

## The Evolutionary Time of Awakening: Do We Need a Third (neither Eastern, nor Western) Way in the World Evolution?

Konstantin S. Khroutski  
Novgorod State University  
Russia

In my previous work on Russian philosophical cosmology (Khroutski, 2005) I have already attempted to substantiate some 'principia' (beginnings) for the advancement and realization of a new – Third – macro-trend in the world cultural evolution (of real and rational Cosmism), of original essence in relation both to the existing Eastern (holistic, but ACosmist<sup>1</sup>) and Western (anthropocentric and AntiCosmist) worldwide civilizational<sup>2</sup> paradigms. The significant aim of this continuing essay consists, however, not only in the further development of the Cosmist issue but, concurrently, I strive now to substantiate the real challenge itself for a new macro-trend (independently of my own preferences) in the world evolution. My term 'Cosmist' means, basically, the wholeness and organic nature of the world (*macrocosm*), and a man's<sup>3</sup> (*microcosm*, that refers equally to any other subject<sup>4</sup> of the life on Earth, from an organic molecule to mankind) – its/her/his – *functionalist*, i.e. deliberate and expedient, integration into the world whole or Cosmos.

Substantially, the initial meaning of the word "cosmos" is (in Eastern and Ancient philosophy) "order and harmonious whole", in contradistinction to "chaos" (in Greek *kosmos* means "order, universe"). Only afterwards the meaning of "harmonious whole that is held and persisted through the direct intervention of divine power" appeared. And just for the last several centuries we treat "cosmos" from the objective astronomic (astrophysical) standpoint, as something distinct from the Earth – a receptacle of celestial objects (such as galaxies, stars, planets, comets, etc.); concurrently with a humanistic viewpoint on "cosmos" as "subjective harmony within the surrounding world".

However, in reality, the planet Earth itself and the entire evolutionary process of the life on Earth (briefly, *Evolutionary Process* or *EvoProcess*), naturally including every self-dependent life process (biological, personalist<sup>5</sup>, sociological, ecological), – are unconditionally the product and the integrated part of Nature or Cosmos (although viewed nowadays as a dualistic pattern), subordinated to the common (universal) Cosmic laws. Hence, every life process or event is the direct subject of Cosmist exploration, for instance, of BioCosmology (wherein 'Bio-' is *Greek*. "Bios" – Life).

The natural sciences reality of *cosmic* origin of the Earth and its Evolutionary Process (and, hence, of every current life process, be it biological, personalist, sociological, or ecological) is simultaneously the Universal objective law of the life on Earth. This law (of Cosmic origination of every life process) does not depend upon any of the existing idealistic (i.e., on the subjective

hypotheses of modern scientists, which are not validated by experiment) assumptions of origin and (macro)evolution of the life on Earth, like creationism, panspermia, biogenesis and abiogenesis, chemosynthesis, etc.), – at any rate life on Earth has emerged and been developed always from cosmic matter and energy. Consequently, the life on Earth (EvoProcess, every human ontogenesis, every social history) always is a Cosmic phenomenon (process) and the direct subject for BioCosmological attitudes and exploration – this is an evident (naturalistic) fact, *a posteriori* truth.

The other important point of departure is that everything has cyclic recurrence in our life (like, in metaphor, – Day–Night–NewDay or Systole–Diastole–NewSystole, or Thesis–AntiThesis–SynThesis), including the world civilizational evolution. The time is, therefore, to return to the primary meaning of the term "cosmos", but now on the higher level of its meaning. From this point of view, a challenge to the realization of a new (now of Cosmist or Day essence – i.e. of deliberate, expedient and integrated life activity of every conscious subject of the life on Earth) macro-trend in the world civilizational development is a matter of fact (*a posteriori* truth), but not an *a priori* speculation (hypothesis). For the substantiation of this reality (the need of a new macro-trend) I have identified eleven global paradoxes or crises (pointed out below) that cannot be overcome (first of all, rationally comprehended) from any current world-viewing standpoint, either Eastern, or Western.

In this (Cosmist) way, we might firstly draw a clear-cut distinction between modern biology (sociology, psychology) and modern physics (both are leading natural sciences): in physics all theories are based ultimately on natural laws, but in biology (as well as in human or social sciences) there are no natural laws (corresponding to the natural laws of the physical sciences) – herein knowledge is based on numerous concepts, like the concepts of: natural selection (Darwin), the meme (Dawkins), the unconscious mind (Freud), self-realization (Maslow), sociological theories (Parsons or his opponent Pitirim Sorokin), or ecological concepts (Biosphere by Vernadsky or Gaia by Lovelock). Fundamental thinking in the former area (that relies basically on physical lawfulness) might be designated as metaPhysics following the Aristotelian meaning, of rational universal reasoning on the first necessitarian principles, underlying the given natural – sensible, empirical, available for physical exploration – world, while the latter as Metaphysics or 'metabiology-metasociology-metapsychology' in Kantian meaning, of primary transcendental – subjective, pluralist – conceptualizing the objective data of sensible phenomenological world.

However, we still do not have *metabiology* in the sense of metaBiology (or BioCosmology), i.e. which comprises Life in all its forms: biological, ecological, personalist, or sociological. Indeed, current 'metabiology' is basically dualistic, lying in the two realms of conscious comprehension – "res cogitans" and "res extensa", thus realizing the main *subject-object* pattern in apprehending the phenomena of the life on Earth. This is an evident *artificial* AntiCosmism, inasmuch as the planet Earth and all the life processes on Earth, including a man's personal ontogenesis, are the result of Cosmic evolution and the product of Cosmic energy and stuff.

In contradistinction, in the introduced approach 'Cosmos' is treated neither in the Aristotelian (metaPhysical) nor Kantian (Metaphysical) approaches, but is viewed from the position of evident reality: every living subject on Earth (including a person

first of all) is the product and functionally integrated element of one whole Cosmos – i.e., a whole person (including her/his consciousness) is the *microcosm* in the one whole world (*macrocosm*). Substantially, herein, a subject of life has its/her/his basic (inherent ultimate) function in this one Cosmic wholeness (like every cell forms in human organism) – to be realized self-dependently during the entire ontogenesis.

Actually, the time is to return to the direct (holistic, but rational) viewing and exploration of the (Cosmic) world. In this Cosmist (real and rational) approach, we might introduce a notion of triadic spiral ascending evolution, but now in a new form: Thesis – Aristotelian cosmist metaPhysics; AntiThesis – Kantian pluralistic Metaphysics (anthropocentric and AntiCosmist 'metabiology'); SynThesis – BioCosmology (metaBiology), which is the Third macro-trend in world cultural evolution. Substantially, as stated above, modern 'metabiology' (that underlies biology, as well as human and social sciences) is based on numerous and various *a priori* concepts, i.e., subjective *a priori* postulates that have been proposed, empirically corroborated and conventionally recognized by a community of scientists (more or less influential in a given society or historical period). As a result, 'metabiology' cannot be reduced basically to a set of objective, real and rational "first principles", inasmuch as it originally comprises a set of various (competitive and often disparate) ontologies in relation to all and the same sphere of life (personalist and sociological as well). However, we do have only one reality – one real Cosmic planet Earth – common to every Earth's dweller! This is precisely the main issue for metaBiology (BioCosmology), the very essence of which is its reducibility to the fundamental principles that are real *a posteriori* truths, i.e., which are verified by natural scientific (physical) data.

These fundamental *a posteriori* (real) – BioCosmological – principles (truths, laws) at least are:

1. *Fundamental cosmism (naturalism)* – undoubtedly planet Earth is the product of Cosmic evolution and a part of the real Cosmos, hence all life processes (including the ontogenesis of a person) have Cosmic origin (are originated from Cosmic energy and stuff);
2. *Fundamental universalism*, first of all the *structural(morphological)-functional* universalism, a natural sciences truth at least since the discovery of the structure of DNA by Watson and Crick, which has proved the oneness of basic physical-chemical elements (of proteins, first of all) that constitute any biological organism on Earth; furthermore, this discovery has demonstrated the psychosomatic unity of any organism (the genetic transmission of physiological character by DNA molecules);
3. *Fundamental self-(macro)evolutionism* – every subject of life is the self-(macro)evolutionary process (including the entire biological evolution and social history) and every subject's ontogenesis is a self-dependent emergent evolution;
4. *Fundamental macro-evolutionary cyclic recurrence of life processes* (a kind of triadicity), which essence is that diametrically opposed, but successive cycles-stages (like Day–Night–NewDay, or Systole–Diastole–NewSystole, or Thesis–AntiThesis–SynThesis) effectively realize the ontogenesis of every liv-

ing subject (biological, personalist, sociological), overruling in evolution each other by turns.<sup>6</sup> In this light, the radical difference of BioCosmology in relation to the distinguished metaPhysics and Metaphysics ('metabiology', 'metasociology', 'metapsychology') lies in the BioCosmological macro-evolutionary approach (in its triadic essence) to the consideration of life processes, substantially relating as to Past and Present, as to Future emergent stages (in the triadic mode of Day–Night–NewDay) of a subject's evolution (during its/her/his entire ontogenesis).

These fundamental objective metaBiological laws, as well as the basic notions of BioCosmological conception are additionally characterized in my preceding article in the JFS (2005, Vol.10, No.2). The other accessible source is the E-LOGOS: ELECTRONIC JOURNAL FOR PHILOSOPHY (Khroutski, 2006–2007), in which, in the 2007, a section of "BioCosmology" and the discussion over BioCosmology is opened<sup>7</sup>.

Another chief issue (that is independent of the author's original BioCosmological conception) is the substantiation of a challenge for a new trajectory (of original gist, still not existing) in the world civilizational evolution. In other words, BioCosmology is just a variant of transcending into the successive macro-level of the world future civilizational development. Therefore, the general question is: Do we really need a Third way (neither Eastern, nor Western) in the world evolution to ensure a safe and successful future?

My answer is a categorical "yes", inasmuch as we, in the present world, are faced with evident global paradoxes or crises (above all, I have in view contemporary Russia). There are, at least, eleven evident global paradoxes (crises) which cannot be resolved from current Eastern or Western worldviews:

- 1) *The loss of a "motivational basis" to procreation* and the focus on a family with one child in favor of hedonistic models in realizing her or his vital energy (in current Russia for example one new-born accounts for two deaths; the objective prognoses of demographers show that already in 50–80 years Russia<sup>8</sup> will meet demographic collapse and disappear from the world scene).
- 2) *The "social hypersexuality"* as a feature (norm) of social life (at least in present Russia), simultaneously with the decrease of births and inability to maintain an essential birth rate – the catastrophic surplus of deaths over births.
- 3) *The increase of depressions* concurrent with alcoholism and drug addiction – which is proportional with the growth of wealth of a democratic society.
- 4) *The super-popularity of sporting competitions* (and super-success of sports industry), alongside (comparatively) with insolubility of many humanitarian problems, as well as inaccessibility and inadequacy of (open to general use) qualitative education, science, health care, etc.
- 5) While billions of Earth's inhabitants watch and enjoy, for instance, international football matches (and think nothing of the transfers of football idols for \$50 million or more) and while many millions of Earth dwellers enjoy regular rest at expensive resorts, our *current ecological crisis* (in our minds, first of all) which threatens imminent disaster to every living inhabitant on Earth, is the matter of concern for a much smaller subset of the planet's population.

- 6) The current *leading role of the philosophy of postmodernism* that affirms basic pluralism (in an objectively universal world) – the randomness of creativity.
- 7) The so-called '*anthropological evolutionary paradox*', in relation to personality: on the one hand, a person is evidently a uterine element of the one common whole cosmic evolutionary process of the life on Earth (that is a natural sciences truth); however, on the other hand, we deny the search for universal evolutionary knowledge and rely on the plural (different and often incompatible) sources of knowledge in defining human's nature: biological, sociological, and psychological.
- 8) The *global biomedical paradox*: The inability, in the hi-tech age, to obtain the etiological – curing, remedial – approaches against chronic non-infectious and non-traumatic diseases.
- 9) The *global bioethical paradox*: up-to-date bioethics tackles the problems that are the consequences of unreasonable activity of modern science and technologies, while, on the contrary, modern bioethics pays no attention to the disclosure and exploration of the reasons and bases of the existing civilizational unreasonableness that generates the man-made threats to the life of a person, society, mankind and the entire world of the life on Earth!
- 10) The *global political paradox*: we are witnessing at present (from rational humanitarian positions) *global senselessness of foreign policy* – i.e., arm-twisting policy of expansion (military intervention), and the numerous billions of dollars already having been spent in senseless militarist aggression which is ten times the amount needed to resolve the actual humanitarian and cultural (aforementioned) problems.
- 11) Finally, *global civilizational paradox* has evidently intruded on our cultural day-to-day life: Western civilization, although based on rational principles, has arrived at the reality of utmost plural (i.e., irrational) global cultural world – constituted by extremely different (frequently opposite) evaluations and reflections (and reactions) on the same issues and problems, arising from the evolution of one common, objectively universal world – the cosmic evolutionary process of the life on Earth (EvoProcess).

In conclusion, if the existing challenge for realization and elaboration of a *Third* evolutionary way in the world philosophy is an objective reality, and again bearing in mind the aforementioned metaphor (that expresses the macro-cyclic evolutionary essence of life processes – Day–Night–NewDay) – then has not the time come to "awake" (for the world cultural workers first of all)?

On the whole, advanced BioCosmology might be treated as the form of a *Third* naturalism and *Third* evolutionary way (metaphorically, a *NewDay*, in relation to the *Eastern Day* and *Western Night*) in the world cultural evolution of which both are the necessary cycles and processes of the revolving experience of the one whole EvoProcess. The substantial moment, herein, is that revolving *Night-cycle* is absolutely necessary for life activity of any living subject (including a civilization), inasmuch as exclusively during the *Night-period* the conditions emerge that are universally (inside the whole organism) reduced to the interests of an individual subject (a constituent of the organism) – to the restoration-growth-accumulation-liberation-

raising of its/her/his proper inherent potentials, like of cardiomyocytes in Diastole. Another crucial moment is that any (physiological) Night-cycle is naturally a sensory rupture of the interrelations of a living subject with the world (i.e. – substantive AntiCosmist attitude) and the submission of an organism to the Night-regulating processes, including the power of Night-dreams (illusions, i.e. hallucinations in essence). Really, precisely 'hallucinatory (primary) and hypnotic (secondary) effect' (for the entire humankind organism, i.e. modern global world) might explain our "scientific" belief in the rational conceptions that are behind any common sense, like the origination of DNA from the "primary bouillon, containing organic molecules"; or the macro-evolutionary shifts through Darwinian selection, like the origination of a human being from the primates, nevertheless that this emergence is characterized by the loss of two whole chromosomes<sup>9</sup>; or in the need of the unified liberalization of the whole world, etc.<sup>10</sup>

Substantially, BioCosmology is both a rational and realistic trend of theoretical and practical activity, inasmuch as it is based basically on *a posteriori* fundamentals, i.e., its fundamental *a priori* notions reflect the real (natural) matter of fact, as it is demonstrated by natural sciences. In contradistinction, the contemporary Western world outlook basically is based precisely on *a priori* (speculative, abstract) fundamental principles, like British empiricism, Continental rationalism, Kantian (and his followers) transcendentalism, Marxian materialism, American pragmatism, etc. This is, so to say, *naturally* (realizing a natural Night-cycle of world development) a *not natural* (in the form of artificial man-world separation) relation to the all-including evolutionary process (EvoProcess) of the life on Earth, really a "*manifold natural-artificial dualism*" (Sakamoto, 2004).

It is also important, that the metaphor of "awakening" has its autonomous development in contemporary future literature. For instance, Dr. Ashok K. Gangadean, organizer of the "AwakeningMind" portal and the author of "The Awakening of Global Reason" (Gangadean, 2006) suggests that we are in the midst of a profound dimensional shift in our rational capacity to process reality, and that this advance is so radical and comprehensive that the very concept of a person, of what it means to be human, likewise is taken to a higher global dimension. Concurrently, in the article "Waking Up to a New Future" (Inayatullah, 2005), Professor Sohail Inayatullah, developing Sarkar's Neohumanism, substantiates the charge to "envision and create an alternative world", and that "the way out is not the imagined past but a move to a spiral future, remembering history but creating alternative futures. What is needed is an evolutionary jump." (2005, p. 56).

Really, "awakening" (in the physiological significance) naturally means the 'revolution' in the conscious condition of a man – radical transformation of sleeping person (from the condition of sensory rupture with the real world-cosmos, thus – from the subordination to Night dreams-'concepts') – to awaken a conscious condition of functionally expedient life activity (for the truly judicious – sane, sensible, reasonable – interrelation with the world-cosmos). In the book "The Consciousness Revolution" (1999) Ervin Laszlo, Stanislav Grof, and Peter Russell make the case that the overwhelming majority of modern scientists consider our assumptions of reality as Reality itself. In other words, "scholars believe that their accepted model of reality is the reality itself, rather than its subjective concept."<sup>11</sup>

In the book "Macroshift" (2001) Ervin Laszlo (one of the world's foremost experts on general evolution theory) arrives at the comprehension of several macro-cycles (substantive in their organization) of world social evolution that will naturally lead us to a new emergent future. They are: Mythos, Theos, and Logos. He concludes, "the next advance of humankind must be governed by a new rationality... mechanistic rationality of Logos must be replaced by a new holistic rationality of yet-to-be-born civilization (that merits the name *Holos*)" (Laszlo, 2001, p. 107).

Therefore, the upshot is that if we really need "a civilizational revolution" for the creation of "a new rationality and new future", then, apparently we can ask: instead of Enlightenment, has the evolutionary time come for an Awakening?

## Correspondence

Konstantin S. Khroutski, Ph.D.  
A/B 123, PO-25, Novgorod Velikiy, 173025 Russia  
Tel., Fax: +7(8162)660950  
E-mail: hrucki@mail.ru

## Notes

1. The type of '...'-brackets, or the typing from capital letter is used for the designation of author's own terms, metaphors, and expressions, whereas "..."-type – for citing and the use of generally accepted words.
2. The term 'civilizational' has a peculiar meaning in the author's original approach – not merely "culturally advanced" (like "civilised"), but it precisely points out the interrelations between various civilizations, thus representing the evolution of mankind as the history, present and the future of integrated interrelations of different autonomous (in their substantive perspectives of evolution) civilizations that advance themselves at the front line of the world (common) cultural evolution at the proper time.
3. The term 'man' is traditionally referred to the human race in general, or "mankind".
4. 'Subject', herein, – is the substantial Cosmist notion that stresses the universality of life on Earth. In the author's BioCosmology 'subject' means the *integrated functionalist subject*, which forever integrates autonomously and hierarchically other subjects (to be the functional whole) and, simultaneously, always being functionally integrated by the higher organised subject (organism). In other words, from the Cosmist point of view, *subject* means every living organism on Earth: organic molecule, cell, biological organism, biosphere, human being, family, community, social body, society, mankind, and, ultimately, Evolutionary Process itself (EvoProcess) – the one common whole cosmic evolutionary process of the life on Earth.
5. I would like to use "personologist" or "personological", but am afraid of their misunderstanding (for instance, contemporary studies of correlation between facial features and personality might be considered). Herein, my 'personalist' certainly correlates with the personalism that stresses attention on individual personality, relating chiefly to the scientific research programs in personality psychology, especially to those that study the entire wholesome lifespan of an individual person (like the theories by Jung, Maslow and

- Erikson). However, the BioCosmological 'personalist', although commonly regarding the personality as the key to the interpretation of reality, substantially introduce a new ('functionalist') sense to this notion – of the ultimate significance of a person's creative functional (substantively inherent, intentional and responsible) contribution to successful and safe evolution of the whole world (or Cosmos).
6. Author deliberately types '(macro)evolutionary' or 'macro-evolutionary' to realize the additional distinction from the term microevolution.
  7. In this relation (of participation in the discussion over BioCosmology) the journal E-LOGOS and its section BioCosmology is acceptable at the: <http://nb.vse.cz/kfil/elogos/>
  8. In later time, due to objective prognoses, the entire world will meet the threat of depopulation, including China as well.
  9. Primates have a set of 48 chromosomes in their genome, while human beings – 46.
  10. In this light, the modern forms of philosophy (that have the general essence of epistemological subjective idealism) are very much natural and essential for the realization of a Night-cycle in the civilizational evolution of the human race, like Humean skepticism or Cartesian dualism, or Kantian apriorism, or Comte's positivism, or Deweyian pragmatism, or the current forms of postmodernism, etc.
  11. In this quoting I refer to the Russian edition of the book "The consciousness revolution", written jointly by Laszlo, Grof and Russell, and published in Moscow, 2004, p. 59.

## References

- Gangadean, Ashok K. (2006). The awakening of global reason: The logical and ontological foundation of integral science. *World Futures*, 62(1–2), 56–74.
- Innayatulah, Sohail. (2005). Waking up to a new future. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 10(2), 55–63.
- Khroutski, Konstantin S. (2005). Russian philosophical cosmology: One step backward and two steps forward – approaching the universal evolutionary future. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 10(2), 97–104.
- Khroutski, Konstantin S. (2006). BioCosmology: Science of the universal future. *E-Logos (E-Journal for the Philosophy)*/2006, from <http://nb.vse.cz/kfil/elogos/science/khrou106.pdf>
- Khroutski, Konstantin S. (2007). Arousing a dispute over BioCosmology. A reply to Stephen Modell. *E-Logos (E-Journal for the Philosophy)*/2007, from <http://nb.vse.cz/kfil/elogos/biocosmology/khrou107.pdf>
- Laszlo, Ervin, Grof Stanislav & Russell Peter. (1999). *The consciousness revolution: A transatlantic dialogue*. Shaftesbury, UK: Element Books.
- Laszlo, Ervin. (2001). *Macroshift: Navigating the transformation to a sustainable world*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Sakamoto, Hyakudai. (2004). Globalisation of bioethics: From the Asian perspective. In Darryl R. Macer (Ed.), *Challenges for bioethics in Asia* (pp. 487–493). *The proceedings of the Fifth Asian Bioethics conference (ABC5), February 13–16, 2004 in Tsukuba Science City, Japan*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Eubios Ethics Institute.