive has been emerging and becoming the part of the Bosnian agenda. The memory of contributions by Abdulah Šarčević is just a step into such a direction.

The signs that redefining defining philosophy by Šarčević can mean that the times are ripe to offer its abundant gifts. These signs are more than visible and are encouraging. His overall *oeuvre* is of great help to such a collaborating conversation.

5

We are facing again the question that emerges in regard to this concept of the perennial philosophy (Kahteran 2002, *Perenijalna filozofija...* (Perennial Philosophy), Sarajevo: El-Kalem, 45). Therefore, to the question: “*What is philosophia perennis?*”, a sufficient answer would be that it has been *stricto sensu* the sum of truths of the natural order, mostly having been appropriated by human beings in the course of history. It is the real and universal philosophy, it has always been present and permanent (it is different from spatial “philosophies”, having been in essence characterized by certain times, authors and systems); whereas, opposite to this, one can observe, within some modern philosophical viewpoints, that *philosophia perennis* looks more like a legacy of perennially unsolvable issues rather than the total and holistic formulation of the first principles. This difficulty in a conscious observation of any essential principles or fundamental, absolute truths of the *philosophia perennis* within the modern philosophical conception lies simply in the fact that there are and that there have been so many different systems and expressions of philosophical speculations. The One is really on a dangerous backdrop in a too cumbersome generalization on essential principles, but, opposite to burdensome and diversified philosophical systems, the alternatives are either the generalization or silence. Furthermore, it is important to point out that there is a difference between what has been marked as *philosophia perennis* in the discipline of modern academic philosophy, and what had been marked with this name in the works of the exponents of the tradition of 20th century. In addition, I would like to mention here the determination that had been given by a collocutor and a collaborator of Šarčević in these kinds of deliberations, Čedomil Veljačić. According to Veljačić, “*philosophia perennis* as a backdrop of philosophical universalism is a domain of expressing ‘eternal motifs’ on the world scale and a comprehensiveness in the history of culture.” (Veljačić 1981, *Ethos spoznaje u evropskoj i indijskoj filozofiji* [The Ethos of Cognition in European and Indian Philosophy], Beograd: BIGZ, 8).

According to Šarčević, it was Jaspers who had established his criticism of the absolute division of historical traditions; but he also opened up a polemics against the reduction of what they were as a mere object of historical knowledge and cognition (*episteme*), the outer understanding according to which their multiple truths would not be connected to our historical fate. The opinion of philosophy, which integrates within itself the traditions of thinking in Asia, is essential for the internal agency, he would say, and it appeals to the freedom, and it always recalls the transcendence in the historically different manner (Kahteran 2002, *Perenijalna filozofija*, op. cit., 50).

In addition to Jaspers as a metaphysician of tolerance (a determination by Harold A Durfee), this concept of *philosophia perennis* can be found in a commendable way in the works of many contemporary philosophers, such as Johannes Hirschenberg, John Hermann Randall, Wilbur Marshall Urban, Radhakrishnan ... (Kahteran 2002, op. cit., 57-58). As a matter of fact, Karl Jaspers would be the best example among the

professional philosophers. In his book (1949), *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library), having been written in USA and as the post-World War II development of thought that different kinds of logic could enable the free communication that would, indeed, persist in the entire humankind, Jaspers addressed the object of the perception of continuity:

Through all the change in human circumstances and the tasks of practical life, through all the progress of the sciences, all the development of the categories and methods of thought, it (philosophy) is forever concerned with apprehending the one eternal truth under new conditions, with new methods and perhaps with greater possibilities of clarity.” (Jaspers 1949, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, 166).

Once more, the equalizing of “a single eternal truth” with *philosophia perennis* emerges in the philosophy of Karl Jaspers to strengthen the idea of continuity (perenniality) in philosophy:

Nowhere at any time has a *philosophia perennis* been achieved, and yet such a philosophy always exists in the idea of philosophical thought and in the general picture of the truth of philosophy considered it as history over three millennia which become a single present. (Jaspers 1949, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, 25).

It has been common among the philosophers, having followed Plato, that unquestioned or uncritical life is not worth living. For, if the eternal truth does not exist, continuous and ever-present, why would one pose all these most relevant and deepest questions, and the answers to them revealed? According to Schmitt’s words, should it not the task of dividing “the perennial elements of philosophical knowledge and permanent truths from those merely passing and relative in temporal sense” be accomplished? Or, to pose the question in a different way, are there within the heavenly “eternal truth” (*philosophia perennis*) some layers of unsolvable questions through conventional philosophical methods, such as dialectic, reason, logic? If that is the case, are those unsolvable perennial issues inaccessible, as it has been aforementioned, for the “improvement of limits” of the Western philosophy with its silent dogma about the unchangeable “progress”? It seems that the modern philosophy has been cleft in two when trying to provide the answer to this question.

Jaspers rejects entirely this remark about the progress in philosophy, and we must add this, as the philosophers from the traditional school have done it. As a matter of fact, the progress in philosophy is a totally meaningless remark on them, since Jaspers demands that “philosophy proper” must, among other things, reject the idea of progress, which, however, is responsible for sciences and the implementation of philosophy. Having directly followed this statement, he declared that “in this conception the new as such is mistaken for the true.” (Jaspers 1949, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, 166). Finally, in a longer but ingenuous polemic against the advocates of philosophical progress, Jaspers accuses the list of his predecessors:

Over and over again they believed that they had transcended the whole past by means of something utterly new, and that thereby the time had finally come to inaugurate the true

philosophy. This was the case with Descartes; in all modesty and with the modest justification Kant held this same belief; it was held in arrogance by the so-called German idealists, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling; and then again by Nietzsche. And tragedy was followed by Satyrical drama. The publication in 1910, in the first fascicle of *Logos*, of Husserl's article on philosophy as an exact science,³ in which, speaking as the most important, because supremely consistent representative of his department, he proclaimed that the definitive principles of philosophy were at last securely established. (Jaspers 1949, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, 167)

Besides a few others, Jaspers speaks against these requests and defends the return to “the traditional search for eternal truth, which is the core of philosophy.” (Jaspers, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, op. cit., 77) In other words, having been faithful to the idea of continuity in *philosophia perennis*, Jaspers demands the importance of rationality while addressing unresolvable perennial issues that, together with the humankind from times immemorial – have been unsolvable, at least, through the conventional methods of philosophical engagement, as aforementioned. All this implies for Šarčević the openness of philosophical tradition, having been represented in fateful people and their works (see, in particular, two works by Jaspers (1980): *Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus*, translated as: *Sokrat, Buda, Konfucije, Isus* (Belgrade: Vuk Karadžić), and (1988) *Anaximander, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Plotinus, Anselmus, Laotse, Nagarjuna*, translated as: *Heraklit, Parmenid, Plotin, Anselmo, Laoce, Nagarduna* (Beograd: Vuk Karadžić) for always new interpretations and integrations. For, they do not tell the truth in their works just about their own section of time, but also about the subsequent epochs in history. They build the multiversum of philosophies of the past, multiple constitution of the world of humankind, which lives historically in a dialectic touching of temporal and eternal, or in the world of immanence and transcendence. Namely, Jaspers is, indeed, a counterpoint to Hegel and the allergic reaction of Modernism to any possibility to have the truth of the great philosophy of the past emerge in our own age, which has been focused on the great thinkers and philosophers, because, in the permanently renewed communication, we remain against the great phenomena of the past, not as being surpassed, but as present / contemporary. Without it, the communication of multiple historicisms acquires the character of non-historical. His idea of boundless communication stems from it, which, for me personally, is not a mere utopia, but always understated yet ever-present Tradition, similar to a subterranean river:

...That the entire philosophy has been present for us nowadays, that it knows itself about its present as a phenomenon of the source / origin, that it knows about the inevitability of universal tradition, that, without it, we would be stuck into “nothing of a single mere

³ The reference is to Husserl's article “Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft” (“Philosophy as Rigorous Science”, 1910–1911), in which he had tried to show that transcendental phenomenology can reestablish the traditional goals of first philosophy on an immanent and nonspeculative basis. See: <<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Philosophy-as-Rigorous-Science>>.

moment”, without the past and future, that it knows about the transience of temporal and the presence and simultaneous temporality of the essentially true of the entire history – all this testifies about and only *philosophia perennis* (Šarčević 2005, *Odabrani spisi* /=*Selected papers*/, Volume III, 40).

With this mediation of one and the other, or the existential reconstruction of the history of philosophy in the form of fateful persons and surpassing the order of nature within Modernism reflects the essence of Jaspers’ thought. In accordance with it, the original reality emerges in the thought and works of great philosophers, whereas the mediation itself of mutually diverse cultural traditions of the East and the West rests on the sameness of human beings. It does not efface but enables diversity and the highest otherness. Even more so, it does want to be entirely new, but to discover existentially and in a new manner the ancient truth of the world philosophy. Šarčević would say in his analysis that the language of truth of the world philosophy, as represented in its great people, reaches above the overall situation of our times in terms of history in the making. (*Odabrani spisi* /=*Selected papers*/, Volume III, 28) The core of Jaspers’ effort to rethink anew a promising possibility of universal communicative survival of humankind as a whole has been reflected in it, whereas it establishes at the same time “the open horizon for the world philosophy in which both the Eastern and the Western philosophy can develop in mutual communication”, which is the task and endeavor of any true philosopher and comparatist.

Comparative philosophy is an ambitious, but historically necessary project of establishing a critical discourse between different philosophical systems and thinkers who belong to these diverse cultures and traditions, and it has as its aim a broadening of philosophical horizons and the possibility of understanding of our students included in its studies. Likewise, the particular task of comparative philosophy is the establishment of international peace and a deeper understanding in a concrete, practical, and, at the same time, intellectual undertaking within multicultural communities. Therefore, comparative philosophy – or what it could be nowadays referred to as “intercultural”, “transcultural”, or, simply “global philosophy” – has expressed, throughout its history, a prolific diversity of goals, methods and styles. One of the permanent goals of comparative or intercultural philosophy was to make evident some basic cognitive and evaluative assumptions of traditions, different from our own one, while expecting to acquire a better clarity and better understanding on the assumptions that inform us about someone’s tradition as cross-tradition undertaking. In this way we begin to know ourselves better, it has been believed, from within and through the recognition of the other, as well as alternative conceptual schemes, values and manners of organizing and finding the sense from the human experience. The main Asian (and nowadays many other non-Western) traditions have been studied, and, afterwards, as they reveal different “ways of thought” in order to contrast them one against the other and compare them with diverse Western forms. This would be the comparative philosophy in its broadest cultural modality (E. Deutsch), and this project can be observed as the part of a larger comparative undertaking that we can refer to as the “problem approach.” Regardless if it is in the ethics, metaphysics, aesthetics, or any

other philosophical discipline, the idea is that we can use resources of these traditions as to enable us to deepen and broaden our own philosophical understanding and acting. As a matter of fact, scholars should be able to study Asian philosophy for the purpose of enriching their philosophical background, in order to enable them to wrestle better with philosophical problems that interest them. Furthermore, we have begun to understand that the very idea of philosophy can designate rather different things in diverse cultures and that we still have to learn a lot from the other conceptions. This brings us directly to the comparative philosophy as creative philosophy. It has been assumed, that from this questioning, we can attain openness to develop new and better forms of philosophic understanding. (Kahteran 2009, *Komparativna filozofija* [=Comparative Philosophy/, Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu, 7).

6

Instead of a conclusion, we can ascertain that this bard of philosophy in all of his courage to pave the ways for the world philosophy in these times of dishonor and other ‘-isms’ in the madness of historical changes in Southeastern Europe has always represented the lighthouse of knowledge and a reliable guide in climbing the ravines of spirit, in these ”Himalayas of soul” – allow us to use in this place the appropriate phrase by Čedomil Veljačić – who had been his co-locutor and a fellow traveler on such a journey, and the model of intercultural thought and cross-tradition engagement. On the other hand, persisting techniques of deforming the reality were reduced just to fill in the void of its existence with the hatred through an enormous catalogue of insults and vulgarities. This has been more than enough reason to prolong and continue this narrative about him, since the time is finally ripe to talk about fateful people of the Southeastern Europe. We are expecting the time with happiness and joy when the prolific religious and philosophical legacy of this region, the Balkans Peninsula and Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular, will begin casting its unique lights on the intellectual traditions of both the East and the West, in the ripening process through the collaboration of ever-growing international community of scholars. It is obvious that, within our context in the Balkans, the words of Professor Chung-ying Cheng (with whom we had conducted an interview that was published in the journal *Odjek* (Echo) in Sarajevo, in the spring of 2007) are becoming true – the comparative philosophy is an actual trend and it is becoming more and more intercultural, intercontextual, and transtextual. As such, it will be more and more rooted in the fundamental sense of human togetherness, which allows a pluralistic approach and expression. Nevertheless, it equally calls for the comparativistic evaluation and judgement among them in the terms on the newly emerged visions of truth and values. Indeed, it is definitely an imperative to deal with this mega-trend that the philosophy of Abdulah Šarčević has always anticipated at large in this region.

Nevad Kahteran
June 2022
nevad_kahteran@hotmail.com