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Editorial Perspective

Take the issue, or the problem, and put it in a perspective. That is the secret of seeing the problem in a different light, clearly and distinctly, not only as it is but also as it is not. “Putting it in perspective” is the crystalline managerial phrase used by Peter Drucker, “an inspired painter of concepts.” Drucker was a professor of philosophy and management at Bennington College, USA. He never made a secret of his belief that people have very little or no imagination and cannot grasp the problems that fulfill the initial requirement of _clare et distincte percepciones_ (clear and distinct perceptions). In fact this was an idea put forth by Rene Descartes, the father of modern philosophy. It is not surprising that the father of the modern philosophy of management should have whole heartedly subscribed to the spirit and methodological requirement of the technique of research. Therefore, we should not delude ourselves into believing that the services we offer to our clients and the subjects we teach to our students are so apparently obvious to them as they are to us—the teachers and the managerial consultants. If our goal is to enlarge and to deepen our research methodologies, our pedagogical practices and managerial services must be such that they “may apply to your organization or it may apply to you as an executive or even to your qualities as a human being. And it is an insight, a way of seeing, not a fact-heavy analysis.” To achieve that ideal, ours must be a research-based orientation and, in its core activities, its goal must be to steadily and gradually increase value added ideals and leadership for tomorrow. The leadership must be willing to assume social responsibility, endowed with the creative will to contribute to sustainable development. To facilitate this process, our organizational structures and teaching ideologies must be informed and inspired by a well-defined research orientation that can help us to draw the future into our present world-view. Changing our way of thinking makes us see clearly and distinctly not a different world, but the same world differently. Such orientation will add to the transformation of management and educational practices through _change_. Our goal, again, must be to develop and devise research technologies that will help our students and our management staff increase their acceptance of the changes they will encounter in life and hone their ability to adapt to these changes creatively. It will encourage them to accept the secret underlying _growth_ and _development_ i.e., the unchanging presence of change. The permanence of impermanence is the secret that reigns supreme in nature and in life. They who have seen intently into the eyes of time and deeply into the heart of life know the abiding secret of _becoming_.

It is also good to keep in mind an observation made by Napolean Bonapart: “There are two leavers of moving men, one is the past by staying the same, the other is the future by inventing new ways to forget the past.” In such an outlook, resilience,
creativity, futurity, goal and direction all become seamlessly blended into a single fold overlaid by a dynamic research orientation.

Culturally, one of the essential characteristics of such orientation is its love for the empowering vitality of truth as much as its over powering quest for the indubitable nature of reality. It is rooted in the lust for life and the passion to live creatively. Such a *summum bonum* teaches us that to live is to outlive and to grow is to outgrow. Needless to say, it is one of the defining qualities of a research-orientated pedagogical philosophy. Its passion for the reality is rooted in the phenomenon of growth, change and development. It teaches us that truth will make us free and larger than who we are. But as teachers and research scholars we have to live our knowledge. The moral and religious implications of *lived-knowledge* are enormously self-referential. They awaken the “I” from its dogmatic slumber and the innermost recesses of the reflexive consciousness, relating the self to itself.

This is a difficult and seemingly impossible task. But such is the nature of the love for truth and the quest for reality. It is all of it hard and what makes it hard manifold is the fact that the quest for truth and search for reality is a *trial by existence*. As we embark on our Journey, we must realize that the fear and trembling will soon overtake us, making us wonder whether what we have discovered is the truth or not. The quest for truth and the search for reality unfolds itself in and through silent intimations and quiet anticipations. The truth and the reality in their horizontal and perspectival unfoldment keep teasing us, like a mirage, luring us farther and farther towards the “yet to be.” Only a thirsty traveler can endure the exhaustion. Only he who is possessed by the will to truth can continue on this hazardous Journey, wondering how far he has yet to go before he can say he has arrived, wondering again if at all he will. Stricken by the fear that perhaps he never will, he can delude himself into believing that he is already in possession of truth, forgetting the fact that our plight is such that even if we were in possession of truth we could hardly say with certainty whether it was truth or not. Therein lies the strength of skepticism, as well as the weakness of subjectivism. A research methodology cannot be effective without overcoming the paralyzing skepticism. It is very precarious to embark in search of *truth* and *reality* without a criteria of evidential certitude. We must resist the temptation to believe too quickly, especially when the hermeneutic pressure is too high and the urgency to capture the truth and reality is at its most pressing. We must always remember that in research every thing hinges upon our knowing not only *what the truth will do to us*, if or when we have found it but also upon our knowledge of *what we will do with the truth* if, perchance, we happen to have discovered it. It is a moral and ethical question laden with existential consequences. But, equally important, it is a serious research question with vast ramifications in the fields of positive and normative sciences. Just like a thirsty traveler, we can indeed
be deceived by the beckoning mirage. But, if we are not so deceived, we must not be proud of our intellect, rather we must attribute it to our imperfect thirst.

Research is a very precarious engagement. In search of truth and reality, there is always so much at stake. Besides our own prejudices, biases, mistaken assumptions, unexamined presuppositions and taken for granted attitudes, one single mistake and just one mistaken calculation can undo the lifelong achievement, undermining our faith and trust in the veracity of truth and reality. Such rudimentary awareness becomes even more sharply focused when we draw into our research perspective Socratic question whether something is true because we like it and think so, or should we like it and take it as such because it is true and real. Needless to say it is a seriously grave question and it weighs heavily on a research student’s fidelity to truth. Such an observation, to borrow Drucker’s description, “is an insight, a way of seeing, not a fact-heavy analysis.” Confronted with such an experience, the deepening shadows of doubt begin to grow deeper still and the lengthening reflection of uncertainty begins to tease us like a silent echo of what is always with us and yet so far away, always within our comprehension and yet far beyond our reach. Such is the magic and the romance of research.

Religion offers its way of grasping the truth. But that is one way. Scientific investigation and logic is another. And yet, we falter when we abandon scientific spirit in favour of scientism. Scientism insists that scientific truth is the only truth nothing but the truth and the whole truth. Only that which can be objectively and quantitatively studied merits the description of scientific truth. Accordingly, what can be recorded with the help of a thermometer has the status of truth but not what the lips register. Logic, especially propositional logic, which Imam Ghazali rejected vehemently in favour of lived knowledge, provides an index of truth. Such truth, however, is devoid of existential significance and therefore it is empty and bereft of personal and subjective signification. “Sugar is sweet” is not a sweet proposition and “ignorance is blind” is not a blind proposition either. Philosophy feels ill at ease with the logical positivist’s desire to reduce existence into logical category and to equate reality with existence. The positivist’s desire implies that whatever exist is real and therefore rational. Hunger, hatred, prejudice, poverty exist and therefore they are real and hence rational. Such a notion of rationality poses a great challenge to our sense of social justice and ethical and moral values. We face a dilemma: if fools are kind then indeed it is wise to be cruel.

Beside scientism and logical positivism, psychologism, moral subjectivism, vulgar pragmatism and epistemological relativism, historicism is another source of annoyance for a student of research. Nietzsche, and, more so, Ibn Khaldun, found
Historicism a great irritant. Apart from the human factor, there is no such thing as history. Apart from the intentionality of human actions, decisions and choices, history means nothing. It does nothing, creates nothing, builds nothing, destroys nothing. It kills nobody and fights no wars. It is never defeated. History is never victorious. It is man who does all that; he makes history. Man is not, he becomes, historical.

What differentiates man as a historical agent and determines his position in the hierarchy of historical consciousness is his ability to think and his passion to ask questions and to wonder why things are the way they are and not otherwise. It is both, praxis and action which gives history the sense and meaning it acquires in time. Without man and his interpretative acts and, more importantly, his constitutive intentionality to deal with the contingencies of his circumstances, history is reduced to a concept without percept, barren and empty of any human relevance.

Let us put it in a historical perspective. Historical men, the makers of history creatively and in their destructive propensities, are concerned with changing the world and not only with explaining it. These men do not take things for granted, without questioning, without doubting and without wondering why? History is vanquished when they falter; it is victorious when they succeed. The lives of all great thinkers remind us that although all reasoning is thinking, all thinking is not necessarily reasoning. Marx had his own good reasons for not agreeing with Hegel. He made Hegel stand on his head, upside down, i.e., the right side up, in order to make him see the world in its human perspective. Social research into the issues of political economy forbids us from seeking refuge from the problems of dialectical materialism through metaphysical flights.

Iqbal’s admonition perhaps will not have the same forbidding countenance tomorrow. But, given his world-view, it is very unlikely that it will ever abandon the world for a metaphysical propensity, disregarding the humanistic view of a philosophy of the worldliness of the world.

It shows how easily we can enter into a totally mistaken orientation. The problems of the lived-world do not go away by wishful thinking. In his Phenomenology of Mind, confronted with the painful realities of the earthly existence, Hegel, in vain, sought relief in the upward idealistic speculations. However, we cannot change the world, nor can we alter the lived reality by giving it a different name. It is what it does.
Hegel’s passionate dialectical idealism may very well be a desirable methodology for changing the world and its hideous problems but only if it is not flawed in itself. Research orientation is rooted in the natural propensity of the truth to define the conditions under which what is taken for granted ceases to be questionably false. The Sophists may have thought that by relativising and subjectivising the truth they had found a way beyond Socratic paradox. But, in order to draw epistemological and ontological issues into the fold of corporate research methodology, one must have a clear and distinct perception of what should be the case in order for something to be irrefutably true or obviously false. In this regard, the Sophist is mortally afraid of the ethical trappings of existential issues. Another implication of subjectivism, especially of the Protagorean type (“what is true to you is true to you and what is true to me is true to me”) is that it has never been and can never be the basis of inter-subjective and inter-departmental research orientation, especially in social sciences. In research, nothing is more, dubious and misleading than the assumption that “man is the measure of all things”. But who is this “man the unknown”, the so called measure of all things? We must realize that in Sophistic proposition pertaining to the relativity of truth and reality, what is hinted at is the underlying problem of change. Man indeed is the only creature who can deal with the concept of change. But measuring change, like measuring speech, means that you are measuring the thoughts, intentions and actions of man. Phenomenology of social sciences teaches us that in social research all pertinent questions must ultimately converge upon the concept of man. In making man the measure of all things we walk on the precarious side of truth, trespassing into a territory where, by our own will, our concepts assume the dimension of reality. Here we must therefore pause to ask: where are we coming from and, also, in what direction are we moving? In research, one must never lose sight of the path he is treading on, remaining focused on the goal he is pursuing, mindful of the fact that in research, as in life, one may indeed be on the right path and yet moving in the wrong direction. In philosophy, logical propositions are harmless invocations. We experience their real sting only when we realize that reality and truth have no sense and meaning, purpose and value outside and beyond the domain of our reflexive i.e., self-relational consciousness. Any alteration in reflexive consciousness is bound to result in a shift in paradigm. And a change of paradigm is not without consequences; it is bound to unhinge our sense of worldliness of the world. Whenever it so happens, we do not inhabit a different world; rather we live in the same ‘old’ and ‘familiar’ world differently. That is the difference research makes in our world-view, and the worldliness of our world. That is where the epistemological anxiety of the Sophist finds a resting place.

In Angola, change means opening up new possibilities for all. Change is meant to offer a vision whereby man can envision a future when the future is contrasted with what used to be as against the possibility of what can be and therefore ought to be.
An Angolan considers it a sin to sacrifice the future at the altar of the past. Even the inhabitant of the dark continent is prone to determine the meaning of the present with reference to the meaning it ought to have in relation to the future. In Nigeria, according to the Hausa belief, death is what renders an object dysfunctional. A human being dies (he is dead, ya mutu, in Hausa language) when he ceases to function. A pen is dead when it ceases to write. Death is the hunter; being is haunted by nothingness. Death in life and life in death is the story and the imperious glory of change and becoming. It is also the secret of a wise man’s knowledge and wisdom.

Research demolishes artificial boundaries, defying unexamined presuppositions, combating taken for granted attitudes, unfolding new horizons and new perspectives, pushing the barriers farther and farther still, raising the bar higher and still higher, defining life as a continuous Journey towards the yet to be of our being able to be, thinking of man as a journeying self whose journeying is unto death and nothingness. Man dies when he ceases to move on to be larger than who he is. While he is alive he cannot say he has arrived. But once he is dead, he is dustily dead.

Research carries within itself the possibility of cognitive and epistemic fulfilment as well as creative and existential discontent. Cognitive dissonance and existential distress demands structural realignment of the given paradigm. With the change of paradigm, the world-view also changes. It is an event of great significance; it is more than a philosophical phenomena. It is, through and through, a research problem faced by a researcher at each defining step of his life. In their The Knowledge Creating Company, (Chapter 2, Knowledge and Management) Ikujiro Nonaka and Hirotaka Takeuchi have examined the problem of knowledge from a phenomenological standpoint to substantiate the issue that among various elements which contribute to the making of a research methodology, one that plays a restrictive and confining role is the tendency towards specialization and narrow minded isolationism. The remedy for the ills of such an attitude lies in the inter-disciplinary and inter-departmental orientation. It is time for us to understand the agony of a seeker of knowledge restricted in his embracing fold of truth by the constructed confinements. A research scholar thrives on creative joy and ecstasy of seeking the truth everywhere, wherever his quest may take him. It is so evident to whoever has lived the life of difference between to know and to understand.

Phenomenology teaches us that in order to live such a life, which is an essential requirement of the research attitude and research culture, one must live a life of double polarization i.e., the life of “I seeing myself as seeing”, “I seeing myself as being seen”, through the eyes of others, “I thinking my thoughts”, relating my ‘self’ to myself (ego, cogito cogitationes). Therein lies the enigma of knowledge which is reflexive even in its acts of objectifications.
Logic of research methodology teaches us that research can take the form of an attitude only in a dialogical environment in which creative propensities can develop and grow as a consequence of inter-disciplinary and inter-subjective orientation. Such orientation supports and reinforces critical and gestaltan impulses, resulting in a synthesis of knowing and being. In authentic research, two tendencies always dominate: the tendency towards knowing and the tendency towards being. These two tendencies cover the entire range of epistemological and ontological problems. It means that in our research orientation our attitude towards the world and, more so, our being-in-the-world in a hyphenated manner, are involved simultaneously. In research, at each stage of summing up, we must carry the past through the present into the future to bear upon the yet occluded possibilities of our ‘knowing’ and ‘being’. A man, long after he is dead and gone, is best remembered for his inquiring and invincible mind, not only for the answers he sought and did not have, but also for the questions he asked to seek the answers to his questions.

Logic also teaches us that in research we must test the consequences and conclusions of our hypothesis deductively. Empirical evidence and existential certitude are both essential requisites of rational claims about the truth and reality of a proposition. All genuine and authentic research grows through deductive reasoning. Truth and reality are both conclusions arrived at by logical deduction. There is a necessity inherent in the ‘if then’ relationship. “If fire, then smoke”; “if A then B”. Notwithstanding Hume and his skepticism about the law of causality, common sense teaches us that empirically the phenomenon of necessary conjunction indicates the inference in which conclusion follows necessarily from the premises. Call it, if you will, the poetics of deductive reasoning. Put it in a perspective to see and to understand what the creative urge for research is all about.