

S.S.Horuzhy

GLOBAL DYNAMICS OF THE UNIVERSE AND SPIRITUAL PRACTICE OF HUMAN BEING

*now the machines demand
their celebration.*

*Source of our weakness
now, and in vengeful rage
ruining our heritage,*

*us shall these things at length,
us, who supply their strength,
serve in all meekness.*

R.M.Rilke. Sonnets to Orpheus, I, XVIII
(transl. by J.B.Leishman).

I. The Christian Universe: Man, Nature and Process

Christianity is not a religion of Cosmos, but the religion of Person. Directly, this classical statement on the subject and type of the Christian religion states nothing on the status and role of the man in the empiric world: the subject of the religion is God as Person, and the notion of Divine Person (Hypostasis) surely does not coincide with empiric mortal individual. Nevertheless, the personalist character of the religion implies immediately quite a number of cardinal anthropological principles. Already the Old Testament states that man is created “in the image and after the likeness” of God (Gen 1,26); that man is put to have supremacy over all the world being (Gen 1,28); that he enters into a special personal relationship with God, “makes a covenant” with God. Anthropological situation is outlined here quite precisely:

1) Man forms the ontological unity with the world, as a “creature”, created being, which is as such and a whole separated by an ontological distance and split from uncreated, Divine being;

2) Although man is united with the world, he is singled out in it, holds the central and leading position in it, having the power over it, given by God;

3) Although man is separated from God, he keeps a constant and mutual, spiritual and existential connection with Him, and this connection of God and man is a decisive factor in the destiny of all the world and creature.

It is obvious here that the biblical world-view is completely anthropocentric.

The New Testament, which states itself as the “fulfillment” of the Old, develops and complements, sometimes radically, these biblical positions. The event of Incarnation, i.e. the union of the Divine and human natures in the Person of Christ, brings the element of anthropocentrism to the limit, probably; but in no way it denies or destroys the ontological unity of man with all the creation. As *ontological* event, it relates to the destiny of all the creature, and man stands out in it as a “representative” of created being, “the sum and concise summary of World”, to use the formula by

Father Pavel Florensky. These features of Christian anthropocentrism should be taken into account when we discuss the critique of anthropocentric views which is today quite popular. The critique states that the anthropocentrism means the egoistic subjugation and exploitation of the environment by man, it belittles Nature and is deaf to its life and beauty, it generates dangerous strategies that threaten the global balance – and it is time to reject it. But in fact, such critique is valid only for certain versions of anthropocentrism and it embraces neither the general concept nor its Christian form. Anthropocentrism as such is the principle of “centrality” (essential, dynamic or teleological) of man in the world, and this principle does not determine the type of man’s relationship with other parts or elements of the world; it is compatible with the attitude of service to as well as domination over these parts. As for the Christian anthropocentrism, it combines the singling out of man with the statement of common destiny of all the creature and this combination amounts actually to the attitude of *man’s responsibility* for this common destiny. What is more, one should keep in mind that anthropocentrism is in a certain sense not an option but an immanent predicate of man’s situation. As demonstrated by phenomenology, man is always placed within the horizon of his lived experience as a subject; he is “in the subject perspective”. Hence in any “Weltbild”, built up by man, the world is that of the subject lived experience, or the “World-as-Experience”; and only after taking this properly into account, one can try to build up some discourse “in the perspective of the Other”. *Mutatis mutandis*, this is valid for the global aspect as well, i.e. for the experience of mankind as a whole. And all this means that what we need now is not the declarative rejection of anthropocentrism, but its new and profound rethinking, fit to the present conditions.

Anthropocentrism of the Christian world-view is combined with theocentrism and Christocentrism of the view of being, the integral reality of God and World; and it is theocentrism and Christocentrism that emerge as leading and preponderant principles of the Christian outlook. In the treatise “De Opificio Hominis” St. Gregory of Nyssa disputes the significance of the ancient principle, stating the correspondence of Man and World as Microcosmos and Macrocosmos; he says that the meaning of the nature of man is revealed in the relation of man not to the world, but to God: “The pagans were saying: man is Microcosmos, he consists of the same elements as the Universe. But ... what is the importance, if we consider man as an image and likeness of the world? Greatness of man does not lie in the likeness to the created world, it lies in being in the image of Creator’s nature”¹. The totality of being is determined by the ontological axis God – Man. The relation of man to God is most pithy, dynamic and dramatic; but the scene of its unfolding is, in the first turn, the inner reality of man, his spiritual and emotional world. Hence the relations Man – Cosmos and Man – Nature turn out to be ontologically secondary and less important in the drama of being; and so for many centuries they stayed far in the periphery of Christian beliefs. Both theoretical problems of these relations and their practical development were almost completely the prerogative of the secularised sphere of science, technique and economy.

In our age, however, under the influence of many factors at once the situation changes profoundly. Below we shall discuss these factors in detail, as they belong to basic features of the modern anthropological situation and technological development. Now we only mention one of their results: the problems of relations of man with

¹ St. Gregory of Nyssa. On the Constitution of Man. St. Petersburg 1996, p.50. (In Russian).

nature and situation of man in the Universe reveal more and more profound religious aspects, and Christian thought involves them more and more into its orbit. Its approach to this circle of problems is based on principles, which were present in the Christian outlook for a long time, but today they come to the foreground, are comprehended anew and given new spheres of application. We shall concentrate on three such principles or key properties of the Christian world-view, according to which this world-view is:

- 1) anthropocentric;
- 2) dynamic and processual;
- 3) energetic.

All the three have different base in the tradition: as we noted, the anthropocentrism is akin to the Judeo-Christian Tradition as a whole; the dynamic and processual view of the world is characteristic for Christianity and much less for Judaism; and finally, the energism, grasping of the reality of man and world “in the dimension of energy”, as a system of all kinds of impulses, drives, activities, etc. is deeply rooted in the all-christian vision, but is explicitly expressed chiefly in the Eastern Christian Tradition, the Orthodoxy.

Although the remark by St. Gregory of Nyssa reduces the importance of the idea of man as the Microcosmos for Christianity, by no means is this idea completely excluded from the Christian anthropology. In fact, it conveys quite adequately the message of the Christian anthropocentrism, but only after being profoundly reassessed and generalized. As the Microcosmos, man is not a part, but the centre, collecting focus and Nexus, principle of connectedness of created being. From this point of view, the idea appears as a structural paradigm and ontological principle. In the first function, it is the assertion of the isomorphism, structural identity of Micro- and Macrocosmos; in the second one, it is the ontological identification of the modes of man’s being and created being as such (similar to the identification of man’s being and “being-there”, *Dasein*, in the “fundamental ontology” by Heidegger). Hence it follows that the fulfillment of the destination of created being is achieved, in the first turn, in man, through man and by man.

As for the dynamical aspects of the constitution of man and world, the key feature of the Christian dynamism is that it refers, first of all, not to physical, but to metaphysical (ontological) dynamics, that of being (*das Sein*) and not essent (*das Seiende*). Always, unconditionally, for Christianity being is a process; but only because of this and depending on this the world is also a process; the dynamics of world is determined by that of being (there is here a common element with the Hegelianism). However, the type and character of the World Process do not follow from the properties of the Ontological Process, as they are stated in the Christian kerygma, in any direct or evident way. That’s why the dynamic and processual character of the Christian world-view is not evident and indisputable. In the most influential and widespread in the West versions of this world-view such character was neglected and sometimes even denied openly. In his well-known study of modern global problems E.Laszlo writes: “All the attempts to bring the biblical tradition into accordance with the permanently evolving reality were ineffective so far. Although the majority of Judeo-Christian religions possess historical perspective, when it deals about spiritual development of a person, they lose such perspective, when it deals about the evolution

of mankind”². This is a very shaky statement. Besides the unfounded application of the evolutionary paradigm to the World Process as a whole, the author disregards completely the stressed above ontological dynamism of Christianity. In fact, already the biblical mythologems of Creation and Fall in their classical patristic treatment imply the dynamical and processual character of world’s mode of being or, in the discourse of human sciences, historicity of this mode. The act of Creation provides the world with the beginning, determines its mode of being as a “begun being”, but it does not determine the ontological status and ontological situation of the creature completely. This status remains open, since the question about the end remains still open: a priori, created being, having the beginning, can possess as well as not possess the end. In other words, two different modes of created being are possible, namely, the creature, resp., possessing and not possessing the predicate of finiteness. (In the theological discourse, these two modes are, resp., fallen and unfallen, perfect (Mt 5,48) created being). Making the bifurcation one of the central notions of his picture of reality, E.Laszlo does not notice that the biblical ontology of Creation is the classical and, in fact, paradigmatic example of ontological bifurcation: the actual created being presupposes necessarily the choice between the two possible modes, and the mythologem of the Fall, or the Original Sin, is nothing but the act of this choice (made in favour of the mode of finiteness).

In the Christian ontology, however, the chain of ontological events is not yet concluded with the Fall, the choice of finiteness and mortality. The event of Christ is stated by the kerygma as a direct continuation of the drama of being, bringing into it a new element of dynamism: that’s why it is considered as a “new beginning” and Christ as “the second Adam”. The death of Christ on the cross is, according to the kerygma, “the redeeming sacrifice”, the necessary and sufficient ontological pre-condition of the Salvation. And the salvation is here nothing but the overcoming of the fallen state (by means of unifying with Christ), the fundamental predicates of which are sinningness and mortality; in ontological terms, it is the ontological transformation, leaving or transcending the mode of finiteness for the other of the two modes of created being. (In the theological discourse, the human nature of Christ belongs precisely to the perfect created being, and due to that the unification with Christ is not the self-realisation of the fallen created nature of man, but its transcension.) But the Salvation is in no way the predetermined necessity! The Saviour does not surmount man’s sinningness and fallenness instead of man himself, He creates for man the situation, in which they are surmountable. The event of Christ creates, constitutes (in the sense of the phenomenology) not a completely pre-determined process, but once more, like the First Beginning, Creation, ontological bifurcation: either the former stay in the mode of finiteness or the transcension of this mode.

This assessment of the event of Christ as the initiation and beginning of a new, bifurcational and transcending dynamics of created being is characteristic especially for the Eastern-Orthodox Christianity. Here a dynamical picture of being emerges, in which the *deification* (θεωσιφ, deificatio), actual transformation of the nature of man into Divine nature comes out as the central concept. This concept has been brought up already by the early Church Fathers of 2.c. (v. Irenaeus of Lyon, Adv.Haer.III.X.2),

² E.Laszlo. The Age of Bifurcation. Understanding the changing World. Amsterdam 1991. (The back-translation from Russian: Put’ (Moscow), 1995, ¹ 7, p.97.).

then it has been expressed by the famous formula by St. Athanasius of Alexandria: “God became man, so that man would become God” (De Incarn.54); but for the western theology it always remained marginal and somewhat ambiguous. Contrary to it, in the Eastern-Christian discourse it was developed into a key concept, conveying man’s ontological destination; so that the whole drama of being, or Theocosmic process, is represented as a single whole, the ordered series of inseparable ontological events:

CREATION – FALL – INCARNATION – DEIFICATION.

Here the deification is the out-worldly, meta-empirical goal or “telos” of created being, which is achieved by means of the process of a special kind, carrying out an actual ontological transformation. Thus created being is represented as the dynamics of deification; but it has to be stressed that it is *ontological* dynamics, of which the empirical contents is not yet revealed by its initial theological and ontological definitions.

As a postulate of faith, the theological and philosophical thesis on the deification is, undoubtedly, holistic and global: it tells about the destiny of created being as a whole, all the spatial-temporal Universe or the Macrocosmos. However, cardinal features of the Christian discourse, its personalist (in the theme of God) and anthropocentric (in the theme of World) character, brought unavoidably the effect that the deification was also related to destiny of the individual, the created person, in which case it was coming out as the meta-anthropological telos of a specific anthropological strategy. Realisation of this strategy, or anthropological process, ascending to the deification, is the sense and subject of the Orthodox school of spiritual (mystico-ascetic) practice, the *hesychasm*. Hesychast practice, cultivated in the Orthodoxy from 4.c. till nowadays, has been developed into a refined holistic practice of the Self, in which, basing on a special technique of “incessant prayer”, a successive stepwise process of the auto-transformation of man, directed to the deification, is built up. This ancient tradition, typologically related to Eastern schools of spiritual practice, is recognized as a true core of the Orthodox spirituality. Evidently, it represents a radically dynamic treatment of man; however, this dynamism hardly touches upon the relation of man to society, nature or Cosmos. In contrast to the relation to God and to oneself, one’s own inner world, these relations turn out to be secondary and marginal, precisely as noticed above.

However, it shouldn’t be otherwise in the sphere of ascesis: by its very essence, the spiritual practice in its classical forms is a *sui generis* anthropological laboratory, where, on the microcosmic scale, in the material of an individual human existence, one discovers and develops the dynamics of ontological transformation of present being, which is, in the case of hesychasm, the dynamics of the ascension to deification. At the same time, as said above, the principle of deification as such should be conceived as a global principle, relating to Macrocosmos. Hence, if only the Christian world-view accepts the principle of the isomorphism of the Microcosmos and Macrocosmos, we conclude that the dynamics of the ascension to deification, found in the ascetic experience, should be interpreted on a universal plan: as a dynamical paradigm or model, which in some generalized form determines also global dynamics, that of the World Process. The Christian anthropocentrism comes out here in the dynamic aspect: *the anthropological dynamics of spiritual practice should serve at the same time as a*

core and paradigm of global dynamics; in other words, the dynamics of deification on the global plan is built up on the base and by the pattern of a certain anthropological core, which is provided by the dynamics of spiritual practice. This is an essential conclusion. First, it means the inversion of the basic relations in the vision of the reality, corresponding to impersonalist religions and theories: in this vision, the anthropological reality does not determine the global dynamics of the Macrocosmos, but, on the contrary, is determined by this dynamics, as by the “laws of nature”. Second, it provides some initial insights into the sense and role of the technique in the vision of the reality, determined by the principle of deification: obviously, in this vision the designing and technical activity directed to nature and Cosmos is needed in order to exteriorize and globalize the dynamics of the spiritual practice, turning the latter into the paradigm of the dynamics of the Macrocosmos. As a result, strategies of the “inner” and “outer” activity of man should converge; combining and merging with each other, they should become two components of a unified ontological dynamics, following the same paradigm.

The dynamics of deification, on the anthropological as well as global plan, is singled out by a number of specific features; in particular, as noted above, it has the bifurcational and transcending character. These features are both closely related to one more important characteristic, which we have called above the *energetic* character of the Christian – and chiefly Eastern-Christian – vision of man, world and being. Usually and predominantly, the European theology and metaphysics are developed in the essentialist discourse, as a discourse about essences and categories, going back directly to them, like ideas, forms, laws, etc. This way is almost unavoidable for the discursive and abstract thought, which unfolds itself by means of constructing notions and syllogisms. However, the Eastern-Christian thought was moved, in the first turn, not by intellectual tasks, but by the practical goal of achieving a certain special kind of experience, namely, the communion with God in the union with Christ. In this case the central part belonged to phenomenology of human energies, i.e. all kinds of impulses, somatic, psychic and intellectual, movements of thought, will, emotions... Man was represented here by his projection into the dimension of energy, or “being-action”, in the ontological terms, and appeared as an energetic formation, system of heterogeneous and interrelated energies. And the goal was to bring this system, or the “energetic image” of man, to such form, in which all the energies of a human being are in harmonious and coordinated unity oriented to deification. The latter is also treated as an energetic concept, namely, the union of all man’s energies with Divine energy, or grace. Thus, what is necessary for the deification is the collaboration and coordination, “coherence” of all man’s energies with Divine energy (though the physical term is applicable in a quite limited degree, since the interaction of energies is here not a physical, but spiritual act, personal communion of God and man). This common, harmonious and unified organization of the two ontologically different energies is described by the Byzantine theological notion *synergy* (συνεργία).

The achievement of synergy and deification (conceived energetically) is exactly the contents of the hesychast practice. The process of the advancement to the meta-anthropological telos of the deification is thus the successive stepwise transformation of the energetic image of man, building up a series of anthropological energetic structures, or “energoforms”, ascending hierarchically to energoforms, corresponding to synergy and deification. But, as soon as the deification is not only the telos of the

spiritual practice, but also a dynamic and global concept, the anthropological strategy of the energetic ascending can be interpreted at the same time as a prototype, pattern of global dynamics. On the global plan, the deification comes out as the meta-historical telos of the global dynamics, like on the anthropological plan it is the meta-anthropological telos of the spiritual practice. This globalising interpretation of the anthropological dynamics of deification, rooted in the Christian anthropocentrism and Eastern-Christian energism, is what we describe below.

The global process, implementing the energetic ascending dynamics, is not just a cosmic and natural process; it has also the ontological and super-natural dimension, as a process in being and not only in essent (das Seiende). In this ontological dimension, it presents a rather close parallel to a certain type of natural processes. When the world, as an energetic formation, directs itself (its energies) to an out-worldly, implementing a different mode of being, telos, it represents an “open system” in (the totality of) being, similar to physical open systems, which are open in the horizon of empiric being. An important property of physical open systems is that they can have an outer source of energy. Next, a special class of open systems form systems in states far from the equilibrium. If such a system possesses an outer source of energy, the flux of this outer energy through the system may generate a progressing process of structuring. These specific processes are studied in a new branch of physics, the synergetics, and it was found that they have numerous parallels in social and biological systems.

Now the analogy with the ontological dynamics is quite clear. The dynamics of deification, on the anthropological as well as cosmic plan, is the dynamics of an open system, for which Divine energy comes out as the “ontologically external source of energy”. Since the substance of this dynamics is the generation of an hierarchy of energetic structures, synergetic processes provide the closest parallel to it. Some of these processes, e.g., those of the classical chaos, present quite graphic structural similarity to the ontological dynamics, since their substance is also the generation of an ordered series of dynamic structures. Thus the language does not lie, and indeed synergy has much to do with synergetics. This conclusion is of heuristic value for anthropology, disclosing dynamic and system-theoretic meaning of many stages and features of spiritual practice. Let us give one example. The synergetic parallel tells us: if a process takes the form of spontaneous generation of a hierarchy of dynamic structures, the system in question should be first brought to a state, removed far from the equilibrium, from all the region of stable regimes. It means that the dynamics of deification, both in the form of spiritual practice and on the global level, should have a certain anthropological analogue of the “state far from the equilibrium” as its starting phase. Such starting phenomena for spiritual practice are religious conversion and repentance (μετανοια) and hence our parallel provides their synergetic interpretation, showing them as “removed far from the equilibrium” or border regimes of consciousness and the whole human being.

Thus in addition to social and biological applications, we discover religious and anthropological parallels to synergetic processes; and one can say that the first discovery of such processes has been made centuries ago in the hesychast ascesis. However, the dynamics of deification has unavoidably capital distinctions from natural processes. As an ontological transformation, it is not unfolding and actualisation of the

available human nature, but its transcension; and it has also defining features of personal and dialogical communion. Hence it follows that it is not an evolutionary or deterministic process or a process of the organic type, in which the development of some “seeds” or actualization of some form given beforehand takes place. At the same time, it is not stochastic dynamics devoid of any ordering or orientation.

Like the anthropological strategy of the spiritual practice, the global dynamics of deification is not at all a single possibility, which is to be realized with necessity. Contrary to it, its realization is most difficult and problematic, because it demands the conscious decision and concentrated effort, complicated organization and coordination of all levels of global hierarchical systems. The topology of reality is always of the bifurcation type, admitting plurality of the development scenarios. It means that, besides the dynamics of deification, other types of global dynamics are possible; and one can describe them using the same methodological paradigm, which considers global strategies as exteriorizations (universalizations, extrapolations, etc.) of anthropological strategies. This anthropocentric approach (which can be interpreted as a certain enhancement of the anthropic principle in cosmology) becomes more and more justified in our age, when the phenomenon of man gets more and more important as a global factor.

In our anthropological model³ we introduce the basic concept of *Anthropological Border*, which is the sphere of limiting phenomena of human experience, where the leading characteristics and predicates of human existence in its normal empiric forms start changing. Following classical philosophical method of defining an object by means of characterizing its border, we define man in the dimension of energy as the “ensemble of strategies, oriented to the Anthropological Border”. Spiritual practice is the only one of such strategies, which is oriented to the actual ontological transformation or, synonymously, to the ontological Anthropological Border. As for other “Border strategies”, they stay within the horizon of present being, which means that they are oriented to other parts of the Anthropological Border, where the latter is not ontological, but only “ontic” (in Heidegger’s sense, i.e. relating to essent and not to being). We have found two kinds of them: virtual strategies, oriented to the transition to virtual reality, and strategies induced from the Unconscious, which are studied in psychoanalysis phenomena, like neuroses, phobias, complexes, etc. Similar to spiritual practice, both these kinds also admit the generalized interpretation as universal dynamical paradigms, applicable to social and other macrosystems in anthropocentric models of reality. (One can remind in this connection that Freud himself considered it necessary to study global generalizations of the patterns of the Unconscious, or “pathologies of cultural communities”, such as “neuroses of civilizations”, “phobias of epochs”, etc.) As a result, in the same way as our anthropological model is determined by the complete topic of the Anthropological Border, including all the three kinds of the Border strategies, -- so the ensemble of global generalizations of the Border strategies determines a model of global dynamics in the anthropocentric paradigm.

³ S.S.Horuzhy. To the anthropological model for the Third Millennium // Vestnik RGNF 1999,¹³. (In Russian).

II. Global dynamics of deification and technological factors

Let us now turn to the role which the phenomena of technique and technology should play in the outlined model of global dynamics. Interpretations of and approaches to these phenomena are countless, but the anthropocentric character of our model suggests that in order to include them into its orbit we have to rely on the *anthropological interpretation*, developed by A.Gehlen, supported by many authors and treating all the kinds of technique and technical activity as certain manifestations of man. Here the technique is “the ability, inherent to man, to change nature in accordance with his goals... This ability of man is inborn, has its origin in the nature of the consciousness and represents one of natural human potencies”⁴. The anthropocentric attitude is implemented in our model in the form of the structural and dynamical isomorphism of the Microcosmos and Macrocosmos; and one of basic conceptions of technique, following the anthropological interpretation of the latter, is fairly in accordance with this form. This is the known conception of the “projection of organs” (Organprojektion), according to which all technical tools (engines, instruments, devices...) in their essence and nature are man-made “projections” (substitutes, prolongations, amplifications...) of various organs of the human body; as well as the opposite, bodily organs are “organic prototypes” of technical tools. Rudiments of this idea could be found in philosophy long ago. Theories, which stated the teleological and purposeful character of the world, quite often illustrated this purposefulness with the correspondence “organs – tools” (Maimonides, 13th c., Bossuet, 18th c., e.a.); on a more abstract level, Hegel treats man’s activity as his exteriorization, projecting oneself out-there; etc. But in the explicit form, both the conception and the term “Organprojektion” have been presented in “Philosophie der Technik” by E.Kapp (1877). In the Russian philosophy the idea was actively defended and developed by P.Florensky (1882-1937) in the book “By the Watersheds of Thought” (1917-22, publ.1990).

The idea of the projection of organs is rather concrete, and its substantiation consisted mostly in the demonstration of correspondences between concrete technical tools and bodily organs. For instance, hand and palm with their variegated functions provide the prototype for all the multitude of tools, instruments, machines of the seizing, pressing, squeezing, etc. principle; the system of limbs and joints is the prototype of all devices with hinges, pulleys, levers, etc.; nervous system has the direct correspondence to electric nets; eye is projected on optical and photographic technique; finally, the projection of body as a whole is house and other architectural edifices. Such an angle of view is not less adequate to the modern technological development; computer and Internet embody the projection of human brain not an inch less directly and graphically than the shovel the projection of hand. But nevertheless for taking into account all topical aspects of the problem of technique some modernization of the idea would be needed. It was noted, e.g., that today it should be complemented with the “analysis of the back action and influence, which new artificial organs had and will have on further development of man”⁵. As demonstrated by countless facts, new organs do not preserve natural proportions of human being, and,

⁴ H.Beck. Das Wesen der Technik // H.Beck. Kulturphilosophie der Technik. Trier 1979.

⁵ H.Sachsse. Anthropologie der Technik // G.Ropohl (Hrsg.) Interdisziplinäre Technikforschung. Beiträge zur Bewertung und Steuerung der technischen Entwicklung. Berlin 1981.

instead of serving man, they frequently make harm to him, sometimes on catastrophic scale. In addition, the idea in its present form takes badly into account the social aspects of technique: it is important that “new organs” frequently are not only created owing to certain social factors, but can be used only collectively; so that they belong not to individuals, but to communities and produce new connections and new social fabric.

For us, however, different aspects are important. It is essential that technique, treated as the projection of organs, appears as a direct practical realization of the structural and dynamic identity of the Micro- and Macrocosmos: all the sphere of reality technologically assimilated by man in its operational structure, and hence also in its dynamics, implied by this structure, turns out to be organized “in the image and after the likeness of man”, in the anthropological paradigm. As a result, the isomorphism itself can be reinterpreted: in a new context, it is not theological or philosophical postulate as well as not a given empiric fact, but a created characteristic of reality, result of technical activity of man in the world. Hence it follows a certain methodological approach to problems of global dynamics and human strategy in Nature and Cosmos. According to the described anthropocentric attitude, strategies of man in Nature in their essence and character are nothing but the projecting of some or other energetic features (functions, properties, predicates...) of anthropological reality; whence the Macrocosmos (the sphere of the assimilated reality) in the dimension of energy, structurally and dynamically, is basically, *grosso modo*, similar to Microcosmos. Anthropological strategy turns out to be the key to global dynamics, and problems of the global development by means of the projection principle go back to anthropological problems and features of the anthropological situation.

Immediate implications of this are of the dual kind, concerning, first, the principles of the appraisal of present trends of the global development and second, the basic principles of the considered type of global dynamics, namely, the global dynamics of deification. In the first case, we try to recognize in the modern global problems, negative trends and phenomena the reflection of problems and trends of the anthropological situation: we discern here projections of diseases, vices and weaknesses of man, stigmata of his finiteness, in the philosophical terms, or fallenness, in the theological ones. One ranks usually among cardinal problems of the technogene civilization of present day the uncontrollable development and growth of the technosphere, ecological problems (pollution of the environment, exhausting of natural resources, destroying of natural ecosystems, etc.) and also bioethical problems, brought forth by the progress of medical and biological technologies (euthanasia, cloning, transplantation, transformation of the existing and creation of new biological species, etc.). In all these problems anthropological roots can be easily discerned.

Christian ascetic anthropology characterizes a wide spectrum of negative phenomena in structures of personality and behaviour of man by means of the concept of *passion* (πάθος). In the framework of the energetic vision of man (v. Part I), the passion is defined as a “unnatural” organization of the energetic configuration of man, a special kind of this configuration, in which all energies are subordinate to one of them, the “dominant”, and form a stable structure, supporting and protecting this subordination. Thus, in contrast to usual, or “natural” configurations, unstable and changing quickly, the state of the subordination to a dominant, or the “passionate

state”, has the cyclic and self-reproducing character, kindred to cyclic states of consciousness in psychiatry and cyclic trajectories of dynamic systems. In this interpretation⁶, passion is a general anthropological phenomenon, going far out the circle of the simplest examples, like greed, lust, envy, etc., with which the ancient asceticism chiefly dealt, and close to the patterns of the Unconscious (see above). The classical ancient analytic of passions can be developed and generalized in many directions, of which two are especially interesting for our subject. First, with the development and change of the society, environment, structure of occupations, etc., the repertory of passions is changing too. New kinds of passions emerge, among which the states with dominants related to intellectual and technical activities are prevailing. Second, according to our anthropocentric principle, passionate states are being projected onto the Macrocosmos, as global and collective phenomena.

Hence it is clear, what interpretation is given to negative trends and phenomena of technological development in our model. Uncontrollable growth of the technosphere and its gaining of the autonomy mean that the goals and values of the technological development have taken the dominant position in the configuration of energies of certain human communities or even the humanity as a whole. The total absorption of these communities in technical progress and slavish subjugation to it took place, and it means, in its turn, that the passionate state of a new kind, collective and global, has been formed. In this connection, it is important that in the asceticism a whole sophisticated discipline of dealing with the passionate states long exists, including methods of their discerning at early stages, practices of destroying and leaving them, etc. Hence, besides providing a certain interpretation of the phenomena of uncontrollable technical development, the anthropocentric approach may also suggest some strategies of mastering them. Similar possibilities are opened by this approach in the field of ecological problems. For the most part, the latter can also be treated, basing on the generalized conception of passions; and what is more, in many cases, like problems of the destruction of environment or exhausting resources, the anthropological roots can be traced not to some new passions, but to the oldest passions of human consumerism, like wasting or greed.

As for the mastering of these problems, its general principles are clear enough from the viewpoint of our global model. The Universe is represented as a Mega-system, comprising the three big spheres, *Man – Technique – Nature*. Each of these possesses its own structure and dynamics, and equally each of these possesses some trends, potentialities of expansion, domination and suppression of other spheres, in which trends the majority of the global problems of our age is rooted. The position of the Christian anthropocentrism does not mean at all that the trends of the human domination over Nature should be given an unrestricted freedom. It means that the mission of man is to serve as an intelligent linking and centering agent in the Mega-system, which coordinates, harmonizes relations of all the three spheres and opens for their ensemble the prospect and possibility of the ontological transcendence. The way to this goal is *dynamical convergence*, i.e. the coordination and rapprochement of the developmental trends, dynamical regimes and patterns of the three spheres (so that, for instance, the technological sphere should get more and more adapted and brought nearer to the patterns of Man and Nature, which process gradually develops already,

⁶ V.: S.S.Horuzhy. To the Phenomenology of Asceticism. Moscow 1998. (In Russian).

together with the development of the opposite trends). This principle characterizes every stage of the globalized ascending process as a coherent unity of energies of the three spheres. Demanding the careful monitoring of all the expansion processes, it also implies a definite position in the well-known problem of the “limits of growth”.

In bioethical problems we find a bit different anthropological roots. Behind almost each of these problems, let it be the cloning, euthanasia or transplantation of organs, the same conceptual and logical situation can be discerned. In all this sphere, there exists the supreme ethical principle and value, subject to unconditional protection and preservation: and this is the human personality. The source of the problems is that in certain spheres of human activity some practices and research fields emerge, which, by some opinions, contradict the stated principle and present the threat of the destruction of personality, while, by other opinions, they do not contradict this principle and are ethically sound and admissible. The indisputable element in the situation is that the disputed kinds of activity, such as genetic engineering, have reached the practical ability of the technical manipulation with human personality, man as a biological and intellectual being: the ability of transforming, reducing, possibly even doubling the latter. Hence the necessity emerged to introduce some protecting rules and formulate the conditions and criteria of the preservation of personality, its undestroyed wholeness. But all the attempts to do this on a satisfactory level fail. All proposed restrictions and criteria turn out to be in some or other respect arbitrary and questionable, and the consensus is never achieved.

From the viewpoint of the Christian anthropology this failure is explainable. The only possible base for a universal and correct, devoid of all arbitrariness, solution of the discussed problems could be a self-consistent conception of *(self-)identity of man*, including the definition of this notion and a sufficient set of criteria, which outline borders of the personality in its principal dimensions and are suitable for practical applications. But such conception is not available today. (Self-)identity of man presents itself a profound problem, complete solution of which is of no avail in any of the existing philosophical or psychological schools. For the Christian anthropology this absence of the solution has a profound reason: the correct solution simply does not exist, since *the created individual does not possess the complete self-identity*. Such completeness demands a definite ontological status and completed constitution (for which reason it is possessed either by a thing or by personality in the strongest sense of Divine Hypostasis). But the created individual is an intermediate kind of being, possessing only a rudiment or seed of the true being and personality (Hypostasis); he has only a chance to acquire a full-fledged ontological status by the bifurcational ontological dynamics of freedom, in which a certain meta-anthropological perspective is realized. It is symptomatic that the same conclusion about absence of the truly self-identical individual was drawn on a completely different base in the postmodernist discourse, where it was expressed by the famous formula “death of the subject”. Hence we conclude that the solution of the whole complex of bioethical problems should be based on a certain solution of the problem of self-identity of man, and this latter solution is available only in the enlarged context, namely, with the choice of a certain meta-anthropological perspective and strategy. As a result, this complex can, in principle, obtain an adequate treatment in the framework of the global dynamics of deification.

The place and tasks of technique and technology in the constitution of this dynamics are clearly implied by its general principles. In our anthropocentric model, global dynamics is a projection of anthropological dynamics, and the global dynamics of deification is the projection of the spiritual practice in its hesychast form; so that the technique should serve as a practical apparatus of this specific projecting. Hence it follows that we need to single out the principal features of the hierarchy of anthropological energetic configurations, ascending to the meta-anthropological telos, and then try to find, which technologies would be able to perform the global projecting of these features. The task seems to be quite concrete, but getting down to it, we discover a problem of principle, related to the very possibility of the realization of the global dynamics of deification. Indeed, the spiritual practice as well as everyone of its stages is an energetic concept, certain paradigm of the organization of human energies and activities; and this paradigm is, generally speaking, total, in the sense that its realization absorbs man totally, demanding the participation of all his energies. This is a classical and known long since property of the mystico-ascetic practice: being immersed into it, a man “rejects the world”, disconnects himself from all usual occupations of the external life. But it is the same man who should realize the global projecting of this practice! As a result, one discovers in the constitution of the global dynamics of deification a contradiction or aporia, which can be called the aporia of the (in)compatibility of *Homo mysticus* and *Homo faber*. As we see it, the practical solution of this aporia, reconciliation of the two opposite anthropological paradigms, extreme introvert and extreme extravert, is to become one of the key anthropological problems of the future. Our preliminary analysis of it⁷ shows that the solution is possible, in principle, but it demands far-going development of the resources of human consciousness, its abilities of the self-observation, self-control and coordinated combination of many activities at the same time.

Spiritual practice is holistic, and it is not just the consciousness, but the whole composition of man that changes in it. The changes are oriented to properties of the telos, ontological horizon of the personal being-communion, which is characterized in the theological discourse as the dynamic reciprocal relation of Three Consubstantial Hypostases. In its turn, this dynamic (i.e. energetic) relation is characterized as Love and its constructive correlate, the Byzantine concept “perichoresis” (περιχωρησις, circumincessio), meaning “going roundabout”, incessant mutual exchange of being, complete giving of one’s own being to the other, complete mutual acceptance and openness. Hence it follows that the being-communion, constituted in the paradigm of the perichoresis, is a kind of being, characterized by total dynamic connection and transparency. As testified also by the mystical experience of higher stages of the spiritual ascension, these two properties belong to the main predicates acquired by the anthropological reality in the ascension to the meta-anthropological telos. Accordingly, the technological aspect of the global dynamics of deification consists in achieving these properties on the global level. It is a many-dimensional and many-sided process, concrete forms of which still belong mainly to the science-fiction today. For this reason we restrict ourselves to a few remarks.

⁷ S.S.Horuzhy. On Things old and new. St.Petersburg 2000.(In Russian).

Being directed to synergy and creating in the synergetic (in both meanings, the and the metaphysical) the transparence and connection of the Macrocosmos, the global dynamics of deification should lead to the convergence of the inner and outer, anthropological and technological branches of the dynamics, and to their gradual unification. It means that it leads also to the change of the character of interaction between man and the outside world, so that the borders between man and his environment become changeable and conditional. When, with the ascension to the meta-anthropological telos, all the levels of the human being, somatic, psychic and intellectual, get transformed, relation of man to Nature and Cosmos unavoidably undergoes profound changes too. All mystical traditions testify in the complete agreement that in the highest stages of spiritual practice perceptive modalities of man take a radically new form. In the limit, this form has the character of so-called *synesthesia* (συνεισθησις, the term of the neoplatonic mysticism), the unified pan-perception, belonging not to an isolated organ, but to all the transfigured human being, made transparent for Divine energies. In the hesychasm this transfigured perception has been called “intellectual senses”. Hence the technique in the global dynamics of deification should realize the global projection of this new perception, transforming the Macrocosmos into the scene of the cosmic synesthesia, perceptive medium, which equally percepts and is open to perception, transparent⁸. Besides other distinctions, the “intellectual senses” correspond to a different form of temporality, which is specific to mystical experience (see⁷). And in the global projecting, which is to be realized by the technosphere, this mystical temporality of the anthropological dynamics should meet other specific forms of temporality, those of relativistic cosmological models. Touching upon the fundamental predicate of finiteness of the present being, such phenomena enter already the eschatological discourse. The dynamics of deification cannot avoid this discourse; but, as said in the Scripture, our vision of the “last things” in this life will always remain vague, as “through the glass darkly”.

⁸ Here the ideas of the global dynamics of deification have something in common with cosmic and anthropological utopias of the Russian avant-garde of the Twenties. In a similar way, there were some common motives with this avant-garde discourse in the late work by Father Pavel Florensky, where a kind of the Christian global model (the model of “pneumatosphere”) has been outlined. However, this model by Florensky followed not the paradigm of deification, but that of sacralization. The relations of these two paradigms are discussed in our book⁷.