

<https://doi.org/10.21638/2226-5260-2021-10-1-140-162>

## PHENOMENOLOGY OF COGNITION IN THE CONTEXT OF MANY-SIDED HUMANISM OF STAŅISLAVS LADUSĀNS

MĀRA KIOPE

Doctor in Philosophy, Professor, Leading Researcher.  
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia.  
LV-1940 Riga, Latvia.

E-mail: mara.kiope@lu.lv

Phenomenology contains potential that can be expanded to include the development of cognitive phenomenology concepts. One of the most notable works in this area is related to the name of Stanislavs Ladusāns (Stanislavs Ladusāns, 1912–1993), the famous Latvian and Brazilian philosopher. The article will outline the key elements of S. Ladusāns' phenomenology of cognition, showing how his many-sided gnoseology was developed as the basis for multidimensional humanism to transform culture into a more humane one. At first phenomenology of cognition is discussed as the ground of many-sided humanism. The notion of many-sided or multidimensional humanism clearly affirms that human understanding about the human itself is based on a plurality of principles. At the end of the seventies Stanislavs Ladusāns decided to realise the philosophy-as-rigorous-science approach—a clear citation of Husserlian idea—and to concentrate attention on the human person within the manifold relations—providing his/her existential experience. All the system of rigorous science of many-sided humanism should be grounded on the theory of cognition. On the basis of epistemology, Ladusāns wants to build a unified picture of human existence, including the discoveries of many sciences and integrating them into multidimensional humanism through philosophy. Meanwhile the phenomenology of cognition in its final form as it is appears in the monograph *Gnosiologia Pluridimensional* (1992) was build up by Stanislavs Ladusāns during many decades. One of the first most important episodes in this process was the reinterpretation of the Thomistic concept of induction. Stanislavs Ladusāns deals with the conception of the general critical reflection by demonstrating the judgment-formation of the mind. Ladusāns holds that the sensual experience providing material contents of our knowledge displays certain *nexuses* between forms of experience, these may be transferred onto general inductive judgements. The second significant episode in the construction of system of the phenomenology of cognition is linked with the concept of “doubling-of-cognition-structure” by which the religious, spiritual experience becomes philosophically legitimate. Even in the case of religion the objective evidence comes first; it gives an opportunity to reason to ascertain about the existence of God. Stanislavs Ladusāns places phe-

© MĀRA KIOPE, 2021

nomenology of cognition or many-sided gnoseology at the corner-stone of his programme of cultural regeneration. The capacity of reason is incapable for revivification of culture—these are overestimated or underestimated—this has to be established in a truly gnoseological investigation. In the context of critics of culture and ideologies is presented Ladusāns' correspondence with Welte and Heidegger, which reveals the intensive quest for thinking about being that where characteristic of the seventies of the last century aspiring towards the grasping of the Highest Being.

*Keywords:* Stanislavs Ladusāns, many-sided gnoseology, Heidegger, Welte, phenomenology of cognition, neo-Thomism, knowledge structure.

## ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГИЯ ПОЗНАНИЯ В КОНТЕКСТЕ МНОГОСТОРОННЕГО ГУМАНИЗМА СТАНИСЛАВСА ЛАДУСАНСА

МАРА КИОПЕ

Доктор философии, профессор, ведущий исследователь.  
Институт философии и социологии, Латвийский Университет.  
LV-1940 Рига, Латвия.

E-mail: mara.kiope@lu.lv

Феноменология содержит в себе потенциал, который может быть расширен посредством разработки понятий когнитивной феноменологии. Одна из самых значительных разработок в этой области связана с именем Станиславса Ладусанса (Stanislavs Ladusāns, 1912–1993), знаменитого латвийского и бразильского философа. В статье очерчиваются ключевые моменты феноменологии познания у С. Ладусанса и демонстрируется, как его многосторонняя гносеология разрабатывалась как основание для многомерного гуманизма, нацеленного на такую трансформацию культуры, которая сделала бы ее более человеческой. Вначале феноменология познания рассматривается как основание многостороннего гуманизма. Понятие многостороннего или многомерного гуманизма явно указывает на то, что понимание человеком самого себя основано на плюрализме принципов. В конце 70-х годов С. Ладусанс принял решение реализовать проект философии как строгой науки — явная отсылка к гуссерлевской идее — и сконцентрировать внимание на человеческой личности в рамках многообразных отношений, составляющих его/ее экзистенциальный опыт. Вся система строгой науки многостороннего гуманизма должна быть основана на теории познания. На основе эпистемологии Ладусанс стремится выстроить единую картину человеческого существования, включающую открытия многих наук и интегрирующих их в многомерный гуманизм посредством философии. В то же время феноменология познания в той законченной форме, в которой она представлена в монографии *Gnosiologia Pluridimensional* (1992), разрабатывалась Ладусансом на протяжении многих десятилетий. Одним из первых важнейших эпизодов этого процесса стало перетолкование томистского понятия индукции. С. Ладусанс разрабатывает общую концепцию критической рефлексии, описывая процесс формирования суждений в сознании. Ладусанс полагает, что чувственный опыт, обеспечивающий наше знание материальным содержанием, обнаруживает определенные связи между формами опыта, которые могут быть перенесены на общие индуктивные суждения. Второй значительный эпизод в построении системы феноменологии познания связан с понятием «удвоения-структуры-познания», благодаря которому религиозный, духовный опыт становится философски легитимным. Даже в случае религии объективная очевидность

является приоритетной; она делает возможным рассуждение, удостоверяющее существование Бога. Ладусанс делает феноменологию познания, или многостороннюю гносеологию, краеугольным камнем программы культурного возрождения. Недостаточность потенциала разума для придания нового импульса культуре — недооценивается ли она или переоценивается — должна быть обоснована в подлинно гносеологическом исследовании. В контексте критики культуры и идеологии представлена переписка Ладусанса с Вельте и Хайдеггером, обнаруживающая интенсивный поиск мышления о бытии, который был характерен для 70-х годов прошедшего века, отмеченных стремлением к постижению Высшего Бытия.

*Ключевые слова:* Станиславс Ладусанс, многосторонняя гносеология, Хайдеггер, Вельте, феноменология познания, неотомизм, структура познания.

In the contemporary philosophy after the sharp criticism of the gnoseologism which subjected philosophy to a great extent to the methodological dictate of the natural sciences, unfortunately, gnoseological or cognitive research as such was pushed aside. Meanwhile phenomenology contains potential to include the development of cognitive phenomenology concepts. One of the most notable works in this area is related to the name of Stanislavs Ladusāns (Staņislavs Ladusāns, 1912–1993), the famous Latvian and Brazilian philosopher who was born in Latvia, in Zvirgzdene village, Ludza district.

Studies to become a Jesuit led him to Krakow (Poland) and to Rome in Italy. After World War II Stanislavs Ladusāns could not return to Latvia any more,—as it had been envisaged—to take up a post in the Catholic Faculty of Theology at University of Latvia. Thus he started his mission in Brasil (1946), where he became the world-wide known neo-Thomistic philosopher, especially because of the work *Many-sided gnoseology*, in which was made the synthesis of phenomenology and thomism, or even more precious to say—Ladusāns worked out original phenomenology of cognition. Indeed, as writes Latvian philosopher Maija Kūle, the history of philosophy testifies that Husserl was influenced by Brentano lectures delivered in Vienna. And his phenomenology ‘stresses aspects that are linked with the epistemological stanpoints of St. Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle, while criticizing the philosophues of Descartes and Kant’ (Kūle, 2002, 160). In his turn S.Ladusāns inaugurates his many-sided gnoseology or phenomenology of cognition approach as to a presence of the wholeness of reality in cognition, in distinction from one-sided philosophical thinking:

In its ontological configuration, the being is revealed as “light,” “transparent,” accessible, familiar. This means a realistic dialogue between the subject and the object, in which each party participates in its own way, critically justifying the classical definition of truth as an adequacy between intellect and thing (*adaequatio intellectus et rei*). It is from this follows the profound demand of the phenomenologically critical movement

of E. Husserl to return our research to the very things (*Zurück zu den Sachen selbst*), dealing with the necessity of cognition of reality in philosophy and of real problems. (Ladusāns, 1994, 97)

This article will outline the key elements of S. Ladusan's phenomenology of cognition, showing how his many-sided gnoseology was developed as the basis for multi-dimensional humanism to transform culture into a more human one.

### 1. PHENOMENOLOGY OF COGNITION AS THE GROUND OF MANY-SIDED HUMANISM

During the seventies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Stanislavs Ladusāns is tackling the philosophical problematics of many-sided humanism. In the article "Open Humanism" S. Ladusāns emphasizes that nowadays a human has become the biggest philosophical problem for himself. (Ladusāns, 1970, 15). Professor Ladusāns critically evaluates Marxism, positivism, Freud's anthropology, rationalistic idealism and structural anthropology, concluding that each of these modern humanisms or anthropological doctrines speaks about the limited components or functions of the human person underestimating complexity and multidimensionality of a person. S. Ladusāns says, that structural anthropology, for instance is focusing on deep intangible structures in human and only these mysterious structures are real and determinative for human existence. At the same time the human being remains only an abstract concept and appears to be deprived of the freedom of choice due to these structures. But a part is not the whole person, so these anthropological teachings are not true. Instead S. Ladusāns proposes an open humanism as opposed to above-mentioned "closed humanisms," which are based on narrow one-sided gnoseological theory. By this article S. Ladusāns announces his plan of building up the new kind of humanism or holistic system of anthropological knowledge.

He started to develop a methodological approach to the development of many-sided or multidimensional humanism, which differs significantly from the traditional neo-Thomistic solution as it was presented in Jacques Maritain's work *Distinguer pour unir: ou, les degrés du savoir* (1932). Maritain reiterated concept of cognition in St. Bonaventure's *The Mind's Road to God* and insisted on the priority of metaphysics in which a gnoseology or theory of cognition is included as the part. Only when the influence of Maritain on Brazilian Christian philosophy diminishes with the departure from the active intellectual life of the strictly conductor A. Lima (Alceu Amoroso Lima), the stage of this philosophy will become mobile, and now, "under the

leadership of Jesuit father Ladusāns, different opinions and mutual exchange will be allowed” (Sturm, 1989, 32).

S. Ladusāns accepts Maritain’s statement about the need for integral humanism, but in a fundamentally different way emphasizes that open, many-sided humanism should be based on an adequate theory of knowledge. Thus, he makes many-sided gnoseology (in Portuguese: *gnoseologia pluridimensional*) the theoretical basis for many-sided or multidimensional humanism. He stresses: “The anthropological doctrine depends on gnoseological or cognitive theory” (Ladusāns, 1970, 19). Characterizing the core of his philosophical research, Stanislaus Ladusāns writes:

What is the basis of this multidimensional humanism? The basis is critical realism. Phenomenologically it analyses and clearly admits as irrefutable human being’s natural cognition in all its authentic structure. [...] Philosophically it creates an organic critical thinking on human being’s recognition abilities and limits—gnoseology. (Ladusāns, 1991, 28)

The notion of many-sided or multidimensional humanism clearly affirms that understanding about the human should be based on a plurality of principles: “Human is also studied in sciences such as biology, psychology, linguistics, art and communication, which indicates that humanism or a person-centered view has more than one dimension” (Ladusāns, 1971a, 27). Thus, in order to describe a human being, one has to illuminate several dimensions, or to perform various types of measurements in unity.

At the end of the seventies Ladusāns decided to realise the philosophy-as-rigorous-science approach—a clear citation of Husserlian idea—and to concentrate attention on the human person within the manifold relations—providing his/her existential experience.

Ladusāns distinguishes four essential dimensions of human being (Ladusāns, 1988, 1) relation with oneself (in Portuguese: *dimensão intra-humana*), accentuating the honorable position of the person inasmuch as it is connected with the spiritual life; 2) relations with the values of the surrounding material world, or the over-worldly dimension (in Portuguese: *dimensão trans-mundana*); 3) relations with other human beings—always an aim and never as a means (in Portuguese: *dimensão entre-humana*); 4) and the relation of a human being with God (in Portuguese: *dimensão supra-humana*). The bases of this kind of many-sided humanism is the original philosophical conception of many-sided realism.

The vertical dimension of humanism allows one to hear that countless voices inside and outside of human proclaim the existence of God, of His beauty and greatness, and these are voices of the fragility of the world (Ladusāns, 1970, 20).

A person inevitably discovers that he/she is not self-sufficient in his/her existence, that there is no absolute autonomy of a person, but there is an uncertainty and contingency of the world, which exists but not because of any necessity. Hence, human existence points to a necessary Almighty Being, Infinite Perfection, who gives and supports the existence. Human beings have wishes that go beyond the possibilities offered by the material world; they may be realized only through intensive spiritual life. Such life praxes are accessible only in Christianity which corresponds to the existence of the soul as an immortal spiritual substance encompassed by space and time. Thus, open many-sided humanism becomes a Christian humanism, as points out Stanislaus Ladusāns (Ladusāns, 1970, 21).

Due to the limitation of the human mind God in His love helps by giving Revelation and that means that faith and reason are operating in unity, and there must be cooperation of philosophy and theology while each of them retains its autonomy. Ladusāns is convinced that the practice of open humanism will transform the world for the better.

The voices of the fragility of the world demand a comprehensive and reasoned humanism, which would strengthen the dignity of the human person in a modern mechanized world where the genuine humanism is necessary, S. Ladusāns repeats many times.

At the same time many-sided humanism should be made as synthesis of all the sciences dealing with the anthropological question. Ladusāns cites experience at a joint university conference in Washington DC where business representatives, administrative staff, social scientists, humanities and computer science researchers explored how cybernetics can promote individual and social development: “However, they did not succeed because they lacked the epistemological and metaphysical studies as basis to link all studies in a single picture” (Ladusāns, 1971b, 24). Therefore it becomes clear that all the system of rigorous science of many-sided humanism should be grounded on the theory of cognition.

In forming a unified anthropological system, S. Ladusāns accentuates the importance of the results of natural sciences—the flourishing of physics and the achievements of technologies are to be put at the service of people. Meanwhile, Ladusāns comes to the conclusion that physics is not in a position to adequately deal with any aspects of gnoseological, metaphysical kind, which is the prerogative of philosophy. This is because the problematics and the aims of physics are extremely narrow ones; they do not reach out towards the deepest foundations of reality, they are incapable to see the world as a whole. It is the specific role of philosophy—to grasp the whole of reality and to contemplate it in the light of evidence (Ladusāns, 1984).

On the basis of epistemology, Ladusāns wants to build a unified picture of human existence, including the discoveries of many sciences and integrating them into multidimensional humanism through philosophy. S. Ladusāns writes: “The epistemological study of human understanding shows that it is not so much analytical as it has a much more integral synthetic tendency. As being is one and naturally our understanding inevitably strives for unity” (Ladusāns, 1972, 27).

Therefore Stanislavs Ladusāns proclaims many-sided gnoseology or phenomenology of cognition as the ground of many-sided humanism: “The final result of critical reflection must be the formation of an integral science of the human being with a deeper dimension of humanism” (Kūle, 2002, 157).

Meanwhile the phenomenology of cognition in its final form as it appears in the monograph *Gnosiologia Pluridimensional* (Ladusāns, 1992) was build up by Stanislavs Ladusāns during many decades. One of the first most important episodes in this process was the reinterpretation of the Thomistic concept of induction.

## 2. POSSIBILITY OF UNIVERSAL EXPERIENCE: RETHINKING THOMISTIC CONCEPT OF INDUCTION

As a Jesuit Stanislavs Ladusāns intellectually was formed in the deep tradition of St. Thomas Aquinas philosophy. The young Ladusāns two years studied philosophy of Thomas Aquinas at Catholic Theological College in Riga under guidance of neo-Thomist philosopher bishop Pēteris Strods—the first Catholic Doctor of Philosophy in Latvia who had received his promotion in Innsbruck University. After two years of studies in Jesuit faculty at Krakow (*Cracoviense collegium maximum et facultas philosophica SS. Cordis Jesu*) S. Ladusāns got to know the golden generation of Roman Thomists, whose views, methodology and didactics was cultivated at Pontifical University Gregorionum (PUG) where S. Ladusāns was studying at the end of 30ies—beginning of 40ies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The role of PUG was significant for the development of neo-Thomistic philosophy, because the professors aimed at providing for the continuation of their work, and all the students and the teaching staff were living in a spatially and spiritually united community, thus ensuring daily communication. The professorial corpus had developed specific kind of philosophical didactics, a method of teaching—their text-books are well-structured, they are characterized by clarity and the analyzed texts are argued in the manner of classical philosophical texts by way of exposition of definite theses.

The school includes such figures as Carlo Boyer—critic of the theory of evolution and specialist on ecumenical problematics, Pawel Siwek—methaphysical psychology,

Paolo Dezza, who is investigating the roots of the teaching of Thomas Aquinas and specific questions of ontology and Christian philosophy. Professor Peter Hoenen—specialist on natural sciences, doctor of physics, who was first to see the incapacity of the “old”, 19th century scholastics to philosophically deal with the theory of relativity and the quantum physics. Hoenen undertook a fundamental and extensive revision of the philosophical approach to natural sciences by way of conjoining of the latest empirical data with the principles of Thomistic metaphysics.

At the end of the thirties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Ladusāns was advised to study—alongside his University courses—at the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas in Rome. Several professors of *Gregoriana* were members of the Pontifical Academy. In 1938 Ladusāns hands in his promotional work *De principii causalitatis origine et veritate*—“About the Origin of the Principle of Causality and Truth.” The work is selected for competitive grading and obtains the First Prize. The chief part of the investigation is drawn from Thomistic metaphysics and epistemology within the context of modern philosophy—much in the same way as he had been taught by his professors.

Stanislavs Ladusāns conceives of the objectivity of the principle within the outer and inner experience, making special reference to the ability of humans to distinguish in his/her reflection the connections of causality, because these connections exist in the real world. The spontaneous ability of humans to apprehend the truth makes it possible for the reason to discriminate between relations existing in things and the images of the mind as reflections of the epistemological faculty of imagination. Thus the principle of objectivity requires a certain cooperation between the outer and inner experience, for the principle of causality is not a pure construction of reason; it is the result of the natural human cognitive capacity to inquire into the truth concerning the causal ties existing between things, based as it is on the understanding of causality existing in the mind (Ladusāns, 1937).

At the same time PUG Thomistic philosophy school postered also the development of Thomistic transcendentalism, activated by Joseph Marèchal—a Belgian jesuit. Marèchal maintains that a synthesis is possible between the Kantian transcendentalism and Thomism in a way leading towards realism concerning the objectivity of cognition, by way of investigation of the activity of the cognitive process. The Jesuit philosophers are attentive towards Marèchallian impulses, at least in order to test the extent of the compatibility of Kantian and Thomistic epistemologies. One of the leading specialists of the history of philosophy studies, particularly with regard to the comparativistics of Kantian and Thomistic views is professor Aloise Naber S.J. who was the research advisor of Ladusāns’ doctoral dissertation. The presentation of his dissertation on November 25, 1946 earns him *Magna cum laude* mark. Ladusāns held



that the teaching of Kant serves as a key for all modern philosophy, while still considering that the metaphysics and epistemology of St. Thomas should become actualized within modern philosophical cogitation. Therefore the theme of his doctoral dissertation was a comparativistic one—“The intelligibility of senses in the early works of Kant and in the thoughts of Thomas Aquinas” (Ladusāns, 1946). By generally assessing the place of this dissertation in the development of Ladusāns’ views, one may say that it served as the bases for the formation of his original noetic conception of Thomistic induction worked out in the fifties and sixties, that ranked Ladusāns among the leading Brazilian Thomistic philosophers (Campos, 1968, 173; Severino, 2000, 7).

Stanislavs Ladusāns deals with the conception of the general critical reflection by demonstrating the judgment-formation of the mind (Ladusāns, 1955; Ladusāns, 1962). Recognizing Aquinas’ gnoseology as more complete than Bacon’s gnoseology, Ladusāns adds that it binds philosophers’ attention to the “phenomenological part that substantiates noethical theses” (Ladusāns, 1963, 44). In other words, Aquinas’ philosophical solutions made a description of what is happening in thinking: “Phenomenological analysis reveals two operations of the intellect or mind: abstraction and reflection, and they gradually leads to the judgment, which is formal housing of the Truth” (Ladusāns, 1963, 46).

The judgements do not arise out of conceptional abstractions, but through apprehension of the act of being. To follow the course of professor Ladusāns’s thought, it must be remembered that according to the classical cognitive theory of Aquinas Thomas, the gradual phenomenalization of things or the departure from the senses through the various structures or faculties of cognition to the soul as a recipient of impression, the intellect or mind performs in a simple apprehension (*simplex apprehensio*), in which the mind knows some essence (*quidditas*), but nothing can be judged on the perceived content. To be able to do that, “our mind critically reflects. This is a natural and automatic activity of our mind” (Ladusāns, 1963, 47).

Critical reflection ensures the transition of the mind to judgment, because in it, the mind determines whether

one or another essence that we perceive as the concept is, or at least may be, and thus the result of a judgment is the allegation, or reveals that one or another essence does not exist, nor can it exist, thus leading to denial of the judgment. (Ladusāns, 1963, 46)

Thus, it becomes clear that reason, intellect tending towards the truth is measuring the experienced essence contained in the concept with one’s own apprehension or intuition.

The original Thomistic solution of the problem of induction is to be found in the possibility of the judgements of the intellect to move over from certainty about a particular thing on to a certain judgement about a thing unknown.

Ladusāns holds that the sensual experience providing material contents of our knowledge displays certain *nexuses* between forms of experience, these may be transferred onto general inductive judgements. “The form informs the matter” (Hoenen, 1954, 57) which is to mean that things contain formal relational ties which are accessible to reason. The manifold elements of the contents acquired by the mind through sensual experience are very concrete, indeed; they are univocal and contingent or transient; and therefore one has to admit, that the mind provides us with the knowledge of particular cases. At the same time, reason offers an universal dimension, or the ability of understanding of the permanent qualities by discovering the formal ties or *nexuses* between forms. Thus “the apprehended connections of the forms is characterized by that kind of necessity, that provides us with understandability, comprehensibility, evidence and the revelation of the true forms” (Ladusāns, 1963, 48).

Thus Ladusāns emphasizes that induction is original and unique source of knowledge of the truth, because induction is also able to provide the first and the unprovable principles of the mind: if the senses are quite well developed, one case is sufficient for a person having experience to understand the regularity.

Meanwhile in the study of the laws of nature many cases are needed, many experiments, while providing well-chosen and organized cases, which guide the mind to make discovery “at a happy moment.” The mind judges because it sees the need for formal ties or *nexuses*. But in order to check out that established formal link is real, it works with the senses that provide a connection to reality.

Surely induction does not preclude deduction, which, based on judgments obtained by induction, extends horizons of knowledge. In short conclusion: due to induction as it is understood in Thomistic way the human mind is able to judge about the adequacy of the apprehended thing and the judgment, i.e. about the Truth.

The main factor in this cognitive process is the full reflexion (*reflexio completa*) as

our mind is not naive, it cognizes a thing, but it also cognizes the cognitive process itself and is able to accurately determine, evaluate whether the explored one corresponds to the existing one or not—this is a phenomenological data. (Ladusāns, 1994, 68–69)

Thus, the notion of total reflection, which phenomenologically describes the mind’s ability to know formal connections in a perceived case, further ensures that using a phenomenological description it is possible to interpret a phenomenon while maintaining the Thomistic basic assertion that it ‘carries with it’ the thing. Thus a phenomenological declaration is formed from the analysis of consciousness, revealing the undeniable and undoubtedly data. Only then, moving logically further, the philosopher can solve problems of an ontological nature (Ladusāns, 1994, 26).

Besides the solution of problem of induction is embodied in the cultural context of the epoch—Ladusāns was particularly attentive to the plans of theological renewal proposed by Bernhard Lonergan, S.J. Ladusāns was “the first one to write on Lonergan’s ideas in Portuguese language” (Alencar, 2010, 116). In 1957 Lonergan had published an impressive philosophical work *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* executed in the manner of transcendental Thomism. The object of this work was the discovery of the normative methods of human cognition, so as to fully grasp the reality by our reason. This problematics is of great interest to both Lonergan and to Ladusāns, because theology nowadays is no longer a deductive but an empirical branch of knowledge; it is scientific, not in the same sense, however, as the natural sciences are. The daily experience of modern people requires explanation within the context of the traditional theological concepts. The empirically experienced facts may be legitimately integrated within the science of theology.

Actually the original reinterpretation of the Thomistic noethics of induction by Stanislaus Ladusāns opens the perspective of transcendentalism in its fullness because the possibility of experience is rediscovered as the possibility of unity of inner and outer experience, i.e. universal experience. This allows the phenomenology to be a transformative factor of the society.

### 3. PHENOMENOLOGY AS A TRANSFORMATIVE FACTOR OF CULTURE

Stanislaus Ladusāns was engaged in the work of managing of the processes of the integration of philosophical culture, which so far had proved beyond the powers of one philosopher or even a group of philosophers and theologians. The synthesis of the new-type of many-sided humanism required the possession of a wide spectrum of mathematically-experimental and technical knowledge. It required the data of other sciences, so as to engage in the research on the human being in modern world.

This type of work was accessible within the precincts of a single organisation—SBFC (*Sociedade Brasileira de Filósofos Católicos*—Society of Catholic Philosophers of Brazil) It was founded by Ladusāns and was uniting many scientists of various fields in the spheres of philosophy and theology. This provided the base for dialogue between the philosophy and the over-technicized world—on the one hand, and the philosophy and the Divine Revelation—on the other. The end result would be the birth of a new, comprehensive systematized body of knowledge, corresponding to the demands of the modern epoch for fostering of the general development of individuals and nations.

Intention of SBFC thinkers is expressed by one of them in the phenomenology of the Christian spirituality, using texts by St. Paul, Augustine, John of the Cross,

and Ignatius of Loyola. The author points out that phenomenology is the assignment of the value of philosophy (in Portuguese: *valorização filosófica*) to religious experience in human cognition. Man has always had a need to think in absolute concepts and in infinite dimensions, because the revelation of the divine presence in a person's self-knowledge is a phenomenon which is given to understanding. The mind creates universe as a system of values arranged in relation to The Highest Value or *Summum Bonum*. So on the exploration of the evaluative activity of the mind it is possible to develop a philosophy of values (Rodrigues, 1972, 12–18).

It was a unique event—The First International Week of Philosophy in São Paulo in 1972. This congress fostered the apprehension of the need of philosophy on a national level and served for universal development of the Brazilian society. It brought together representatives of various philosophical schools of Brazil, who came to better appreciate their scholarly fields. The conceptual basis of the Congress was concerned with value problematics, the role of values for the change of being. The values are based in being, yet their specific distinction is connected with the capacity to produce a new ontological order, new ethical social and juridical order. The production of values means the creation of a new order of being; this is to be taken to mean, that the creation of values is designed to produce a better, more humane reality. Portuguese philosopher Enes resuming the impressions from this event reports, that Brazilian philosophers want to create an ontologically existential understanding of the human in society, “they try to realize the mission of Protection of Being in the political system at a time of technical, economic and the rapid growth of social benefits” (Enes, 1972, 410). In the opening speech of the event its main organizer and the president of SBFC professor Ladusâns emphasizes:

Philosophy is what invites people to think seriously and deeply about the big issues in our lives and activities, in all the modern culture. Philosophy is one that is able to explain and offer solutions to various torturous questions: about the meaning of life and death, about the meaning of good and evil, about the basis of values, about the dignity and rights of the human person, about the relationship between cultural and spiritual heritage, about suffering, about injustice, about oppression, about violence, about love, about natural order and disorder, about education, about authority, about freedom, about the meaning of history and progress, about the mystery that covers our lives and is behind the solution of these issues—about God, His existence, His personal character and His providence. (Ladusâns, 1974a, 35)

In the working group, which deals with the problems of cognition philosophers present phenomenological researches on cognition, showing how Husserl's method of philosophy as a rigorous science can be turned to justify the understanding of a

particular historical reality and the creation of a unified human metaphysics that integrates the achievements of different sciences. Ladusāns in the report “Phenomenology of the Dynamics of the Intentionality of Cognition” (Ladusāns, 1974b, 311–321) outlines the concept of the doubling of the cognitive structure in internal experience:

The cognitive subject has a composite unit consisting of sensory experience, abstraction, reflection, and judgment. The structure of human cognition is in relation to the reality of the senses. It results in a diversity of inner data, objects of intellectual consciousness, which in us turn into different kinds of inner experiences that are able to create a new series of abstractions, reflections and judgments. Noetic judgments are born in the reflection on the cognitive nature of intellect or understanding. [...] Thus the unified dynamic structure of our cognition is repeated on another plate: as an inner experience, a corresponding abstraction, a subsequent reflection and judgment. (Ladusāns, 1974b, 320–321)

However, we now have before our eyes the second significant episode in the construction of system of the phenomenology of cognition. As mentioned above, the reinterpretation of the concept of the Thomistic induction justified the possibility of a universal experience as linking internal and external experiences. Now with the concept of “doubling-of-cognition-structure” religious, spiritual experience becomes philosophically legitimate.

Later professor Ladusāns in *Gnoseologia Pluridimensional* (Ladusāns, 1992) chooses for the starting point of such a gnoseological approach the natural spontaneity, and the naturally critical stance of human cognition. The deepest impulses of the cognitive processes and gnoseological initiative are born out of the general human yearning towards happiness. The general gnoseological inspection reveals the tendency of the human spirit to ascertain the real worth of the cognitive results obtained by reason and the senses. Here professor Ladusāns makes use of the previously mentioned understanding of the total or full reflection by way of postulating of the double-kind knowledge of the “I,” i.e. “I know that I know—this is the kind of apprehension concerning the knowledge of the truth!”

Gnoseological method is reflexive, because each person introspectively “looking inside oneself” reads in his/her intellectual experience. What is *given* there—in other words—becomes conscious of the innermost acts and of the subject holding them together—the “I.” Phenomenological declaration gives an opportunity to describe the natural structure of the acquiring of knowledge received through introspection. S. Ladusāns offers a substantial improvement of the inner-evidential phenomenology by way of introducing of the concept of the doubling of the cognitive structure. The dynamic structure of the cognitive process tends to repeat itself, yet the *doubling* of

the same takes place not on the bases of outer experience, but on that of the inner one. Critical assessment of both forms of experience undertaken by reason results in judgement. Thus, by considering the process of cognition as a genesis of ontological judgements, Ladusāns offers the leading role to the objective evidence with which the intellect or reason becomes compatible in an obvious manner. Thus the objective evidence is the chief criterion of truth.

Even in the case of religion the objective evidence comes first; it gives an opportunity to reason to ascertain about the existence of God. As the next step—the evidence of faith becomes involved. The objective evidence lies at the bases of the new humanism or science about the human being, for “the philosophy of the human being will be truly wholesome only when it will become consonant with the measure of the truth of reason—with the things themselves, the objective evidence” (Ladusāns, 1994, 34). The result of the question of happiness is a practical one—the human being in following the voice of conscience performs choices and acts to deepen the unity with the Highest Good. In doing good things a human being acquires peace.

Further, in nineties of the XX century Ladusāns will begin work on “Philosophy of Religion,” the second volume of the gnoseological trilogy in which he will develop a phenomenological declaration on the data of inner experience that underlies man’s natural religion, on which the supernatural Christian religion is lied down. But he does not complete the volume. After returning from six months of lecturing work in Latvia, he died in July, 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Meanwhile the written but unfinished manuscript (Ladusāns, 1996) was published in Riga Major Seminary Publishing House after the death of the famous author.

Ladusāns accentuates the fact that the human spiritual yearnings provide the passage from human nature onto the Highest Being. Ladusāns discusses six yearnings characteristic of the human nature, leading onto the Highest Being, thus providing a solution to the lack of self-assertedness of the human being. These are the following: human natural yearning towards happiness and towards God as the Highest Good; human yearning towards the wholeness of all-embracing reality and towards God as the Infinite Reality; human yearning towards unity of all—and towards God as the Highest Unity; human yearning towards the fullness of truth, and towards God as the Foundation of all Truth; human yearning towards the beautiful, and towards God as the Supreme Beauty. These five transcending natural yearning are to be supplemented by a sixth one—the sense of moral obligation in conscience, exerting to do good and to beware of the evil. The natural principles engraved in human nature offer an opportunity to achieve union with God. Ladusāns metaphysically defines these principles of the human nature, these five powerful yearnings—towards reality, unity, truth, the

good and the beautiful—as being *re-ligious*, i.e.—being of such a kind that they form an act of *religizing* or re-connecting of a human person with God (Ladusāns, 1996).

Research and organizational endeavours of professor Ladusāns are noteworthy as evidence of promoting of the philosophical culture, which is based on phenomenology of cognition as a transformative factor of the human society and culture.

In 1972 the Christian philosophers from several Latin American countries, taking a cue from Father Stanislavs Ladusāns' exemplary work of SBFC, established in Brazil during the Eight Congress of Philosophy an American Catholic Association (ALAFAC). In 1978 Stanislavs Ladusāns in the capacity of the President reorganizes it into Inter-American Philosophical Catholic Association (*Associação Católica Inter-americana de Filosofia*, ACIF). This organization becomes a platform for the intellectual renewal and development of Latinamerican Christian intellectual community, fostering the development of a new type of Christian philosophy attentively listening to the experience of present-day human persons.

Remarkable are Ladusāns' administrative efforts, including several journeys to Europe, USA and Canada in preparation for the First World Congress of Christian Philosophy in Argentina in 1979. This was connected with the centenary of the publication of the encyclic by Pope Leo XIII *Aeternis patris* dealing with philosophy of saint Thomas Aquinas. The Congress revealed the Christian philosophy, including phenomenology of mystic life, “as a mean for the solving of the most essential of human problems, which was unattainable for materialism, pragmatism, secularism and pseudopluralism” (Caturelli, 1980, 15).

S. Ladusāns' conceptual and managerial efforts were essential also for the holding of subsequent world congresses of Christian Philosophy in Monterrey, México (1986), Quito, Ecuador (1986), Lima, Peru (1990). The last congress with the managerial participation of S. Ladusāns began to be organized in Lublin, Poland with the view of uniting the activities of the post-soviet Eastern European thinkers. But this didn't happen because of the decease of professor Ladusāns.

Another aspect of Ladusāns' work in the mid-seventies is concerned with the organization of an independent institute of philosophical research in São Paulo. The name of the institute *Conjunto de Pesquisa Filosofica* (CONPEFIL) may best be translated as Union of philosophical Research. S. Ladusāns was the Director of the Institution and it became one of the centres for the development of philosophy in Brazil. In the opinion of historians of philosophy, the “Brazilian philosophical culture witnesses speedy development in the 20<sup>th</sup> century because philosophical research was mainly carried outside the Universities—it took place at independent institutions like that of CONPEFIL” (Rodríguez, 1993, 11).

S. Ladusāns places phenomenology of cognition or many-sided gnoseology at the corner-stone of his programme of cultural regeneration. The capacity of reason is incapable for revigoration of culture—these are overestimated or underestimated—this has to be established in a truly gnoseological investigation:

Cultural drama has arisen due to the oblivion of the content of gnoseology. Disruptive in modern culture is a phenomenon of pure subjectivism, relativism and skepticism, which excludes from reality either the conscious subject or the object of cognition. Culture has forgotten its own foundation—objective evidence. (Ladusāns, 1993a, 42)

Ladusāns points out that the notion of culture is analogical—that “culture” is equivocally formed and subjectively experienced act of the inner spiritual culture of the person. Human life and culture derive from the condition, habits and aspirations of human soul. Equivocal designation means that the inner culture, the spiritual life is attributively used with reference to various manifestations of spirit, to forms of artistic expression, etc.—which bear the name of “culture.” By cultivating one’s inner life, the immortal life of the soul, “a person reaches such a level of critical competency that allows to evaluate and to produce new forms of culture” (Ladusāns, 1993a, 35). The many-sided spiritual culture provides for personal and national elevation to a much higher level of fullness—reaching the status of love. However, a person is incapable of reaching such a task on his own; one needs the cooperation with God. The individual person and a nation has to open up within the spiritual self-identity in the culture of love, so as to reach an increasing *pulsation* of culture, in order to take a stand against the unhuman ideology-saturated philosophy of modernity and post-modernity.

4. PHILOSOPHICAL SELF-PORTRAIT AS AN EXPRESSION OF  
THE ORIGINAL INTENTIONALITY OF LIFE.  
CORRESPONDENCE WITH MARTIN HEIDEGGER AND BERNHARD WELTE

The philosophical and administrative efforts of Ladusāns—as stressed even by the representatives of the youngest generation of Brazilian philosophers (Netto, 2013)—was an essential contribution to the philosophical self-identification of the Brazilian nation. The Brazilian philosophy “has independealy arrived at the understanding of the problematics of inter-subjectivity; it holds that ‘another ‘I’ is not ‘my world’ and that ‘my world’ is to be complemented by drawing upon ‘the Other’” (Selvaggi, 1988, 19).

In the context of the Brazilian striving for their genuine identity also in philosophy, S. Ladusāns’ investigation (Ladusāns, 1976a) still remains one of the main



sources in history of philosophy in Brazil. Ladusāns has produced a system of research methods, consisting of short questions aimed at the philosophical professional so as to sketch his own self-portrait. It includes the exposition of the significance of philosophy for Brazilian society and the methods of philosophical cogitation. The questions of the interview do not require definitely formalized answers; “the main thing is—to stimulate the spontaneity, to produce ones own self-portrait in all sincerity, and to establish lively and truthful communication with the reader” (Ladusāns, 1971c, 24). In the monograph S. Ladusāns has included self-portraits of 27 Brazilian philosophers. The most important achievement of S. Ladusāns is the establishment of the identity of Brazilian philosophical professionals, of urging them to change the situation whereby they used to position themselves exclusively as against European thinkers and proposing to reflectively analyse the real situation in Brazil. The intentional union of philosopher with reality as against a description performed by others is the sole source of true and fruitful thinking (Ladusāns, 1971c, 17).

This offers an opportunity to describe the level of originality of Brazilian philosophy. Ladusāns accentuates the fact that originality is connected with way of life and the intellectual activity of the thinker; these take place within a particular cultural context on the bases of a particular kind of experience stimulating specific philosophical problematization. The originality of a philosophy does not necessarily have to be related to some new intellectual content, but it is enough if an idea or work is the author’s personal, creative, self-conscious, full of life and responsible creature: “The novelty of the act [of the intentionality of life] is a necessary precondition to describe it as original. It is in this sense that the present-day Brazilian philosophical thinking is original” (Ladusāns, 1977a, 62).

S. Ladusāns also intends to create a collection of philosophical self-portraits of contemporary German thinkers.

Ladusāns’ correspondence with Heidegger reveals the intensive quest for thinking about being that where characteristic of the seventies of the last century aspiring towards the grasping of the Highest Being. Ladusāns started the correspondence with Martin Heidegger with the letter to Bernhard Welte—philosopher and theologian, a specialist on Heideggerian teaching of the Freiburg University—Welte became an intermediary for Ladusāns’ contacts with Heidegger. Bernhard Welte writes in a letter to Martin Heidegger dated by July 23, 1973:

Today I would like to write You about the request of Brazilian friends. I have been asked several times to address you by Father Ladusāns, S. J. from Sao Paulo in Brazil. At first I was dismissive, but now I would like to do it. Mr. Ladusāns asks You for a short philosophical autobiography. Mr. Ladusāns wants to publish it in an anthology of modern

philosophy. Of course, I do not want You to be bothered by this request. I can assure You that Brazil, like other Latin American countries, still has a genuine interest in Your thinking. You can't talk there about the post-Heidegger era. In this regard, what You would write would probably benefit and hopefully fall into fertile soil. (Welte, 1973, 33)

Bernhard Welte continues the letter revealing that in the spring semester, which was the last at his official university post, he once again chaired a seminar on Heidegger's thinking, on the question of the metaphysical God. He writes that during the seminar he has revised some of its previous views obviously having in the mind his article on the issue (Welte, 1971).

In his reply about the philosophical self-portrait Heidegger admits that, because of his age, he wants to save energy and will not be able to comply with Father Ladusāns request. But the solution could be if Ladusāns would be offered the recently published monograph of Walter Biemel on Heidegger (Heidegger, 1973). Joaquín Silva comments that Jesuit father Ladusāns with perseverance which is worthy of spiritual son of Ignatius of Loyola—via Welte—repeated this request to Heidegger over and over again. However, Heidegger was even more persistent than Ladusāns and repeatedly refused this request (Silva, 2008, 341).

A year after this correspondence Welte in a letter to Heidegger again mentions Ladusāns' request:

There is a hitch. Father Staņislavs Ladusāns, S. J. of São Paulo in Brazil is very persistent. I think, that he has a valid reason. He is not satisfied with Biemel's small and interesting compilation, he wants that You yourself would say some words about Your way of thinking. He insists that I would visit you with a tape recorder, and then You could give your answers. The questions are written. I don't know if You will not get tired of it and I do not want to force you on anything. I just want clear and unambiguous indications in respect to Ladusāns' request. I would add that, of course, I would be very happy if I could prepare such an interview with You. (Welte, 1974, 36)

Martin Heidegger answers that

unfortunately I am even more persistent than Father Ladusāns. I definitely appreciate his interest very much. But for years I have been refusing any interviews about my thinking. But this fall I have found a perfectly valid substitute: this is your text and your art of co-thinking with me. [...] P.S. Please, greet Father Ladusāns from me. (Heidegger, 1974, 34)

So Martin Heidegger fully relying on Bernhard Welte's interpretations, suggested Welte's article summarizing the last seminar at the University about the question of God in Heidegger's thought as a worthy equivalent of his own self-portrait. Later Welte confirms that he has sent this text to Father Ladusāns: "This was done, and

so I appear, so to speak, as Heidegger's representative in that book in Brazil" (Welte, 1982, 86). Unfortunately the book has never been published.

It should be noted, however, that Ladusāns and Welte were close each to other as thinkers, as they were brought together by the conviction that philosophy must be able to help modern man to discover God in his inner experience. Andrzej Wiercinski in his analysis writes:

Heidegger's philosophy was for Welte paradigmatic for a new attempt to convincingly and credibly (*glaubhaft*) proclaim the Christian faith to a contemporary human being. One of the main concerns for Welte was to express the permanent legitimacy of the Christian message in the language of the contemporary believer. He situates the human being in the horizon of transcendence. Therefore, the human search for God means also a quest for self-understanding. The horizon of faith is the *locus theologicus*, in which, while experiencing God in the act of faith, a human being reaches to the depth of one's very existence. (Wiercinski, 2010, 3)

Bernhard Welte publishes the article about Martin Heidegger's thought on ideologies in the collective monograph in Brazil (Welte, 1977b, 99–114). It was S. Ladusāns' conceptional leadership realised in the Research Courses which he later elaborated in the collective monograph *Partly and All-Embracing Thinking* (Ladusāns, 1977b). In the Introduction of the collective monograph S. Ladusāns clarifies the title of the volume. The notion of partial thinking (in Portuguese: *pensamento parcial*) is to be referred to ideology which narrows down the horizon of the reality and turns it into a totalitarian norm of world outlook. In contrast—all embracing or total thinking (in Portuguese: *pensamento total*) refers to philosophy, that is, according to its nature, opened for the total reality; it offers judgement within the perspective of objective evidence. It transcends, extols and illuminates the partial meanings and senses within the context of being. Thus philosophical thinking is a mean of standing in opposition to the destructive influence of modern culture and ideologies (Ladusāns, 1977b, 11)

In 1980 Welte sent to Ladusāns his book *Der Weg meines Denken* as his philosophical self-portrait, and Ladusāns signs the replay letter with the words "Friend in Christ" (Ladusāns, 1980). In a letter Ladusāns asks Welte himself to interpret what is his conception of philosophy, what is his conception of theology and what is the logical connection between the two, as well as he asks about the specifics of atheism and secularism in Europe, about Welte's view of Latin American Catholicism, and asks Welte to write a testimony about Martin Heidegger. Welte writes in the reply letter, that

there is no explanation for my philosophical concept, nor is there any explanation for the theological concept, therefore there is no logical integration of the two disciplines. I don't think it would even be appropriate today. Because the both—philosophy and theology

and their interrelationships are facing big changes that will drag on for a long time. [...] However, I have often thought about the relationship between philosophy and theology and have also often spoken out in this regard. However, it seems superfluous to repeat it again, because I said what I had to say in the article *Die Wesensstruktur der Theologie als Wissenschaft in Auf der Spur des Ewigen*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, S. 351–365. In addition, three articles can be read in the same volume: *Die Philosophie in der Theologie*, S. 366–379, *Zum Strukturwandel der katholischen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, S. 380–409 and *Ein Vorschlag zur methode der Theologie heute*, S. 410–428. I have also written reflections on the philosophy of history: *Krisis der dogmatischen Christus-aussagen* in the volume *Zeit und Geheimnis*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1975, S. 292–318. I cannot say more about this important topic. (Welte, 1980)

In response to Ladusāns' question about European atheism, what it is and how to overcome it, Welte writes that he has recently published a short book about it: *Vom Licht des Nichts*, Patmos-Verlag, 1980. Welte highly appreciates the contribution of Latin American Christians to Catholicism, which is 'especially true of popular piety.' Regarding to the question for more details about Martin Heidegger, Welte responds, that "I have already done that too" in the article "God in Martin Heidegger's Thinking" in the volume *Zeit und Geheimnis*, S. 258–282. This article was authorized by Heidegger himself, and in addition, it is possible to read 'what I said at Heidegger's tomb' in 1976 (Welte, 1977a). "I think you already know all that," Welte writes in a letter to Ladusāns, "they are published in *Erinnerungen an Martin Heidegger*, Pfullingen, 1977." And he continues:

Dear Mister Ladusāns, if you want anything from all of the above so to translate and publish it, then I'm completely agree with and I will make it all available to you. [...] But I cannot make any new reflections on these points in the near future. (Welte, 1980)

In discussing the question about the nature of Christian philosophy Ladusāns refers to "an actor"—the person who engages in the process of thinking—the Christian intellectual whose natural philosophical activity is intertwined with supernatural faith. Thus the unification of Christian Revelation and philosophical reflection within a single personal experience is logically possible and even necessary for complete apprehension of reality. Faith is not an obstacle for philosophical reflection as it had been held by rationalist philosophers; faith stimulates cognitive activity. Why?

Ladusāns' answer is that, first of all faith does not impinge on the natural capacities of reason—these are free to be developed in all sorts of ways. Secondly—philosophy substantiates its propositions on the bases of evidence, not in Revelation, as it is done by theology. The role of faith in philosophical contemplation is supra-natural help in solving philosophical problems. Ladusāns points out that supra-natural vir-

tues—such as faith, love, hope are in a state of regular interaction. The virtues facilitate the capability of rational cogitation *in ordine exercitii*—by way of stimulation. Ladusāns characterizes Christian philosophy as a kind of cogitation born out of a living interaction with faith (Ladusāns, 1993b).

Ladusāns' philosophy is ontological, for he views cognitive process as an apprehension of the inner structure of reality.

Philosophy opens up to the rationality of Christian Revelation so as to answer questions that are unaccessible to pure reason within its own limitations. Thus, for example, reason is not capable of providing an answer to the burning question about the last things (*ta eschata*)—neither on individual (personalized) nor universal—concerning the whole of humanity—level. This makes it imperative to engage Christian Revelation within philosophical reflection. Thus offering the vision and the consummation of the development of human life and of the whole historical process, providing answers for the absolute ends.

## REFERENCES

- Alencar, F. L. (2010). A encíclica Aeterni Patris e o movimento de restauração da filosofia tomista. *The Chesterton Review*, 2 (1), 107–134.
- Campos, F. A. (1968). *Tomismo e neotomismo no Brasil*. São Paulo: Editorial Grijalbo LTDA, 1968.
- Caturelli, A. (1980). Antecedentes del Primer congreso mundial de Filosofia cristiana. In *Sociedad Catolica Argentina de Filosofia. La Filosofia del Cristiano, Hoy. Vetera novis augere et perficere. Primer Congreso mundial de filosofia cristiana. Cordoba, 21–28 octubre 1979* (13–30). Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba.
- Enes, J. (1972). Semana internacional de filosofia (São Paulo, Brasil). *Didaskalia*, 2 (2), 409–411.
- Heidegger, M. (1973). An Bernhard Welte, 28. Juli 1973. In *Martin Heidegger. Bernhard Welte. Briefe und Begegnungen* (34). Klett-Cotta.
- Heidegger, M. (1974). An Bernhard Welte, 13. August 1974. In *Martin Heidegger. Bernhard Welte. Briefe und Begegnungen* (34). Klett-Cotta.
- Hoenen, P. I. S. (1954). *De Noetica geometriae. Origine theoriae cognitionis. Analecta Gregoriana, vol. LXIII. Series Facultatis Philosophicae. Sectio A (n.5)*. Romae: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorinae.
- Kūle, M. (2002). *Phenomenology and Culture*. Riga: University of Latvia.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1937). *De principii causalitatis origine et veritate*. In *Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI). Inventario della Nuova Campagna. Parte Ia. Opera Nostrorum* 1181.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1946). *L'intelligibile nel sensibile secondo i primi scritti di Kant e nell'insegnamento dell'Aquinate*. Roma: PUG.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1955). Resposta a uma Tese Marxista. In *II Congresso Brasileiro de Filosofia (Curitiba, 1953)*. São Paulo: Brasil.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1962). Aspectos gnosiológicos da indução. In *Anais do Quarto Congresso Nacional de Filosofia* (459–475). São Paulo: Fortaleza IBF.

- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1963). Dažas gnozeoloģiskas refleksijas par indukciju. In *H. Biezais (Ed.), Ieskatītais un atzītais* (35–54). Stockholm: Daugava.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1970). Atklātais humānisms. *Dzeive*, 3, 14–19.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1971a). Aspectos Humanísticos da Ciência. Juízo crítico-constructivo sobre o Simpósio da Bienal. *Estudos. Revista de filosofia e cultura da Associação de professores católicos de Porto Alegre*. R. G. S., XXXI, (1), 27–29.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1971b). Função integrante da filosofia hoje. Algumas reflexões comemorando o primeiro aniversário da Sociedade Brasileira de Filósofos Católicos. *Estudos. Revista de Filosofia e cultura da Associação de professores católicos de Porto Alegre*. R. G. S., XXXI, 1, 22–33.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1971c). Introdução II do Prof. Pe. Vice-diretor da Faculdade de Filosofia Nossa Senhora Medianeira, Diretor Geral da Biblioteca Manoel da Nóbrega, Idealizador e Diretor da Coleção de Auto-Retratos Filosóficos Brasileiros. In *Buggenhagen, Arnold von. Autobiografia filosófica. Contribuições ao inquérito do professor Dr. padre Stanislavs Ladusāns sobre a situação filosófica no país. Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de São José do Rio Preto, Estado de São Paulo* (17–27). São Paulo: Brasil.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1972). Integração de Valores. *Estudos. Revista de Filosofia e cultura da Associação de professores católicos de Porto Alegre* — R. G. S., XXXII, 123, 25–34.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1974a). Discurso de abertura da semana pronunciado pelo Presidente da Sociedade Brasileira de Filósofos Católicos, no dia 16 julho de 1972 na Câmara Municipal de São Paulo, local da realização da I.ª Semana Internacional de Filosofia. In *Sociedade Brasileira de Filósofos Católicos. Humanismo Pluridimensional. Atas de Primeira semana internacional de Filosofia. Primeiro Volume* (29–40). São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1974b). Faculdade da Filosofia N. a S. a Medianeira, São Paulo, Brasil. Fenomenologia do dinamismo intencional do conhecimento. In *Sociedade Brasileira de Filósofos Católicos. Humanismo Pluridimensional. Atas de Primeira semana internacional de Filosofia. Primeiro Volume* (311–321). São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1976a). Idealizador e Diretor da Coleção. In *Rumos da Filosofia Atual no Brasil em auto-retratos. Primeiro volume*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1977a). Originalidade do Atual Desenvolvimento Filosófico Brasileiro. In *Filosofia e desenvolvimento. Atas da III Semana internacional de filosofia realizada na cidade de Salvador, BA de 17 a 23 de julho de 1976. Vol. 1* (62–79). Rio de Janeiro: Ed. americana.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1977b). *Pensamento parcial e total. Primeiro Volume da Série Investigações filosóficas de atualidade*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1977b). Apresentação. In *Pensamento parcial e total. Primeiro Volume da Série Investigações filosóficas de atualidade* (9–16). São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1980). Epist. Sao Paulo, 20.03.1980 — B. Welte. In *Foundation of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Institut für SystematischeTheologie*. São Paulo.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1984). *Uma reflexão final integrante*. Integração final das pesquisas do 15º colóquio filosófico internacional, realizado de 23 a 29 de Julho de 1984. Private Archive of Staņislavs Ladusāns, SJ, unnumurated document.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1988). *Atualização do presente curriculum, feita no dia 12 de Janeiro de 1988*. Private Archive of Staņislavs Ladusāns, SJ, unnumurated document.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1991) Dabiskā reliģija kā filozofiskā saistība ar Dievu. In *Filozofija un teoloģija. Rakstu krājums. Vispasaules latviešu zinātnieku kongress* (27–31). Riga: LZA Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1992). Membro da Pontificia Academia Romana de Santo Tomás de Aquino, presidente da Associação Católica Interamericana da Filosofia — ACIF. In *Gnosiologia Pluridimen-*

- sional. *Fenomenologia do Conhecimento e Gnosiologia Crítica Geral*. 1.o volume da *Trilogia Gno-siológica*. 8.o volume da *Coleção do Conjunto de Pesquisa Filosófica (CONPEFIL) Investigações Filosóficas da Atualidade*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1993a). Cultura e filosofia cristã ou filosofia cristã da cultura. *Veritas. Revista da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul*, 38 (149), 35–50.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1993b). Kristīgā filozofija. In *Svētais Akvīnas Toms* (209–223). Riga: LZA FSI.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1994). *Daudzpusīgā gnozeoloģija. Izziņas fenomenoloģija un vispārējā kritiskā gnozeoloģija*. Riga: Rīgas Garīgais Seminārs.
- Ladusāns, S. S. J. (1996). *Reliģijas filozofija. Otrās gnozeoloģiskās trilōģijas sējums*. Riga: Rīgas Metropolijas Romas Katoļu garīgais seminārs.
- Netto, E. (2013). *A Contribuição de Stanislavs Ladusans para a filosofia no Brasil*. *Filosofare*. Retrieved from [http://emilionettofilosofare.blogspot.com/2013/07/a-contribuicao-de-stanislavs-ladusans\\_1852.html](http://emilionettofilosofare.blogspot.com/2013/07/a-contribuicao-de-stanislavs-ladusans_1852.html)
- Rodrigues, A. S. J. (1972). *Genética Cristã de Valores*. São Paulo.
- Rodríguez, R. V. (1993). *Panorama da Filosofia Brasileira*. Teoría, Crítica e Historia. Retrieved from <https://www.ensayistas.org/critica/brasil/velez2.htm>
- Selvaggi, F. S. J. (1988). *Filosofia do mundo. Cosmologia filosófica*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Silva, J. (2008). Dios en el pensamiento de M. Heidegger: La interpretación de Welte. *Teología y vida*, 49 (3), 339–351.
- Sturm, F. G. (1989). Philosophy in Brazil Today. In J. J. E. Gracia & M. Camurati (Eds.), *Philosophy and Literature in Latin America. A Critical Assesment of the Current Situation* (25–35). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Severino, A. J. (2000). *A Experiência Filosófica Brasileira da atualidade: uma proposta de sistematização*. Editora Mandruvá. Retrieved from <http://www.hottopos.com/convenit3/severin.htm>
- Welte, B. (1971). La Question de Dieu dans la Pensee de Heidegger. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 26, 147–165.
- Welte, B. (1973). An Martin Heidegger, 23. Juli 1973. In *Martin Heidegger. Bernhard Welte. Briefe und Begegnungen* (33). Klett-Cotta.
- Welte, B. (1974). An Martin Heidegger, 31. Juli 1974. In *Martin Heidegger. Bernhard Welte. Briefe und Begegnungen* (36). Klett-Cotta.
- Welte, B. (1977a). *Search and Find: An Address on the Occasion of Martin Heidegger's Funeral*. Universitas 19.
- Welte, B. (1977b). O Pensamento de Martin Heidegger e as ideologias. In *Pensamento parcial e total. Primeiro Volume da Série Investigações filosóficas de atualidade* (99–114). São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Welte, B. (1980). Epist. Freiburg den 2. April 1980 — S. Ladusāns. In *Foundation of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Institut für Systematische Theologie*. Freiburg.
- Welte, B. (1982) God in Heidegger's Thought. *Philosophy Today*, 26 (1), 85–100.
- Wiercinski, A. (2010) Infinity and the Call of Thinking: Bernhard Welte and the Question of God. *Analecta Hermeneutica*, 1 (2), 1–14. Retrieved from <https://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/analecta/article/view/164/107>