

REHABILITATING PITIRIM SOROKIN'S GRAND TRIADOLOGIC CONCEPT: A BIOCOSMOLOGICAL APPROACH

Konstantin S. KHROUTSKI

ABSTRACT. *This work attempts to rehabilitate Pitirim A. Sorokin's Triadologic approach to civilizational and sociocultural studies. Sorokin's Triadology means the discovery and substantiation of the three natural types of sociocultural (super) systems (in the work, they are given the abbreviation – T-SCSS). Each T-SCSS is essentially autonomic, in its whole and all-embracing organization, but heterogeneous (and reducible to its own foundational principles or “ultimate true realities”, in Sorokin's term). All the Three T-SCSS (called by Sorokin as “Sensate”, “Ideational” and “Integral”) are always synchronously active, but dynamic and cyclic (taking the dominance by turns) in their interrelations. The well-being of the world (life) is impossible without this natural dynamic (evolutionary) cyclicality. In general, Sorokin's scientific activity is essentially characterized (especially that this truth had not come to light for Sorokin himself) as the contemporary representation of neo-Aristotelism¹ (Aristotle's Naturalist Organicism – Biocosmology).*

It is argued in the work that at present the concept of the T-SCSS can be extended into the more broad notion of the type of ‘cosmology’, and, thence – to the Triadologic (cosmological) construction of knowledge (substantiating Three forms of scholarly endeavors: Positivist, Organicist, and Integralist). This approach already is realized in the agency of the Biocosmological Association (BCA was launched in Veliky Novgorod, in 2010). A key proposal is to advance a new scientific – Triadologic – approach to civilizational studies (relying on the Biocosmological foundational principles). The primary task is, however – to overcome the existing ‘cosmological insufficiency’, which is firstly the misinterpretation of the true (of scientific Organicism) meaning of the Aristotelian philosophical (super)system. Essentially, Aristotle's great scholarly potential (his Naturalist cosmological Organicism) is urgently needed for the contemporary global scientific

¹ Notably, the Biocosmological Association (BCA) has introduced the neologism “Aristotelism” instead of the commonly used “Aristotelianism”. The reason is that BCA treats the Aristotelian philosophy as the autonomic (super)system of rational scholarly knowledge (and which truly is the foundation of the entire modern scientific edifice). In other words, Biocosmology (neo-Aristotelism) means a kind of “cosmology” or “kosmology” (if to refer to the Ancient “Kosmos” – the notion of the world-whole and the Organicist world order).

In this approach, Aristotle's philosophy evidently stands as a rational supersystem of knowledge that is fundamentally autonomic – fully reducible to Aristotle's Biocosmist – *Hylomorphist* – world outlook; Organicist physics and metaphysics; Four-causal-aetiology (with the leading role of teleodrive causes); Functionalist telic methodology; bio-socio-Kosmist anthropology and universalizing Bio-sciences (of all types: natural, human and social, formal, applied) and Noospheric global sociocultural development and co-evolution. In fact, this is Aristotle's original, but a radically new approach in the contemporary scientific milieu. A reason is, therefore (as it was considered in the BCA) – to distinguish it (from the commonly accepted attitudes) by the use of the neologism “neo-Aristotelism”.

community. In the work, the notions Aristotle-1.0, Aristotle-2.0, Aristotle-3.0 and Aristotle-4.0 are proposed which signify that, at present – for the third time in global cultural history – the significance of Aristotle’s scientific Organicism is lost from the modern cultural agenda, and the potential of the contemporary (neo)Aristotelian scholarly cognition is accumulated (now) in the interior of the Russian scientific tradition (of Russian Cosmism, Organicism, Functionalism, Cyclism, Pulsationism, etc.). This fundamental substantive potential is ready for use by the global culture (and scholarly community), now, actually – for the construction of the Integralist era in the world evolutionary development. In the latter relation, three science-oriented approaches are advanced and characterized in the paper.

Firstly, however, we are to get over the aforementioned ‘cosmological insufficiency’. Still, in fact, the foundations of our modern (of the 21st century) scholarly activity refer to the opposite foundational idealistic principles (established yet in the 17th century) of Dualism and Anthropocentrism (and their mathematical physicalism), thus placing Sorokin’s essential scientific Organicism (and its cornerstone “immanent causality”) beyond the scope of modern scholarly sense of concern and attention. Under such conditions (of civilizationists’ and other scholars’ persisting inability to see the realistic causing factors of civilizational development), crises-conflicts-clashes-wars are inevitable. The time is, therefore, to draw correct – Realistic – conclusions and proceed to doing right things.

KEYWORDS: Pitirim Sorokin, Triadology, type of sociocultural supersystem, Aristotelism, scientific Organicism, Russian cosmism, (Bio)cosmology

Contents

Introduction

1. PITIRIM A. SOROKIN’S SCHOLARLY TRIADODOLOGY

1.1. The notion of ‘cosmology’ and representation of the basic Biocosmological principles

1.2. Triadologic basis of the contemporary Biocosmological approach

2. PITIRIM A. SOROKIN AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATURALIST ORGANICISM (NEO-ARISTOTELISM, BIOCOSMOLOGY)

3. CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL ‘COSMOLOGICAL INSUFFICIENCY’

3.1. Paradoxes and inconsistencies in Pitirim Sorokin’s theoretical constructions

3.2. ‘Cosmological insufficiency’ as the decisive factor

4. THE ORGANICIST TRIADODOLOGIC NATURAL LAW

5. ARISTOTLE-1.0; ARISTOTLE-2.0; ARISTOTLE-3.0; ARISTOTLE-4.0

6. INTEGRALIST ERA – THREE SCIENCE-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO ITS REALIZATION

Conclusion

Introduction

An outstanding (Russian-American) sociologist Pitirim A. Sorokin, studying the causes of “super-rhythm of Ideational-Idealistic-Sensate supersystems” (Sorokin 2010:679–683) had disclosed the Triadologic essence of sociocultural reality and further developed the Triadologic method of civilizational and sociocultural studies. In the outcome, he made the prognosis that “a new – more integralistic – supersystem of culture and noble society built not upon the withered Sensate root but upon a healthier and more vigorous root of integralistic principle.” (Sorokin 2010:702). It can be argued that the prognosis of the maitre of modern sociology and civilizational studies is essentially realized.

Indeed, the world today becomes more complex. The contemporary societal milieu is actually characterized by the cultural diversity and even by the Clash of Civilizations (Huntington 1993). Essentially, Samuel Huntington posits that in the contemporary (Post-Cold War) time precisely cultural and civilizational (rather than ideological) differences become the main driving forces of conflicts, clashes and wars. Thus, the primary task (in understanding actual civilizational “crises and renewals”) is the exploration and scholarly substantiation of the inherent grounds of existing actual civilizations and their natural activities. Huntington states: “Civilization identity will be increasingly important in the future, and the world will be shaped in large measure by the interactions among seven or eight major civilizations. These include Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and possibly African civilization. The most important conflicts of the future will occur along the cultural fault lines separating these civilizations from one another.” (1993:25) To the point, still, “cultural fault lines” are beyond the profound scholarly exploration.

At the same time, inasmuch as the global cultural world becomes more complex, and many new internal factors come onto the scene, causing the appearance of new tensions (conflicts, crises) – the scientific community and public leaders are facing new problems and challenges. Thus, we can note the obvious paradoxical situation (of global significance), wherein the modern society and culture have found themselves now. The gist is that, on the one hand, the cultural world is evolving (by itself, spontaneously) and approaching the Integralist forms of (global and local) co-existence and co-evolution. On the other hand, although modern scholars and public figures do their best to mitigate the adverse effects – contemporary foundations of the scientific activity (aetiological, gnoseological, methodological, anthropological, sociocultural, of evolutionary theory and global studies, etc.) still rely on the basic (foundational) principles of science that were advanced and established yet in the 17th (at best, 18–19th) centuries, and which have the purely Sensate meaning.

Thus, the real (natural) cultural global development is adequate for (or aiming at) the 21st century’s reality, while the modern scientific foundations correspond to the Sensate “major premises” and “ultimate principles” of the 17th century. This is both the paradoxical and dangerous situation! Indeed, the lack of theoretical means for the sufficient comprehension and the adequate control of the contemporary

unfavourable (but natural) processes may lead to serious irreversible effects. Therefore, we urgently need to start the search of the effective and adequate foundational principles and systemic theoretical means. Among them, certainly, Pitirim Sorokin's Triadologic scholarly approach has a crucial significance.

In the given work, our main task is precisely to rehabilitate (and, thus, introduce to scholarly medium anew) Pitirim Sorokin's Triadologic approach (now, on the Biocosmological – neo-Aristotelian – foundation). The gist is that the Triadologic approach (which was discovered, advanced and substantiated by Pitirim Sorokin in the 1930s), and which is a cornerstone of the Biocosmological Association agency – has been lost in the field of view of the modern scientific community. A crucial point, herein – it is not easy (equally for the BCA's associates) to grasp the Triadic (Triune) essence of the civilizational and sociocultural (dynamic, cyclical, evolutionary) development. Therefore, we do need to set aside (for a while) the immediate discussion of hot political events; but to primarily focus on the purely scientific foundational (methodological) issues. From our (BCA's) standpoint – this is firstly the issue of naturalist Triadology (discovered by Sorokin, and which has the essence of “Copernican revolution”), but which still are not apprehensible (or well forgotten) in the current scholarly milieu. Otherwise, without clarifying the methodological principles, our habitual immediate stressing on (hot political) examples' discussions – is the direct way to a fruitless speculation (inasmuch as they all can easily be interpreted with other various indistinct bases, thus attaching to the overall process of their discussion a kind of pointless and/or superficial debating.

Pitirim Sorokin founded and introduced the grand Triadologic method for the study of civilizational and sociocultural processes in his four-volume phenomenal “Social and Cultural Dynamics” (1937–1941). However, so far this method has not become a reliable tool for the actual scientific research. Paradoxically, Sorokin's legacy – his dynamic cyclic theory of civilization and sociocultural change, and its underlying Triadology – and although he is recognized “a giant of 20th century sociological thought”) – nowadays Sorokin is perceived as a “marginal figure” in science and whose works are treated “largely as deviations from accepted social scientific practice...” (Nichols 2012), thus factually making his scientific method unusable in modern scholarly endeavors.

In this paper, the reasons for this adverse event are subject to scrutiny. Several reasons are identified, but the so-called ‘cosmological insufficiency’ is recognized as the most significant. ‘Cosmological insufficiency’ firstly means that modern scholars have lost the sight of the true significance of Aristotle's philosophy which essentially is the (super)system of Naturalist Organicism. This happens not for the first time in cultural history. In the special section (entitled Aristotle-1.0, Aristotle-2.0, Aristotle-3.0, Aristotle-4.0) – at least three periods of the neglect of Aristotle's philosophy (and its subsequent return to the forefront of scientific activity) are discussed. With respect to the current (Integralist) epoch, neo-Aristotelian potential (once again, without a serious attention from the modern scientific community) is accumulated in the Russian scientific tradition. Primarily, in this relation, the notion ‘cosmology’ is

introduced and characterized as the notion of a special cognitive supersystem (similar to Sorokin's concept of the type of a sociocultural supersystem, but which is broader and embraces the entire range of life phenomena). In this course, some information on Biocosmology and Biocosmological Association is given in the Section 1.

In the outcome, the work aims to contribute to the effective resolution of contemporary actual Integralist issues. Firstly, in this direction, the pursuits that are currently realized within the scope and agency of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations (ISCSC)¹ are appreciable (they are given attention in the Section 5). The other approach relates to the general development and scope of activity of the Biocosmological Association (BCA). Another one (the third), which equally accepts the Biocosmological (neo-Aristotelian) foundations – is aimed at the development of potentials of the Asian holistic philosophical systems, and, thus – has the special actual significance and destination. Therein, connoting with the (also transitional and Integralist, although of the opposite direction) epoch of the European Renaissance – the notion of the civilizational epoch of 'Asian Awakening' is coined. Essentially, the Asian cosmologies are the natural bases – “ultimate principles” – for the construction of a true Integralist civilization and sociocultural reality.

1. PITIRIM A. SOROKIN'S SCHOLARLY TRIADOLOGY

Pitirim A. Sorokin (1889–1968) is ranked by L.T. Nichols (1999) as “a towering figure in the first half of the twentieth century,” (1999:139). Sorokin was the first Chair of the Department of Sociology at Harvard University, and he served as President of the American Sociological Association in 1964. Barry V. Johnston substantially adds that the works of Pitirim Sorokin are done in the field of a strict empirical sociology, each, starting from the first volume of *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (in 1937) containing “an enormous amount of comparative statistical data” (2001:42). Likewise, from the Introduction to the Transaction Edition (by Michel P. Richards), of his *magnus opus* – the work “Social and Cultural Dynamics” (commonly abbreviated as *Dynamics*; in its Fourth printing, 2010) we can know that realizing this grand project Sorokin and his assistants “examined and classified over 100,000 works of art as well as all the major philosophers...” (p.ix). These are the notable features of his work: the rigorous empirical approach to the studied (of colossal size) material; and “rather than sampling his data, Sorokin attempted an exhaustive classification of art works and thinkers over a 2500-year span.” (Richards 2010:ix)

In this way (studying Sorokin's Integralism), B.V. Johnson complements that Sorokin “adumbrates a new approach to social science and the treatment of social problems”; in this Johnston refers to Sorokin's works that “begin with *Dynamics*, progress through his crisis studies, and culminate in his works on altruism and social reconstruction.” (2001:42) Likewise, Johnson essentially stresses that “besides ideographic, Sorokin's scientific activity includes the essential and considerable

¹ The ISCSC-website is: <http://www.wmich.edu/iscsc/index.html>

nomothetic component, which both have led (shifted) Sorokin's scientific advances at the level of ability "to attack the idea of a *progressive linear evolution* (*italics is mine. – K.K.*) that culminated in the modern age of science and progress." (p.42) This is a penetrating appraisal of Sorokin's advances, for the above-mentioned Integralism (and the scholarly cyclic approach to sociocultural and civilizational studies on the whole) deals with the changeable sociocultural reality which, thereby (as the research issues) – is incomprehensible for the commonly accepted (scientist, "linear")¹ methods of research. Especially, the Triadologic essence of Pitirim Sorokin's cyclical theory of sociocultural change is in the focus of our attention.

"Regrettably, the reviews of the 1937 volumes, – as Johnston has revealed, – were mixed and the book fared poorly at Harvard and in the sociological community". At the same time, more importantly, the fourth volume of *Dynamics*, which contained the most powerful argument and evidence for Sorokin's Integralism, was not published until 1941. "By then many sociologists had lost interest" (2001:42). Lawrence T Nichols shed more light on the study of this complex issue. He found out (2012) that "knowing little about the larger Russian socio-historical milieu, its intellectual discourse and collective memory," Western scholars have not been able to comprehend Sorokin's outlook, behavior and professional output in the United States in relation to these essential contextual factors. Nichols concludes that "this is arguably a fundamental reason why many U.S. sociologists have tended to see Sorokin, especially since 1937, as a marginal figure and to regard his works largely as deviations from accepted social scientific practice... that did not accord with contemporary 'normal science' (in Thomas Kuhn's notion)." Thus, in short, L.T. Nichols arrives at the conclusion that "despite his overall assimilation into American society and higher education, including his appointment at Harvard University and his election as president of the American Sociological Association, Sorokin should be understood in large measure as a life-long Russian intellectual." (Ibid)

In turn, from the standpoint of Jay Weinstein (2004), Sorokin's "integral philosophy, or integralism, is presented as the solution to problems associated with the most recent stage of a long historical cycle." Characterizing this cycle, J.Weinstein profoundly touched upon the essential moment in regard to Sorokin's scholarly approach: "this cycle is comprised of three alternating types of cultures: the sensate, the dominant type in the contemporary Western world; the ideational, characterized by spirituality and altruism; and the idealistic, a transitional stage that occurs between the other two." (p.52) As it is well known (firstly, from his comprehensive four-volume study, *Social and Cultural Dynamics, 1937–1941*), Sorokin believed that currently the Sensate era is on the verge of decline and that a new, Idealistic (Integral) stage might be emerging (if it could be helped along). Sorokin stated "the *Dynamics*' prognosis of the coming decline of the domination of empirical, Sensate system of truth and science." (2010:254)

Sorokin's scholarly Triadology – his basic grasp of the "the principle of immanent change" that underlies "*each of the three integrated forms, or phases, of*

¹ Based on the idea of a "progressive linear evolution".

the Ideational, Idealistic and Sensate supersystems”, determining their changing: “*rising, growing, existing full-blooded for some time, and then declining*”; and explaining “why each of these forms does not stay forever at its domination, and why it has to give place for the other forms of the triad.” (Sorokin 2010:676) – all this is a cornerstone moment for the origination and development of Biocosmological Association (BCA) and its journal “Biocosmology – neo-Aristotelism”. It is significant that Pitirim Sorokin perceived sociocultural reality as essentially *heterogeneous*, which includes interrelating bipolar (and intermediate – Integral) spheres, and which is hierarchical and changeable, i.e. dynamic and cyclic (Triadic). Essentially, Sorokin introduced the Organicist scientific approach – a kind of scholarly Triadology – which naturally corresponds to the Bipolar and Triadic essence of sociocultural reality. Brilliant scholar, Sorokin genetically related (in his sociocultural synthesis) the ideas of Ancient triadology and Christian Trinitarian range of issues, and, of course – of his scholarly Triadic typology of the world cultures (civilizations, sociocultural supersystems).

Essentially, Sorokin dealt precisely with the unified “types” of sociocultural systems, As he explained this moment (in his answer to Arnold Toynbee, during the First ISCSC-conference in Salzburg, 1961) – there are two main approaches to the study of civilizations: the one “tries to find in the total human universe of social and cultural phenomena main systems of high cultures or high civilizations as a unified body, in which each important part is interdependent and dependent on other parts, each part depends upon its whole and the whole depends upon its parts” (this approach is represented by F.C. Northrop, A. Kroeber and P.A. Sorokin); the other approach is represented by Danilevsky, Spengler, and Toynbee, and it “tries to define ‘intelligible fields of study,’ identify civilizations as a ‘spatially bounded entity somehow located within a part of the population occupying certain territory” (Palencia-Roth 2011:54–55). Therefore, inasmuch as Sorokin’s unifying – Triadic typological – approach is essential for us, we find it reasonable to introduce the abbreviation T-SCSS (**T**ype of **S**ociocultural **S**upersystem), precisely in respect to Sorokin’s scholarly Triadologic approach.

A decisive moment is that each of the Three grand T-SCSS are autonomic and embracing (universalizing) all the other social and cultural systems of the given “Type”. Sorokin stated: “all the fine arts of these cultures are part of one living unity, the manifestation of one system; and that therefore when this culture begins to undergo the process of transformation, they all naturally follow the same path and change in the same direction.” (Sorokin 2010:223) This essential point is noted by other authors – “vast cultural system consists of language, science, philosophy, religion, the fine arts, ethics, law, and the vast derivative systems of applied technology, economics, and politics.” (Lane and Ersson, 2005:143). As well as “these civilizations, or cultural supersystems, like deep cultural undercurrents, largely determine most of the surface ripples of the sociocultural ocean: the life, organization, and functions of smaller groups and cultural systems, the mentality and behavior of individuals, and a multitude of concrete historical events, trends and

processes.” (Ibid.:14) The other essential moment is the disclosed Bipolarity of sociocultural reality (social and cultural phenomena and processes). In his *Dynamics* Sorokin stated: “In brief, the Sensate culture is the opposite of the Ideational in its major premises.” (Sorokin 2010:28)

At least, we can affirm that Sorokin made the greatest discovery (of a kind of “Copernican revolution”) – by disclosing the Triadic (and Bipolar) – cyclic, dynamic – nature of the sociocultural reality. Robert K. Cooper and Ayman Sawaf exactly evaluate Pitirim Sorokin as a “revolutionary thinker” – they highlight Sorokin’s focus on the study of the “three forms of truth: sensory, rational and intuitive” (1997). Moreover, the integration of senses, intuition and reason is precisely the core feature of the integral gnoseology used by Aristotle. One more penetrating note made by Cooper and Sawaf is that for Sorokin, “the most fundamental and essential, and the deepest, is intuitive” (Ibid.). Notably, authors (who study Sorokin’s theory) usually take into consideration “senses, reason, and faith”, as it is given in V.Jeffries’ “The integral paradigm: The truth of faith and the social sciences” (1999). The authors likewise give the valuable reminder of Carl Yung’s judgment: “the term intuition does not denote something contrary to reason, but something outside the province of reason.”

In general, there are various appraisals and opinions in relation to the elements in the “triadologic” approach by Pitirim Sorokin. For instance, V.Jeffries points out that “Sorokin’s sociology rests on the assumption that there are three components of the subject matter: personality, as thinking and acting individuals; society, the totality of interacting individuals and social relationships; and culture, composed of meanings, values, and norms and the vehicles through which they are manifested” (2006)¹. Tiit Remm’s “a closer look at Sorokin’s work reveals the illusion of using a hierarchic triadic model of meaning-subject-object.” (2010:398). Andrew Targowski takes an analytical approach which is similar to the mature Sorokin’s research position, by considering the three sociocultural “supersystems” – “ideational (reality is spiritual), sensate (reality is material), or idealistic (a synthesis of the two).” (2011:6). Endre Kiss, in his conference paper “The Triadic Scheme of Sorokin’s Social Theories,”² offered an interpretation of the tension in Sorokin’s work from a philosophical perspective – between empiricism and holism.

At the same time, we are to pay attention to the conclusions of researchers who bear in mind properly the ‘triadologic meaning’, thus directly referring to Sorokin’s “triadic frame” and “triadic account of sociocultural dynamics” (Talbutt 2001:32); or who directly conclude that each actor (element) of the sociocultural unity (in the light of Sorokin’s conceptual constructions) “must ultimately be referred to the triadic

¹ Taken from the online publication of the author’s conference paper “The Contributions of Pitirim A. Sorokin’s System of Thought to Public Sociology”, at the American Sociological Association’s Annual Meeting, Montreal 2006. URL: http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/0/4/6/6/pages104664/p104664-1.php

² At the meeting in Slovenia, 2001, held by the German Society of Sociology.

manifold, or matrix in which it exists.” (Jeffries 2005:68) Evidently, therefore, an urge exists to focus and attempt to elucidate and rationally substantiate the essence of Triadologic (Bipolar, Dynamic, Cyclic) approaches and advances realized by Pitirim Sorokin – “a giant of 20th century sociological thought” (in expression of Robert K. Merton). Especially that Pitirim Sorokin outlined a clear perspective of constructing “a new – more integralistic – supersystem of culture and noble society built not upon the withered Sensate root but upon a healthier and more vigorous root of integralistic principle.” (Sorokin 2010:702). However, we do need to know, first of all – in clear rational forms – what is the scientifically valid significance of these “roots” which will serve as the reliable foundations for this essential construction.

In conclusion, regarding the main significance of Sorokin’s Triadologic concept, we can claim that the contemporary crisis is ‘naturally’ persistent and guideless due to the evident neglect of Natural Organicist causes (‘Natural Organicist laws’), which are still out of view of the modern scholarly community. Accordingly, expectation of civilizational “renewals” is delayed and poses a threat to the continuation of (natural processes’) safe evolutionary (in complexity) sociocultural development. All this is the result (in our view) of the contemporary ‘cosmological insufficiency’ – a historical ‘myopia’ and inability to comprehend and follow the Organicist laws of Nature (Biocosmos) – firstly to rehabilitate the significance of Aristotle’s philosophical (super)system of scientific Organicism. The latter primarily means the comprehension (recognition) and development of the Organicist basic principles: the inherent Changeability (Immanent causality and Teleodrive evolution), Bipolarity, Triadicity, Dynamic Cyclicity (Spiral evolutionary development), Heterogeneity and the Hierarchical pattern of the natural (Kosmist) world, etc. These Natural Organicist principles embrace the entire multiplicity of life forms, including the civilizational (equally of global evolution) processes.

Our scholarly failure to follow the laws of (Bio)nature – already had brought about, as the inevitable result, two world wars in the 20th century; and currently (in the same trajectory) we are approaching the 3rd world war (in the 21st century). The contemporary conflicts in Ukraine, Moldavia, Balkans, Iran, Syria, Iraq, Egypt (and so forth) are the evident signs of this horrible prospect. Strikingly, Pitirim Sorokin has disclosed and substantiated (and warned about) the causes of the modern Crisis (which threatens the existence of all mankind) yet in the 1920s, long before the contemporary man-made civilizational catastrophes – firstly of world wars, past and coming (in which connection, pathological – unnatural – impact on the dynamics of current civilizational conflicts has a profound negative influence).

We, therefore, urgently are to rehabilitate Sorokin’s theoretical (of the Natural Organicist essence) proposals, primarily his Triadologic conception of the natural sociocultural (evolutionary) development. In this way, primarily, we need to acknowledge that contemporary civilizational studies do not have the character of a purely applied science. As all other sciences, civilizationists’ pursuits are to have (be constructed on) their own foundational bases. At the same time, as already stated above, modern civilizational (sociocultural) knowledge still is based on the

foundational (aetiological, methodological, anthropological) bases of the 17th century (i.e., of purely Dualist and Anthropocentric essence, thus definitely ignoring the true Organicist approaches). Evidently, nowadays, someone (of science fields) ought to push forward the 21st century's (natural, adequate) foundations of science – 21st century's foundations of science for the 21st century's science-based efficient civilizational and sociocultural development (and not only evolving in respect to hi-tech progress). To our (BCA) firm belief, civilizationists are the primary candidates (and responsible persons) to realize this essential function.

1.1. The notion of ‘cosmology’ and representation of the basic Biocosmological principles

Three major types of sociocultural supersystems (T-SCSS) and multiple constituting systems of social and cultural organization (in each of the Three T-SCSS) – all this is the objective reality which does not depend on human's consciousness (but is based on the natural order of things, including the determining natural “immanent causation”). Thus, each of the Three main T-SCSS incorporates its own “major premises” (“ultimate principles”, “cultural mentalities”; or, in other words, types of rationality, types of cognitive activity, mindsets, etc.). Therefore, an urge is to include into the contemporary scientific activity (firstly, into the area of civilizational studies) a special scope of research which deals precisely with the Type of all-embracing scholarly endeavors (in accordance with the Three T-SCSS disclosed and substantiated by P.Sorokin), thus ranging from (the given T-SCSS's) “ultimate principles” to applied theories and concrete practical activities.

For this reason, in the Biocosmological Association (BCA), we have advanced the notion ‘cosmology’, and its essential form – Biocosmology. Essentially, the meaning of ‘cosmology’ is close to Sorokin's notion of the T-SCSS (Type of all-embracing SocioCultural SuperSystems). In turn, the notion of ‘cosmology’ is intended to be broader – to embrace and cover (in each of the Three main cosmological spheres) the entire range of the phenomena and processes of life. Naturally, therefore, there are three “biocosmologies”, and the (neo)Aristotelian Biocosmology is just one of the Three, with its specific (Organicist) realm.

In general, accordingly to its original meaning, the notion “cosmology” refers to the comprehensive (all-embracing) and autonomic (with its own intrinsic organization that is not determined by extrinsic forces) sphere of scholarly cognition. Stated differently, ‘cosmology’ is a “supersystem” of rational scholarly knowledge – “type of” knowledge and cognitive activity – that integrates (on the basis of inherent “ultimate principles”) and embraces all the constitutive systems of knowledge applied in the given realm of life phenomena (and processes); and at all the hierarchical levels of life.

Originally, the field of *cosmological* explorations deals with the four main issues:

1. A study of the Universe in its *wholeness*, i.e. fundamental rational representation about the world as a whole;

2. A definite rational resolution of the world's *aetiology* – i.e. the issue of active (driving) *causes* in the cosmic (world) whole;
3. A definition of fundamental (*universal*) *laws* in respect to both material (Physicalist, Non-Organic) and Organic (Life) phenomena and processes;
4. Elucidation (in the accepted cosmological sphere) of the place and *role of the Individual* in the world current evolutionary processes.

For instance, in respect to the Biocosmology (RealKosmism) which is the form of neo-Aristotelism – its cosmological general principles are:

- *Organicist (Bio)physics* and (*Bio*)metaphysics;
- *Four-causal aetiology*;
- *Integral gnoseology*¹;
- *Functionalist telic methodology*;
- *bio-socio-Kosmist*² anthropology;
- *universalizing Bio-sciences* (both natural, human and social, formal, applied), which are ultimately directed at the
- Noospheric – *AnthropoKosmist* – global sociocultural development and *co-evolution*.

Characteristics of the other two cosmologies: of AntiKosmism (based on Plato's Dualism and which produces Anthropocentrism and Physicalism, or Positivism); and AKosmism (based on a Transcendent Holism, and which produces Anthropoholism and Complex Systems Sciences) – are given in the author's work (Khroutski 2013).

1.2. Triadologic basis of the contemporary Biocosmological approach

Pitirim A. Sorokin's scholarly Triadology is a cornerstone principle for the development of the Biocosmological Association (BCA). This organization (and its journal "Biocosmology – neo-Aristotelism") was launched in 2010, in Veliky Novgorod (Russia), at the Novgorod State University after Yaroslav-the-Wise. In its main conception Biocosmology aims to carry out a modern form of neo-Aristotelism, but precisely pursuing the goal of rehabilitating the genuine meaning of the Aristotelian philosophical system (a significant product of the world cultural development) – precisely in its true sense of the Aristotelian original scientific Organicism. In this regard, for the convenience of a brief expression of the entire Biocosmological approach – the formula "Bio-3/4" exists. Now, we propose a slight modification of this formula – into **Bio-4/3**. Herein:

¹ The notion 'gnoseology' deliberately replaces the commonly accepted term "epistemology", because the latter is actual in (refers to) exclusively the Sensate sphere of sociocultural activity (and its Positivist – mathematical-physicalist – science), while 'gnoseology' is proposed to be active in all the Three realms of scholarly endeavors (in Sorokin's and /Biocosmological designations): *Sensate/AntiKosmist, Ideational/RealKosmist, Integral/AKosmist*.

² The letter "K" in the "Kosmist" points out to the Ancient notion of Kosmos (which signifies cosmos-world as the all-embracing Organicist Kosmos), i.e. – to the ancient Greek rational cosmism.

“**Bio-**” means just the Aristotelian scientific Organicism that deals with all the real (empirically evident) world, whether physical or metaphysical (for, basically, the world-Kosmos is recognized as the one organic whole), hence the bases and methodological approaches to rational cognition are the same for both scopes, i.e. for all scientific and philosophical researches;

“**4**” – means aetiological Four-causality, with the cornerstone value of the Aristotelian principle of *hylomorphism* and primary significance of the unity of all the Four main Kosmic causes (*c.materialis*, *c.formalis*, *c efficiens* and *c.finalis*), but with the leading significance of the inherent teleodrive causes – *c.finalis* and *c.formalis-entelecheia*;

“**3**” – means methodological Triadicity – which deeply correlates with Sorokin’s Triadologic advances – the universal co-existence and alternating (cyclic dynamic) domination as of the Three autonomic spheres of life activity (in respect to any natural organic entity), as of the Three corresponding (equally autonomic) supersystems of scholarly rational knowledge (with the common subject-matter): two polar (opposite to each other in their organization and organic functioning); and the third (but considerably the first) – intermediate – the Integral(ist) sphere of knowledge.

Therefore, following the Triadologic approach – we always deal with the Three biocosmologies, wherein the Aristotelian (Organicist, AnthroKosmist) Biocosmology is just one of the three equal autonomic spheres of knowledge; while the other two are the Integralist (Holistic, of System sciences) and Positivist (Dualist, Mathematical-Physicalist, Anthropocentric) biocosmologies which (each) has its own physics and metaphysics, aetiology, gnoseology, methodology, anthropology, socioculturology, evolutionary theory and global studies, etc.

Essentially, the formula of Biocosmology might be extended to “**Bio-4/3-I**”, wherein “**I**” signifies the topicality of contemporary Integralist studies. Indeed, precisely the intermediate *Integralist* sphere of scholarly endeavors (which place is *in-between* the poles of rational knowledge) is the main area of interest and the scope of Biocosmological Association’s agency (and what essentially demands the true and full rehabilitation of the significance of Aristotle’s pole of rational Organicism). It is important to note once again that the essence of Integralist research (which mainly is expressed in contemporary systemic, holistic, true interdisciplinary studies, etc.) – true *Integralism* is based on its own “ultimate principles” (cosmological foundations, with its own type of rationality) but in terms of scholarly activity it is realized in the effective synthesis of rational means (tools of exploration: principles, methods, patterns, notions, etc.) which are taken (and included in the common arsenal) equally from both poles of scientific and philosophical knowledge: Positivist (Dualist, Physicalist and Anthropocentric) – Plato’s; and Organicist (Biocosmological and AnthroKosmist) – Aristotle’s.

Relying on the scholarly Triadology of Pitirim Sorokin, we actually strive to realize the Triune (Three-dimensional, Three-logic) approach. That is, we aim at the inclusion in the overall scope of current scientific activity all the Three main forms of

contemporary scholarly endeavors. They are naturally autonomic and synchronous (but naturally coordinated and cooperating) spheres of scientific activity. In the recent work (Khroutski 2013), an attempt is made to substantiate and propose (for public assessment) the *Triadologic* formula – 50-(Positivism)/ 10-(Organicism)/ 40-(Integralism), thus, in sum, all scholarly endeavors occupy 100%. This is a proposal – how to organize (but, firstly, to distinguish) the Three autonomic forms of scientific activity. In our proposal, 50% (of societal resources) is reasonable to assign for the support and development of modern Positivism (*Sensate* science); 10% – to the polar Organicist T-SCSS (*Ideational* science, in Sorokin's term); and 40% to the actual forms of contemporary Integralism (*Integralistic* science), mainly represented in modern patterns of complex systems and holistic sciences.

2. PITIRIM A. SOROKIN AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATURALIST ORGANICISM (NEO-ARISTOTELISM, BIOCOSMOLOGY)

In his penetrating research, B.V. Johnson stresses that Sorokin explained “the cultural changes as the result of two forces: the principle of limits and immanent determinism.” (2001:43) These causal forces become possible because “social systems, like biological ones, change according to their inherent potentialities.” (Ibid.) That is, “*immanent determinism* claims that the social structure and culture of a system establishes its capacity for change.” (Ibid.) Each inherent potential naturally has its limits. In turn, the potential of the polar (opposite) substance accumulates, begins to dominate, and at some moment actualizes its cycle of life and development. This is normal (natural and intelligent, because the other is unnatural and impossible) state of things, and this pattern completely fits the essence of the relationship between opposites, that is just expressed in Aristotle's philosophy. Sorokin himself gives the following answer to the crucial issue, in his *Dynamics*:

The above is sufficient to answer the problem of Dynamics: why a whole integrated culture as a constellation of many cultural subsystems changes and passes from one state to another. The answer is: it and its subsystems – be they painting, sculpture, architecture, music, science, philosophy, law, religion, mores, forms of social, political and economic organizations – change because each of these is a going concern, and bears in itself the reason of its change. (p.638–639)

In turn, in the Introduction to *Dynamics*, we find the answer to the issue about the interaction of internal and external causes. The latter (external factors) can only serve to accelerate or retard the system's growth, “but they cannot alter the nature of system itself” (Richards 2010:ix). Scholars at the Saskatchewan University are of the same opinion. In respect to the conceptual constructions of Pitirim Sorokin, they point out to the “Autonomy in Social Systems”, accentuating that any social system has a certain degree of autonomy and inherent self-regulation, and “the more integrated it is, the more autonomy it has”. This principle explains the interrelation of a social system with external agents and objects. That is, “a highly integrated culture

has a much greater autonomy from external conditions (outside influences or causal agents) than a poorly integrated one.” The general conclusion is (from the analysis of Sorokin’s scholarly developments) – “the inherent cyclical tendencies always are immanent in the processes of cultural and historical change.”¹

The aforementioned “immanent determinism” of social systems fully corresponds with the “Law 3” in the civilization theory by Nikolai Danilevsky: “*Law 3. The basic principles of a civilization of one historico-cultural type are not transmissible to the peoples of another historico-political type. Each type creates its own civilization under the greater or lesser influence of alien – preceding or synchronous – civilizations. (Translated from Russia and Europe, 1871, by Pitirim A. Sorokin in Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis, 1950, 50, 60).*”² It is not surprising, therefore, that the Organicist background (adherence to the principles of Naturalist Organicism) is characteristic (typical, even distinctive) for the scholars who devoted themselves to civilizational studies. Indeed, otherwise it is impossible to grasp the changeable (dynamic, cyclic) essence of a sociocultural reality. Therefore, Sorokin essentially stressed the notions of the “‘immanent changeability’ of any empirico-sensory object or process (‘immanent causation’).” (Sorokin 2010:462)

In recent decades, with respect to the typical representatives of Organicism in civilizational studies, the names of Oswald Spengler and Pitirim Sorokin are usually called. At the same time, as a rule, the contribution of Nikolai Danilevsky (1822–1885) is not mentioned (although he advanced his civilizational theory of purely Organicist character half a century ahead of Spengler; his main work “Russia and Europe” was published in 1869). However, Sorokin considered himself just the follower of Nikolai Danilevsky whom he estimated as “the true founder of the long galaxy of the creators of the “macrosociological theory of local civilizations.” (Sultanov 1996:4)³

Substantially, Danilevsky’s proposals in the field of civilizational studies (firstly, his work “Russia and Europe”) has the twofold essence. Firstly, it gave the birth to the scientific Organicist approach in civilizational studies, thus bringing about the capability of scholarly understanding, explanation and prognostication in respect to sociocultural change and evolutionary civilizational processes. Secondly, “Russia and Europe” had disclosed the truth of the civilizational peculiarity and evolutionary mission (destination) of Slavic civilization and its inherent culture (of which Pitirim Sorokin and his scholarly Triadology is the bright patterns; this issue is discussed in the Section 5 of the paper). Notably, “Russia and Europe” has much in common with “Decline of West” of Oswald Spengler (which appeared half a century later) wherein Spengler also highlighted the future significance of the Russian-

¹ Citations are taken at the Saskatchewan University’s site:

<http://library2.usask.ca/sorokin/about/bio/philosophy>

² Cited from the ISCSC-site: <http://www.wmich.edu/iscsc/civilization.html>

³ Cit. by: Sultanov. K.V. (1996) Sorokin o Danilevskom kak zachinatele traditsii lokal’noy interpretatsii mirovyh kultur i tsivilizatsiy (Sorokin on Danilevsky as the pioneer of the tradition of local interpretation of world cultures and civilizations). St. Petersburg., 1996. P. 4, 5. (In Russian)

Siberian civilization (or to use the term of “high culture” or “cultural-historical type”, or “Organism”). However, the main difference between the Organicist conceptions of Danilevsky and Spengler is that the latter is basically pessimistic and retrospective (historical), while the former is optimistic and prospective (evolutionary).

Both, Danilevsky and Sorokin are the followers of the true (Aristotelian) Organicism. Essentially, therefore, both they used the genuine aetiology of Aristotle, although did so spontaneously and implicitly, without a direct reference to the true meaning of the Aristotelian philosophical system of scientific Organicism. In an obvious way, however, their conceptual constructions are based on the genuine (Aristotle’s) Four-causal aetiology (wherein the *intrinsic* goal-driven causes have the leading role) and the genuine (Aristotle’s) Integral gnoseology (wherein *senses, intuition and reason* are *triunited* and act integrally, and wherein *senses* are essential but *intuition* has the leading role).

This is a type of Organicism that is reflected in the extensive exploration of Rudolph J. Rummel (1975), especially in the section “33.3. Organicism” Rummel writes that Organicism is “opposed to both the mechanistic and vitalist interpretations of life and the universe is the organismic view, which holds that the universe itself is a whole – a fundamental nondivisible unity – or that the wholes familiar to us that make up the universe or organic life are themselves basic.” Therein, an essential complement follows – “Organicism is contrary to mechanism but not contradictory to it, for one can consistently believe in wholes as basic, as well as physical beings.” At the same, we are to stress this moment once again – Danilevsky and Sorokin (and other followers of the true neo-Aristotelism) represent precisely the form of Naturalist Organicism.

A cornerstone moment is that P.Sorokin’s scholarly endeavours brought about and applied in sociology and the area of civilizational studies precisely the principles of the Aristotelian Organicism. Stated differently, this is categorically not a search of positivist analogies with biological organism, or the scholarly compliance with the formulas of ‘holistic’ organicism: “the whole is more than the sum of the parts” (Morowitz 2002:23); and “the whole determines the nature of parts” (Phillips 1976:16). In contradistinction, Sorokin’s Organicism (essentially realizing Aristotelism) is reduced mainly to the inherent causes of the parts (organs of the given Organism). This Organicism has basically the (Bio)Cosmist nature, i.e. in addition to the two accepted (by science) and independent components – physical (material world) and vital (life, organic, biological) – the sociocultural or superorganic phenomena (in Sorokin’s theory) are introduced and constitute hierarchically the basic (and higher) “immaterial” component of supra-conscious meaning (the inherently driving causes) superimposed upon the physical and vital components.

Rather, this is hierarchically the higher level that substantially has the *intraconscious* essence, therefore using (treating) “physical and vital components” as the ‘functional organs’ for the life-long (ontogenetic) wholesome activity of the given subject of life. Thus, by the self-realization and production of efficient specific

effects and results (of its own inherent Functionalist life activity) – the subject of life (individual, society, cultural system, etc.) presents the wholesome effects already for the higher-order (in the Kosmist hierarchy) level of life (sociocultural) organization.

Sometimes, neo-Platonian meanings are attached to the scholarly advances of P.A. Sorokin. However, the evidence is that the (neo)Aristotelian constituent of his scholarly creativity also is actual and is really strong and has the leading significance. Precisely these (neo-Aristotelian) bases of Sorokin's scholarly Triadology and Integralism are put into the foundation and scope of the Biocosmological Association's activity.

At first, however, we are to distinguish clearly the features of the two forms of essentialism – Plato's (which is Transcendent, Dualist and, as referring cognition – Anthropocentric); and Aristotle's (Hylomorphist and Organicist; and Nature-centric or AnthroKosmist). The comparison is given below (in the table).

Table 1.

Plato's essentialism vs Aristotle's essentialism

Plato's essentialism (PE)	Aristotle's essentialism (AE)
<p>PE basically has the idealistic (<i>dualist</i>) essence – it is centred over the primarily Idealist perception (of the ideas of Transcendent and Transcendental origin). Essentially, this is the representation of empirical resemblances (range of “resemblances”) of the perfect (‘ideal’) prototype of a thing under study – the subject-matter for mathematical analysis (logics). The latter forms the modern dominating mathematical-physicalist methodology of research that integrates physicalist approach (materialist reductionism) and mathematical (abstract, based on Plato's idealism and dualism) processing of the empirical data. Basically, the design of a research likewise has the abstract (idealistic, dualist) origin. This PE-type of cognition realizes substantially the <i>abstract-quantitative</i> approaches to rational cognition, and uses the <i>explanatory</i> mode of scientific understanding of the real world, describing through mathematical analysis the <i>extrinsic</i> attributes of the physical world (answering on the question “How”).</p>	<p>AE has the opposite meaning and basically has the realistic (universalizing) – intrinsic and dynamic (cyclic) – essence centred over the substance of the given individual (thing, entity, bio-organism, human being, subject of sociocultural and civilizational activity) under study. The latter always conforms to the cornerstone principle of <i>hylomorphism</i> (stating that material and non-material causes of its/her/his existence and development are inseparable – always integrated into the one whole), but wherein the inherent goal-driven and self-actualizing causes have the leading significance (firstly, <i>causa finalis</i> and <i>c.formalis-entelecheia</i>). This Organicist (universalizing) approach is possible by means of the integration of all the three main modes of knowledge (a kind of Integral gnoseology): empirical thorough research, intuitive substantial grasp, and the rational logical construction of the conceptual edifice. This AE-type of cognition realizes basically the <i>Noospheric-qualitative</i> approaches to rational cognition, and uses the <i>definitive</i> mode of scientific understanding of the real world, answering “Why” – by defining the substantial <i>intrinsic</i> goal-driven causes (of the Individual under study, which is empirically evident), and which are of the primary significance for the entire conceptual edifice.</p>

In conclusion, we are to state that Aristotle's philosophical system – of scientific or Naturalist Organicism – is the self-sufficient rational cognitive (super)system of scientific knowledge. A generally recognized fact is that Aristotle's philosophy forms the foundation, as well as supporting structure and 'cement' (binder, matrix) of the entire edifice of modern science. As it is well known, Aristotle is the Father of Science. Essentially, his scientific Organicism is precisely the polar (to currently dominating Sensate) system of science. Essential features of Aristotle's scientific Organicism are: its own Bio-physics and Bio-metaphysics; Four-causal aetiology; Integral gnoseology; Functionalist telic methodology; bio-socio-Kosmist anthropology and universalizing Bio-sciences (including all forms: natural, social, formal and applied); which all are directed at the universalizing evolutionary (sociocultural) processes, including essentially telic, Noospheric global development and co-evolution. The attempt to rationally characterize and compare these Three major forms of rational (scholarly) activity is given in the author's work (Khroutski, 2013). Another important thing is that although Aristotle's (super)system of knowledge is fully needed and essential, and was (and is) fully used in the course of global cultural evolution – several times during the cultural history of the last nearly 2500 years it was forgotten and lost from the scope of scholars (a kind of cases when 'baby was thrown out together with the bathwater'). Essentially, this topic is discussed below (in the Section 5).

3. CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL 'COSMOLOGICAL INSUFFICIENCY'

3.1. Paradoxes and inconsistencies in Pitirim Sorokin's theoretical constructions

Paradoxically, Pitirim Sorokin, in his many brilliant performances and replies during the First (organizational) ISCS-conference in Salzburg (1961) – he made therein no mention of the significance of his Triadologic approach as the essential methodological principle of civilizational and sociocultural cognition. At the same time, he strongly stated (repeated) the Triadologic essence that "Sensate culture, which has been the culture that has dominated in world history for the past 500 years – Sensate culture is necessarily yielding to a new 'Integral sociocultural order.'" (Palencia-Roth 2011:411)

There are some other obvious paradoxes in the scholarly constructions of Pitirim Sorokin. For instance, he advanced and substantiated the significance of "major premises" and "ultimate principles" in studying sociocultural and civilization systems. "These three capacities are also collectively manifested at the macrosociological level as major types of culture, – B.V. Johnson emphasizes, – "the pure forms are ideational and sensate, and the third, a mixed form Sorokin termed idealistic." (1999:27) The defining characteristic of each type derives from "the principles of ultimate truth through which it organizes reality." (Ibid.) In this Triadologic approach, particular importance relies the study of the nature or "the ultimate true realities" which generate the Three main types (T-SCSS¹) of the "the

¹ Once again, T-SCSS – is the abbreviation of the notion 'Type of the SocioCultural SuperSystem' which is the key notion of Pitirim Sorokin's scholarly Triadic approach.

vastest” formations – sociocultural supersystems: Sensate T-SCSS; Ideational T-SCSS; and Integral T-SCSS.

At the same time, the task of the scholarly study and definition of the “major premises”, “ultimate principles” or “ultimate true realities” was clearly set in respect to the Sensate T-SCSS and Ideational T-SCSS). However, paradoxically, it was not realized in relation to the Integral T-SCSS which has the main significance in Sorokin’s theoretical constructions. Not surprisingly, we met in Wikipedia the characteristic of Sorokin’s grand “*Social and Cultural Dynamics*” as the work that expounded “his controversial theories of social process and the historical typology of cultures”.

In fact, Sorokin did not make a clear distinction (except for the Sensate T-SCSS) between the major proposed (super)systems: Ideational, Idealistic, and Integral. For instance, he wrote: “the major premise of Sensate culture and the Sensate supersystem will be progressively replaced by the Integralistic or Ideational premise and supersystem.” (Sorokin 2010:702); or “in so far as Idealism is a trait of Ideational and of Idealistic culture (in accordance with the character of the Idealistic theory) and Materialism is a trait of Sensate culture...” (Sorokin 2010:294). As a result, Sorokin reduced the number of “ultimate true realities” (and, thus, of “culture mentalities” or ‘types of rationality’) from (naturally) Three – to Two, or, rather, to One (Idealism).

Indeed, in respect to the so-called Materialist (of the Sensate T-SCSS) “ultimate true realities”, which are based on the “empirico-sensory” data, but which (in the Sensate T-SCSS) are strictly perceived and processed from the Dualist – Anthropocentric (Idealist) standpoint, i.e. being the form of Idealism as well. Thus, in fact, in his general theorizing Sorokin did not find a place for the scholarly Realism (Bio-Naturalism – Organicist Naturalism), although Sorokin is himself (but implicitly, spontaneously) a true representative of this (Bio-Naturalist) realm of scientific activity. At any rate, the opposite pole to Idealism is naturally the contrary Realism – of the subject’s (Individual’s) Organicist integration into the Kosmos (and, thus, of actual agency in the realm of Hylomorphist AnthroKosmism).

Finally, the third realm is the intermediate (but basal, axial) Integralism, which (for instance, in respect to cognitive activity) naturally uses scholarly rational means of both poles of cognition (Positivist and Organicist). Essentially, Integralist realm has its own certain “ultimate principles”. Accordingly, and in the reasonable way, the aforesaid Three spheres (T-SCSS) can be referred to Transcendental (Sensate T-SCSS), Biocosmological (of “immanent causation” – Ideational T-SCSS), and Transcendent (Integral T-SCSS) “major premises” or ‘types of rationality (and “ultimate principles” of life organization).

To the point, their substances (of each of the Three) are equally incomprehensible, representing *noumenon* or “thing-in-itself” (for a Sensate T-SCSS); *entelecheia* – inherent, changeable, hierarchical and self-evolvable goal-driven causes (for an Ideational T-SCSS); and *absolute* – transcendent substances” (God, Matter, Energy, Field, Information, etc) – for an Integral T-SCSS.

Essentially, due to Sorokin's theory, each of the Three T-SCSS all-embraces the entire set of constituting (of the given Type) sociocultural systems. As scholars at the University of Saskatchewan arrive at the conclusion, while analysing the issues of Sorokin's "Philosophy of History", "the Sensate supersystem is made up of: sensate science, sensate philosophy, sensate religion of a sort, sensate fine arts, sensate ethics, law, economics and politics, along with predominantly sensate types of persons and groups, ways of life and social institutions. Likewise, the Ideational and Integral supersystems consist respectively of Ideational and Integral types of all these systems."¹ In a consequence, naturally, we can expect the opposites of the two sciences (in respect of their bipolarity – of Sensate-science and Ideational-science), or the rational characteristics of all the Three sciences – Sensate, Ideational, and Integral.

Indeed, in turn, any comparison (in scholarly meaning) is possible only between the phenomena of the same order. Therefore, the opposition (and distinctions) between Sensate and Ideational supersystems are realizable exclusively between 'scientism and scientism' – i.e. 'Sensate science and Ideational science' (which are founded, accordingly, on Plato's and Aristotle's essentialism); or 'Sensate religion and Ideational religion', or 'Sensate faith and Ideational faith', etc. However, a comparative study and analysis of different (heterogeneous) phenomena (from a rational point of view), such as science and faith – this approach is impossible (as a rational attempt) in principle. In fact, the concept of faith (religion) can be reduced to a certain sacred text, while scientific knowledge – to reliable data, logically wealthy theories and their testable outcomes.

In one place Sorokin attempted (to some extent) to draw a distinction between the sciences, "The 'scientists' of Ideational cultures are likely to concentrate their attention on one group of Sensate phenomena as the most important, while scientists of Sensate culture may find these problems unimportant and may concentrate on another..." (Sorokin 2010:230). In the other place, however, Sorokin removes any illusions, demonstrating that he recognized only one type of science – Sensate science: "Since Science and its system of truth are to be supreme in the Sensate and secondary in the Ideational society, it can be expected that Ideational cultures and periods are to be marked by fewer important scientific discoveries." (Sorokin 2010:230) Maybe, a reason is that Sorokin was unaware about the fact that Aristotle is both the Father of Science and Father of Empiricism. Therefore, he could not take into consideration that in spite of the radical distinctions of Aristotle's philosophical-scientific Organicism (which basic principles are fully opposite to the bases of the Sensate science) – precisely Aristotle's scientific Organicism (i.e. "Ideational science") is solely capable to realize the understanding of the changeable and cyclic essence of sociocultural reality; and that Aristotle's cognitive system is based on the strict empiricism ("empirico-sensory" method).

¹ Taken from the site: "Pitirim A. Sorokin Collection at the University of Saskatchewan" – <http://library2.usask.ca/sorokin/about/bio/philosophy>

3.2. ‘Cosmological insufficiency’ as the decisive factor

In general, what are the reasons of the aforementioned paradoxes, inconsistencies and difficulties (in the clear explanation of some key moments of Sorokin’s theoretical constructions)?

Firstly, the evident factor is that Pitirim Sorokin was, as we mentioned above, “among the most prodigiously productive scholars in the history of sociology,” active and fruitful in the sociological, cultural and civilizational areas of: “historical and statistical analyses of cultural types, integration and change; analysis and typology of social relationships; analysis of the historical fluctuation of war and revolution; analysis of mobility and stratification; analysis of social theories and of methodology; and his pioneering theoretical formulations and empirical work in the study of altruistic love.” (Jeffries, 2006) Therefore, Sorokin merely had not enough time to master one more extended research area – to explore the fundamental issues of the philosophy of science.

Another reason was disclosed by L.T. Nichols (2012) and discussed in the Section 1 – Pitirim A. Sorokin is a brilliant representative of the Russian (Slavic, “Ideational” – RealKosmist) scientific tradition, but which is difficult for perception and understanding by the Western (Sensate) scientific community. Therefore, maybe (under the pressure of the Sensate scientific medium), Sorokin gradually deviated from the true (original, expressed in the 1930s in *Dynamics*) Triadologic approach to the field of interdisciplinary but unipolar and mono-linear studies like the issues of science/religion confrontation.

The third reason (we assume its crucial significance) is the existence of the so-called ‘cosmological insufficiency’. In other words, Sorokin (as other scholars, as all men of science in the Modern Sensate era) was trapped in (held hostage by) the idea that there is only one (Sensate) science, and only one scientific method, as well as in history (development) of science – the only one linear development exists, wherein Aristotle (albeit significant figure) is merely a (naive) precursor of modern unfolded (of high level) scientific achievements. As a result, even having realized a brilliant (Naturalist) discovery and substantiated the Triadologic existence of the Three T-SCSS (which actually means that there are Three autonomic supersystems of scientific knowledge) – Sorokin turned out to be unable to transcend the ideologically formed barrier (educational – curriculum-based, and of the entirely dominating Sensate T-SCSS) – of the cultivated Sensate (conscious and unconscious) mental setup.

In fact, Sorokin did not draw a distinction between the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle (as well as between Aristotle’s and religious or/and theological constructions). He wrote (in one line): “Plato’s idea, Aristotle’s form, Christianity’s concept of the identity of the members of the Holy Trinity (the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit), Plotinus Logos (Nous), the ultimate realities of many philosophers, are examples of such a realism.” (Sorokin 2010:325) Or, similarly in one line: “The great tide of singularism in the period from 420 to 380 B.C. called forth a temporary reaction against it, led by the standard-bearers of universalism: Plato and Aristotle,

with their followers.” (Sorokin 2010:347) Or, wherein Aristotelism is directly referred to “the truth of faith”: “Also the world of Plato’s ideas, Aristotle’s forms, and the ultimate realities of various thinkers are the reality sought for by the truth of faith.” (Sorokin 2010:327). In fact, however, Aristotle was pagan “to the marrow of his bones”, and, what is significant – he is recognized all over the world as the founder of empiricism (Father of Empiricism) and Father of the modern Science on the whole.

Significantly, all this apparently is the result of the current ‘*cosmological insufficiency*’, that chiefly means the loss of Aristotle’s rational Organicism from our current intellectual field of view. A key point is (as John Herman Randall Jr., renowned specialist in Aristotle asserts) – modern scholars “have come at Aristotle from the standpoint of the later medieval developments and problems” (Randall 1960:iv); and that the early modern scientists (including Bacon, Descartes, and Kant) had discarded Aristotle in rebellion against his religious interpreters. Randall also seriously doubts, “whether Aristotle can survive translation into the Latin substantives of the scholastic tradition, or whether it is possible to state his *fundamental functionalism* in the Latin tongue.” (Ibid.) The latter statement is in accord with the conclusion of Alexander Herzen, made in the 1845, about the “revolt against Aristotle” because of the “originality of the new thinking” and that “one must not forget that Aristotle of the Middle Ages was not the true Aristotle, but the one transcribed to Catholic morals, ... Descartes and Bacon, alike, denied him as the canonized pagan” (Herzen 1946).

David Charles, in his “*Aristotle on Meaning and Essence*” argues that Aristotle’s actual account is distinct from the one often described and attacked as “the Aristotelian essentialism.” He states: “Aristotle’s account of essentialism is, I argue, distinct from that offered by its major competitors (whether conventionalists or Platonists, as these are characterized in Chapter 1), and is immune to some of criticisms developed by (for example) Descartes, Locke, and Quine. Aristotle is not, in my view, the type of Aristotelian essentialist they attack. Indeed, the form of essentialism he defends is preferable (in certain major respects) to the alternatives currently available.” (2000:3) Another valuable judgment is made by American philosopher (objectivist) Ayn Rand (1963): “If there is a philosophical Atlas who carries the whole of Western civilization on his shoulders, it is Aristotle. He has been opposed, misrepresented, and – like an axiom – used by his enemies in the very act of denying him. Whatever intellectual progress men have achieved rests on his achievements.”

In general, it can be argued that Pitirim Sorokin has discovered the Triadologic (dynamic cyclic) scientific law, which is related to the sociocultural reality. At the same time, he did not succeed in its clear (definite) formulation, as well as subsequently Sorokin did not rely on this law in his theoretical and practical activities. In our view, there are three main reasons. The first is that Sorokin was burdened all the time with a wide front of sociological activity which he constantly carried out. The second is (that is supported by L.T. Nichols, 2010) – Sorokin’s

scholarly advances are based on his belongingness to the Russian (truly Organicist) scholarly tradition; but having found himself in the foreign, English-speaking academic medium (which has difficulties with the perception of Organicist ideas) – Sorokin was forced to reduce the dynamics of his Triadologic approach development.

Eventually, the third (and which we consider as the main) reason – Sorokin, within the entire modern scientific community – was “a prisoner” of the situation of ‘*cosmological insufficiency*’, especially due to the forgetfulness of the true significance of Aristotle’s philosophical (super)system of scientific Organicism. As a result of all three reasons, Sorokin did not develop his discovery in terms of working out its scientific and philosophical grounds, thus – aiming at the substantiation of its universalizing significance (for all forms of life).

4. THE ORGANICIST TRIADOLOGIC NATURAL LAW

In conclusion, we can try to formulate the meaning of this Organicist Triadologic law (firstly discovered by Sorokin in the sociocultural and civilizational sphere). This law (basic realistic principle) states that there are always (synchronously, but which take dominance by turns) Three autonomic realms of life (of the type; in any natural organic entity or process: biological, anthropological, sociocultural, evolutionary, global, etc.), and, accordingly – spheres of cognitive activity (including science and philosophy): two polar and the one intermediate (Integralist – basal, axial).

Thus, the reality of a life process (entity) is exercised in synchronous coexistence but the regular change (of domination) of the opposite (polar) spheres (Bipolarity) of the whole organ’s (organism’s) life activity (like Systole and Diastole in the heart life activity). Equally, the third (or the First in significance) intermediate and Basal (Axial) sphere permanently exists and self-evolves (and dominates in its turn). Its main tasks are to self-maintain the Homeostatic equilibrium of the Organism (and its homeostatic interrelations with the Environment) at the given level (of the Kosmic evolution), enabling the transition from one to another life pole’s activity and dominance; but, ultimately – aiming at the realization of the whole (ontogenetic) process of Functionalist growth and full (natural) self-realization of the given Organism. In respect to Aristotle's philosophy, Integralist realm of life activity correlates with the Aristotelian *causa formalis*, but which is treated in its (original) essential Organicist (Hylomorphist) interaction with *c.finalis*, *c.materialis*, and *c.efficientis*.

Another (“essential” metaphorical) example is the day-(24 hours)-biorhythm. In fact, each organism (human, as well) everyday has the alternate domination of the two polar (opposite) realms (or spheres – Sorokin’s similar notion is “supersystems”, ours – “cosmologies”) – of Sleep (aimless) processes and purposeful Awake-activity. The latter are radically different and independent in all kinds, having their own inherent potentials and the Functional control centres and peripheral actuation systems. In respect to the cognitive activity we evidently have to discern the Positivist (reducible to Plato’s Dualist essentialism, which is Anthropocentric) and

Organicist (reducible to Aristotle's Hylomorphist essentialism, which is Nature-centric) poles and realms of scientific pursuits. In turn, the Third – intermediate (basal, axial) realms is Integralist (of modern holistic, systemic, complex sciences) sphere of scholarly endeavors (which is, substantially, the main scope of BCA's activity).

5. ARISTOTLE-1.0; ARISTOTLE-2.0; ARISTOTLE-3.0; ARISTOTLE-4.0

This is not for the first time (that during the world – dynamic and cyclic – cultural development) – Aristotle's philosophy (as the whole system of knowledge, in its original meaning) slips out of the contemporary global scholarly community's view and escapes from (the given epoch's) cultural memory (and the whole cultural medium). At least, it can be argued Aristotle (his entire philosophical supersystem of scientific Organicism) was forgotten thrice in the course of global cultural history.

From this standpoint, and using an analogy with the generations of software (as well as following the pattern of Andrew Targowski who uses in his work the notion "spirituality 2.0"; [Targowski, 2013]) – we can distinguish four historical eras wherein Aristotle's Organicist philosophy (its conceptual constructions and elements, as 'blocks and bricks') were used as the basic means for the realization and construction of the new T-SCSS (new "high culture") that becomes dominant for the regional or global cultural evolution in the given epoch.

Primarily, of course, Greek genius created and introduced into the world culture his own philosophical (super)system of scientific Organicism – *Aristotle-1.0* – in the 4th century BCE.

Next "fluctuation" of (neo)Aristotelism and the emergence of Aristotle-2.0 had taken place many centuries later – in the 12th century, already in the Medieval Latin Europe (in the High Middle Ages). Therein, the conceptual notions and ideas of Aristotle (his works on the whole), already substantively lost and forgotten – were reintroduced to the Latin West. Thus, the "rediscovery" of Aristotle had been realized. In the 12th century, Aristotle's conceptual constructions were urgently needed to Medieval scholars (among them, Saint Thomas Aquinas and his *Summa Theologica* is usually named in the first place) – for the substantiation and building of the new era (and culture) in the history of Western civilization – of the Medieval Western Christendom. "*Aristotle 2.0*" means that most of Aristotle's works were re-translated in Latin from Arabic and Greek texts (as Aristotle's works were mainly preserved in the Arab world and Byzantine Empire). Therein, however, Aristotle's scholarly Organicist ideas (with their fundamental "immanent causality" essence) already were used (as a Means) for building the new school of inquiry known as scholasticism, which emphasized scholarly observation but chiefly served the proving of God's existence through philosophical means.

Exactly this historical (Medieval) period of the recovery of Aristotle's texts and the deliberate use of his conceptual constructions (precisely in the light of building the Medieval ontotheological cultural medium) – brought about the appearance of Aristotelianism, a tradition of philosophy which "Medieval – ontotheological"

essence precisely was accepted by Pitirim Sorokin. In turn, in the Biocosmological Association – to distance ourselves from the Medieval ontotheological values – we propose the neologism Aristotelism (instead of Aristotelianism) thus emphasizing our commitment and intention to rehabilitate the original (of scientific Organicism) significance of Aristotle's philosophy.

Further, in brief, *Aristotle-3.0* underlay the (scholarly) emergence and evolving of the epoch of Renaissance (14–17th centuries) which is the pre-stage of the next Modern era (since the 16th century) – precisely the typical form of the Sensate T-SCSS. Aristotle-3.0 is the new natural retrieval of Aristotle's philosophy and science (again, as the constructional material) – for the substantiation and building the framework of the new era in European and global culture – Modern history, with its (anti-Aristotelian) Anthropocentric (Dualist, Sensate) and Positivist (mathematical-physicalist) scientific method.

Indeed, substantially, Francis Bacon did not create new categories, concepts and conceptual structures. In general (Bacon in the 17th century, as well as Aquino in the 12th century) – they used “off the shelf” conceptual constructions (as ‘blocks and bricks’) from Aristotle's Organicist philosophy, and formed them into a new construction (edifice of) knowledge built already on the radically (cosmologically) different foundations (of the Dualist separation of man's mind from aimless tangible cosmos-space), and which (ultimately) were aimed purely at the Anthropocentric (Sensate) premises of sociocultural activity. Accordingly (to the Sensate T-SCSS), new Sensate aetiology (with the deletion of teleodrive causes and “immanent causality”), Sensate gnoseology (epistemology), Sensate methodology (“scientific method”), Sensate anthropology, Sensate evolutionary theory, Sensate global studies, etc. were established in the societal practice and cultural milieu.

Characterizing the newly introduced (in the Modern era) “scientific method”, the importance of the experiment (i.e. extra-natural, experimental research settings) and of the mathematical analysis (i.e. of the priority of abstract Idealistic reasoning, independent from the real natural world) is founded and highlighted. In the new method, objects of research (scope of cognitive activity and the produced knowledge) methodologically have acquired completely the different meanings (fully opposite to the entities of Aristotle's scientific Organicism). These are the essential features of the research method developed by Francis Bacon – which became the early precursor of the modern scientific method. At the same time, Bacon's achievements were basically realized (on) and by the use of the conceptual structures from the (opposite) scientific system of Aristotle's Naturalist Organicism. Essentially, the new scientific method was substantiated and proposed in Bacon's book “*Novum Organum*” (“The New Organon”) and was intended to replace the methods that have been proposed in the “*Organon*” (collection of Aristotle's works on logic) almost two millennia ago. This is what Ayn Rand meant in her judgment (1963): “If there is a philosophical Atlas who carries the whole of Western civilization on his shoulders, it is Aristotle. He has been opposed, misrepresented, and – like an axiom – used by his enemies in the very act of denying him.” In other words, Bacon's (and, previously – Thomas

Aquinas') practice demonstrate that Aristotle's (super)system of scientific Organicism is actually the only (reliable) resource (i.e. the conceptual foundations, supporting structures, matrix) for all other essential (even opposite) systems of scholarly knowledge.

Eventually, *Aristotle-4.0* emerged since the 18th century (but, chiefly – from the second half of the 19th century and in the 20th century) – within the tradition¹ named as Russian cosmism, or Russian organicism, or Russian functionalism, or Russian cyclism, or Russian pulsationism, etc. This tradition has the essence (but which emerged spontaneously) of the true Aristotelian scientific Organicism, i.e. which, in the first time in the Human history revert to the development of Aristotle's true (original) Organicism, but at a new high level of the world culture. This means that Russian scholars (including Sorokin)² had factually realized the return and rehabilitation of the Aristotelian genuine Organicist Bio-physics and Bio-metaphysics, Four-causal aetiology, Integral gnoseology, Functionalist telic methodology; bio-socio-Kosmist anthropology and universalizing Bio-sciences (both natural and social); which all are directed at the Noospheric global sociocultural development and co-evolution. Pitirim Sorokin is one of the representatives of this brilliant scholarly tradition that was realized in the Russian cultural milieu. Essentially, Nikolai Ya. Danilevsky (Russian biologist and civilizationist, whom Sorokin appreciated as his predecessor in the development of civilizational theory) has predicted, yet in the 1869³, that Slavic civilization will introduce to the world culture the new specific form of science (a constituent of the new “historico-cultural type”) that would be great, not less important for the global development than the currently dominating Western forms.

Danilevsky explored the Slavic sociocultural development during 150 years that preceded his civilizational explorations (in the 1860's), and, on the basis of the data obtained – he built a scientific hypothesis about the subsequent ‘evolution’ (“historical development”, in his text) – manifestation of the globally significant social and cultural advances of Slavic civilization. In particular, he asserted that the identity (inherent potential) of the Slavic science will inevitably actualize itself. Remarkably, the subsequent 150 years of the Russian cultural development (which is already the topic of our analysis) – confirm the consistency of the civilizational scientific hypothesis by Danilevsky. The analysis shows that the Slavic science exists and that it is fundamentally and essentially distinct (from the currently dominating method of scientific activity); because it relates to the substantive (autonomic) cosmological basis of scholarly endeavors (which correspond to Aristotle's principle

¹ Still hardly known in the West and world on the whole

² Although neither Pitirim Sorokin, nor other Russian scholars did not realize (due to the historico-political ideological factors) this cornerstone moment – of their belongingness to the supersystem of Aristotle's scientific Organicism; however, this is a special issue for the study and discussion.

³ In his famous monograph “Russia and Europe”, wherein his subject-matter was Slavic civilization as a whole.

of *hylomorphism* and include into scientific scopes the inherent goal-driven causes as the leading aetiological forces).

In general, Slavic science represents *Aristotle-4.0* form of scholarly endeavors, which corresponds to the true Organicist philosophical system of Aristotle.

Indeed, the achievements of Russian scholars fully and clearly exemplify this assertion. Among their great advances, the following major accomplishments ought to be mentioned: “the inherent principles of a civilization” in the cyclic civilizational theory by Nikolay Ya. Danilevsky; “goal-directedness” of evolutionary processes by Karl Ernst von Baer; conceptual “sensible (wholesome) egoism” in the philosophical constructions by Nikolay G. Chernyshevsky; the physiological conception of “internal inhibition” and the basic psychological notion of “free will” by Ivan M. Sechenov; “Tectology: the universal science of organization” by Alexander A. Bogdanov; the conception of the ruling orthogenetic “internal principle” in the evolutionary theory of “nomogenesis” by Lev S. Berg; intrinsic “cyclic development” of economic processes by Nikolay D. Kondratieff; “the goal reflex” and “unconditional reflex” in Ivan P. Pavlov’s theoretical constructions; “the dominant theory” and the conceptions of “functional organ” and “chronotop” by Alexei A. Ukhtomsky; “intrinsic activity of living matter” by Vladimir I. Vernadsky and his theories of biosphere and noosphere; “the general theory of functional systems”, based on the conception of the leading significance of the inner “result of action” by Pyotr K. Anokhin; Pitirim Sorokin’s conception of the “immanent determinism” of a sociocultural system and his cyclic theory of social change (“social and cultural dynamics”); “the concept of universal functional units” in the field of evolutionary biology, by Alexander M. Ugolev; “the need-informational theory of emotions” by Pavel V. Simonov; the concept of “passionarity” by Lev N. Gumilev, and others – all these fundamental concepts (and their psychophysiological and sociocultural conceptual constructions) are reduced to Nature-centrism (AnthropoKosmism) and include the leading significance of organic *intrinsic* cyclic activity and the whole-organizing and *inherent (immanent)* goal-driven causes (similar to the Aristotelian *causa finalis* and *causa formalis-entelecheia*). Essentially, these leading inherent causes which are independent of human consciousness or of any transcendent or transcendental (or empiricist) ideas, – exactly these intrinsic goal-actuated (purposeful) forces (in accordance with the domination of the due inherent life cycle) realize the well-being ontogenesis (evolution) of the given subject of life (bio-organism, the individual, society, state, civilization, biosphere, noosphere). Really, we can define this historical (evolutionary) phenomenon of the global scientific development as ‘*the Russian organicism (functionalism)*’.

However, a question is: Will the Western (global) science (culture, as a whole) be interested in Russian scientific (Organicist) tradition and its achievements in the form of Aristotle 4.0? At any rate, Pitirim Sorokin stated his general conclusion: “The major premise of Sensate culture and the Sensate supersystem will be progressively replaced by the Integralistic or Ideational premise and supersystem. Such a shift will be led, first, by the best minds of Western society.” (Sorokin 2010:702).

There is the well-known judgment by Alfred North Whitehead: “The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato” (Whitehead 1967). Using a periphrasis, Russian philosophical and scientific tradition (which, naturally, on the basis of Aristotle’s knowledge – integrates philosophy with science,) – ‘Russian philosophy and science consists of a series of footnotes to Aristotle’. We mean that Russian thinkers (and the scientists from other countries, adherents of scientific Organicism and the general systemic and holistic approaches) have rehabilitated Aristotle’s hylomorphism and AnthroKosmism, and, thus – all the Four Aristotle’s main (Kosmic) aetiological causes: *material, formal, efficient, final*; stressing their equivalence, but highlighting the leading role of the inherent goal-driven causes (*c.finalis and c.formalis-entelecheia*). They follow the Aristotelian precept (made in his “Physics”, Book II, Chapter 7):

Now, the causes being four, it is the business of the physicist to know about them all, and if he refers his problems back to all of them, he will assign the ‘why’ in the way proper to his science – the matter, the form, the mover, ‘that for the sake of which’.

6. INTEGRALIST ERA – THREE SCIENCE-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO ITS REALIZATION

The first ISCSC-congress in Salzburg (1961), due to the information of Michael Palencia-Roth (2011), was enhanced by the presence of the two most honoured and prominent participants, P.A. Sorokin and A.J. Toynbee. Also unusual was “the emphasis on “Denken in Kulturen” (thinking in cultures) as the main approach. It was agreed that a “new ethos” was needed for a new type of scholarly activity, all of which would take some time to develop [End of Gesamtbericht].” (p.115) Notably, the given work precisely tends to approach the task of creating a new *ethos* and *new type of scholarly activity* on strengthening the capacity of civilizational studies.

The ‘first’ approach evidently refers to many outstanding scholarly achievements, pursuing the goal of integrative interdisciplinary research. Among recent advances, the new stage (and the whole process) of Andrew Targowski’s development of his interdisciplinary theory of wisdom and the concept of wisdom civilization draws attention (Targowski, 2013). Appreciably, this is the resemble direction (in aspect to scientific pursuits) of Pitirim Sorokin himself, if to refer to his concept of altruistic love and sociological theorizing in this regard. At the same time, this approach is characterized by the unipolar foundation (in relation to the scientific method), significantly limiting its scholarly capabilities.

The ‘unipolar’ means likewise the acyclic – mono-linear – perception of a sociocultural reality, because this endeavor accepts the existence of only one science (one ‘scientific pole’ and one “scientific method”) that which is the Sensate (Positivist) science, based on the mathematical-physicalist method. This approach continues to be currently dominant in the vast importance. Education factor realizes herein a great influence. Modern graduate already has a great conviction (both on the

conscious and subconscious levels) that there is only one science, and all the rest is fully unworthy of her/his attention. Sorokin was captive himself by this prejudice – that there is only one form of scientific knowledge – Sensate science – based on the Dualist mentality and which uses exclusively Positivist (mathematical-physicalist) method of research.

Therefore, Sorokin (although himself being a true representative of the Aristotelian scientific Organicism; and having created the Triadologic scholarly approach) – he unintentionally found himself in the situation wherein he made analysis and synthesis on grounds of combining scientific and non-scientific forms of knowledge. The latter naturally is groundless in a logical sense, because all this cannot be reduced to a uniform basis for the subsequent rational constructions. Inevitably, as a result, this way lead (and led Sorokin’s pursuits) to the study of incompatible concepts (and their relationships, including conflicts): like science and religion, technology and faith, or empiricism and the spirit. On the other hand, in general, modern sociologists perceive (understand, treat) Sorokin’s Idealistic (or Integralistic) type of culture as precisely the one that combines both ideational (“faith/religion”) and sensate (“science”) characteristics (which are essentially incompatible, and thus cannot be combined in principle).

Not surprisingly, Pitirim Sorokin’s theoretical and practical endeavors (for instance, in realizing his concept of Creative Altruism) had yielded few successful results. As Jay Weinstein appraises the two decades of the intensive activity of the Research Center in Creative Altruism at Harvard University (organized and headed by Pitirim Sorokin): “The sociological community showed little interest in altruism, integralism, or the reconstruction of society.” (2004:53) J.Weistein also brings the opinion of Barry V. Johnston (who is the renown specialist in the study of Sorokin’s scholarly legacy): “Sorokin’s methods simply will not sustain his arguments with the precision he desires...what he has produced in *Dynamics* and the works that follow is a broad and valuable philosophy of history. It is a start, not a science...” (Ibid.) Weinstein’s general conclusion is even more depressing: “Among the key concepts introduced by him are sensate and ideational culture types, creative altruism, and integralism.” However, “since Sorokin’s death, several studies have supplemented his approach, some with explicit reference to him but, because his contributions were generally ignored, most lacking such citations.” (p.51)

We can add that the Triadologic concept was disclosed and introduced into scientific practice as a research approach. However, so far this method has not been developed in the significance of the ready to use (mature, highly effective) tool for scholarly endeavors. First of all, therefore, we need at present to rationally (scholarly) clarify its (Triadologic) foundations: aetiological, methodological and anthropological; basing on the clear understanding (and accepting their polarity in respect to the modern mathematical-physicalist “scientific method”) of the Organicist principles of scientific activity.

In order to obtain efficient results, we do need to introduce new approaches to the study of civilizations and sociocultural systems. Andrew Targowski points to the

two valuable forms in respect to the definition and classification of civilizations – “culture-oriented” and “religion-oriented” (Targowski, 2009). In this course, the time is ripe to add one more – “science-oriented” approach which can assume a really crucial significance. A key assumption of A.Targowski’s interdisciplinary theory of wisdom is that “Wisdom ought to be defined in such terms as to be understood not only by experts but by an average man.” (Targowski 2013:16)

In this line, another citation is valuable. It belongs to the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin. In his *Dieu et l'État* (published posthumously in 1882) he says: "The liberty of man consists solely in this, that he obeys the laws of nature, because he has himself recognized them as such, and not because they have been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual. In this way will the whole problem of freedom be solved, that natural laws be ascertained by scientific discovery, and the knowledge of them be universally diffused among the masses. Natural laws being thus recognized by every man for himself, he cannot but obey them, for they are the laws also of his own nature; and the need for political organization, administration and legislation will at once disappear. Nor will he admit of any privileged position or class, for “it is the peculiarity of privilege and of every privileged position to kill the intellect and heart of man. The privileged man, whether he be privileged politically or economically, is a man depraved in intellect and heart.”¹

In our time – the age of crisis – we do need to rehabilitate Pitirim Sorokin’s scientific Triadologic method. Sorokin’s scholarly Triadology brilliantly discloses the reality (natural existence) of the Three T-SCSS, and, thus – of the Three types of sciences (based on the Three natural types of cultural mentality or types of rationality). By restoring Sorokin’s Triadology, we can create the foundation that definitely gives us the scientific perspective in carrying out the tasks set as by Mikhail Bakunin, as by Andrey Targowski.

In the aforementioned perspective, two other approaches become the working tools for the implementation of the tasks. Both approaches categorically accept the Bipolar nature of the sociocultural world (and of scientific activity), as well as the Organicist – Heterogeneous, Hierarchical, Cyclic, Dynamic, Evolutionary – essence of the sociocultural reality under study. The first is the Biocosmological approach which is aimed at the primary recovery of the true Aristotelian scientific Organicism. Basically, we rely on Sorokin’s notion of “rhythm”, and the evidence of “‘the super-rhythm of Ideational-Idealistic-Sensate phases’ in the various historical eras, including ‘the Graeco-Roman and Western supersystems of culture’” (Sorokin 2010:676). For Sorokin, “the fact of the rhythm” (i.e. “Ideational-Idealistic-Sensate” rhythm) “seems to be beyond question.” (Ibid.) Sorokin likewise adds that “in a clearly defined form, we have traced somewhat similar rhythms even in several other cultures, like the Hindu, the Chinese, the Arabian, and a few others.” (Ibid.) In his *Dynamics* (as it can be repeated), Sorokin states:

¹ This citation is accessible at the site: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/1911_Encyclop%C3%A6dia_Britannica/Bakunin,_Mikhail

By virtue of the principle of immanent change, each of the three integrated forms, or phases, of the Ideational, Idealistic and Sensate supersystems cannot help changing, rising, growing, existing full-blooded for some time, and then declining. The principle explains why each of these forms does not stay forever at its domination, and why it has to give place to the other forms of the triad. (Sorokin 2010:676)

In general, the history of the Western civilization (the Postclassical era) – The Middle Ages (with the prevalency of *intrinsic* stimuli, i.e. of the Ideational type of sociocultural organization); the intermediate epochs of the Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment (with the mixed – Integralist – foundations of their sociocultural systems); and Modern times with the evident dominance of the *extrinsic* stimuli (and the Sensate type of culture) – is a prime example of the reality of (*super*)*rhythm*, disclosed and substantiated by Pitirim Sorokin. This historical evidence is the direct confirmation of the natural (dynamic cyclic) recurrence of sociocultural evolutionary (that has its *inherent* past, present and future) development. Moreover, the natural cyclicity – of the essential interchange of the polar cycles, on the basis (axis) of the given evolving civilizational organ (Organism – the organic Functionalist whole), with its dynamically and cyclically dominating “ultimate premises” and the goals of cultural evolution (i.e., eventually, specific cultural mentalities and types of rationality) – this natural cyclicity is evidently the Organicist (Bio-physical – Biocosmological) law of nature (Kosmos).

Hence, there is no need to “invent a wheel” every time, but we can use the “method of essential metaphor”¹, i.e., to realize the sufficient transfer (shift) of a knowledge from one (already scientifically studied and known) sphere of reality into the new area of exploration (that contains difficult research issues). Thus, applying to the physiological knowledge, the contemporary epoch – of (post)Modern or Sensate times – is a natural expression of the recurrent cycle of Sleep (with its main feature of sensory denervation with the world, i.e. Dualist relation to the world) in the evolution of the global Organism (of life on Earth) and world culture as a whole.

Applying the “method of essential metaphor” accepted in the Biocosmological approach – a reason is to place herein the comparative table of Sorokin’s and the Biocosmological exploratory approaches.

¹ This method is defined and characterized in the recent author’s work (Khroutski 2011).

Metaphorical comparison of the Biocosmological approach with the cyclic dynamic theory of Pitirim Sorokin.

<i>In the theory of P.A. Sorokin (three main types of sociocultural supersystems)</i>	<i>In physiological metaphor</i>	<i>In the Biocosmological approach</i>
<i>Sensate</i>	Sleep aimless (chaotic, ruled by chance) processes of organic regeneration, growth, restoration and emergence of the new life potentials and 'technologies'	AntiKosmism (<i>Humanistics</i>)
<i>Integral</i>	Fundamental (axial) well-being vitality (of homeostatic essence) and which is the basis for the cyclic dynamic Transitions from one pole to the domination of another pole (Awakening, or the transition from Wakefulness to Sleep)	AKosmism (<i>Holistics</i>)
<i>Ideational</i>	Awake goal-driven (Kosmist, based on the inherent purposeful self-actualizing) activity	RealKosmism (<i>Realistics</i>)

Yet in the first half of the 20th century, Pitirim Sorokin substantiated and claimed “the crisis of a Sensate culture, now in its overripe stage, the culture that has dominated the Western World during the last five centuries. It is also the crisis of a contractual (capitalistic) society associated with it.” (Sorokin 2010:622). Thus, automatically (due to the “immanent causality”), the beginning of (actual need for) the transitional (intermediate – Integral) cycle-age has emerged. Naturally, this will be (is) the other civilization(s) able of revealing and developing its own (inherent) civilizational potentials – to lead the world culture to the opposite (contrary to the Sensate) pole of the world civilizational evolution.

In the fourteenth century, as Sorokin stated, the re-emergence of singularism was followed by a recession of universalism and integralism, and it was “in complete accordance with the rising tide of the Sensate culture and its cultural variables” (Sorokin 2010:349). Accordingly, as it follows from the above – we currently (already for a century, due to Sorokin’s theory) must contemplate the booming artifacts of culture(s) which are Integralist by nature and thus oppose the modern Sensate cultural order. This is precisely the alternative and natural emergence of the self-evolving Integral supersystem of sociocultural (civilizational) development (its local and global forms), which ultimately are aimed at the natural (macro)evolutionary Integralist shift.

In our (cosmological) approach – these are the natural (cultural and scientific) manifestations of RealKosmism (Aristotle’s scientific Organicism) which patterns are combined with the Sensate means in forming the contemporary Integral(ist) sociocultural supersystem. In a physiological metaphor, this is a (long awaited) cycle of Awakening – transition (in the cultural, cosmological) relation – from Dualist to Integralist bases and type of mentality in cultural activities, i.e. by advancing the appropriate (inherent) cosmological foundations and using equally the patterns (conceptual constructions) from both poles of mental activity – Plato’s (Dualist and Anthropocentric) and Aristotle’s (Naturalist and Organicist – AnthroKosmist).

However, although evident in the global life, still, in a scholarly medium – these (RealKosmist and Integralist) signs are practically invisible. Therefore, not surprisingly, Sorokin’s powerful civilizational theory of dynamic cyclic Triadologic essence – so far is factually beyond the attention of contemporary scholarly community. What could be the reason?

Applying again the essential metaphor, we can get the knowledge from physiology that the cycle of Sleep (in the whole Bio-rhythm) is the realm of Immune system dominance. This dominance refers to the entire triad (triune natural interrelation) of polar IS-Immune System and CNS-Central Nervous System; and the intermediate integral ES-Endocrine System. Thus, of long standing, if not to empower (offer the possibility to) CNS, for its natural dynamic-cyclic arousal (during Awakening) and dominance (during the natural Functionalist Awake-activity) – and in its true-natural interrelation with the ES – then, in principle, the IS will inevitably monopolize the rule and control over the whole organism, i.e., in our case – over the cultural mankind (Noosphere) and the whole life on Earth (Biosphere). In medicine, this type of pathology is defined as chronic immunopathologic diseases (like systemic lupus erythematosus, in rheumatology). As it is well known, this type of diseases has a very poor prognosis (wherein recovery is impossible in principle), i.e. this kind of pathological process inevitably ends in death of the organism (in our case – in death of humanity).

Therefore, the greater significance belongs to the third proposed approach that is expected to be capable of the resolute acceptance of the Bipolar and Triadic – cyclic dynamic – essence of sociocultural processes; and, thus taking into consideration the Biocosmological (neo-Aristotelian – of the Naturalist Organicism) foundations as its essential constituents. Substantially, it has the special importance. Third approach’s significance lies in the fact that it uses the knowledge of Eastern philosophies (as Taoism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Shinto and the like), which are naturally holistic and thus form the essential basis for the successful organization of Integralist sociocultural systems.

During the First ISCSC-Conference in Salzburg Pitirim Sorokin spoke of the historical transition from Ideational to Sensate culture, which has become the culture that dominated in world history for the past 500 years. Contemporarily, however, as he concluded: “Sensate culture is necessarily yielding to a new Integral socio-cultural order” (Palencia-Roth 2011:411). In this, essentially, Sorokin emphasized: “the

creative centers of the world are shifting from Europe and North America to Central and South America, to India, China, and Japan, and perhaps Russia.” (Ibid.)

Thus, taking in mind the historical epoch of the European Renaissance, we can speak now about the essential phase of ‘Asian Awakening’ in establishing the Integralist era in the contemporary world culture. In any case, however, without the study and rehabilitation of Aristotle’s pole of scientific Organicism (Biocosmology), we are unable to realize the true rational constructions of Integralist knowledge, which has the intermediate position between (and integral relation to) the two poles of scholarly knowledge. Thus, Aristotle (and his Naturalist Organicism) is not less actual today (in the 21st century) than in the 17th century or 12th century, or 4th century BC, or – presently for the fruitful development of the great potentials of Eastern holistic philosophical systems (as “ultimate principles” and “culture mentalities”).

Conclusion

One of the important conclusions reached at the First ISCSC-conference in Salzburg, was “exactly the problems that are on the agenda of history and that their scientific comprehension is perhaps the most important task of today’s and the future’s social sciences” (Palencia-Roth 2011:114). Essentially, the scholarly Triadology that is proposed, substantiated and developed in this work – is the reliable base for the realization of this urgent task. The gist is, as it was shown in the work – “renewal of civilizations” is the Renewal of the T-SCSS (due to the Natural Organicist – dynamic cyclic – Order); i.e. renewal of the type of its “ultimate realities” (foundational basic principles), thus – renewal of the respective type of cosmology.

Summarily, modern civilizational crises are the man-made crises which causes are reducible to the contemporary ‘cosmological insufficiency’ (present-day inability of the science to rehabilitate, develop and follow the Organicist laws of Nature (Biocosmos), primarily to rehabilitate the significance of Aristotle’s philosophical (super)system of scientific Organicism and develop the realistic basic principles – of the inherent Changeability (Immanent causality and Teleodiven evolution), Bipolarity, Triadicity, Dynamic Cyclicity (Spiral evolutionary development), Heterogeneity and the Hierarchical pattern of the natural world, etc. These Natural Organicist principles embrace the entire multiplicity of life forms, including the civilizational (equally of global evolution) processes.

The natural world is one, and, naturally – the science is one. At the same time, inasmuch as sociocultural reality is Triadic and Triadologic – science equally is Triadic and Triadologic. Rather, contemporary science is Triune, i.e. scholarly endeavors are realizable in the Three autonomic, synchronously active forms (in the Biocosmological Association’s practice and P.Sorokin’s notions: *Sensate/AntiKosmist*; *Ideational/RealKosmist*; and *Integral/AKosmist*). The Triune formula is advanced of their significance for the resolution of contemporary actual

issues: 50-(Positivist/*Sensate*) /10-(Organicist/*Ideational*) /40-(Integralist/*Integral*), in toto – 100% (Khroutski 2013).

In the general course, the Integralist development of Asian holistic philosophical systems (which are the natural resource for the contemporary building of the Integralist world) is the great potential and main direction of scholarly endeavors (in the work it is characterized as the “third” science-oriented civilizational approach). A cornerstone moment, likewise, is that precisely civilizationists (inasmuch as this field of knowledge is basically built on the Organicist principles) – can push forward the Triadologic Organicist (neo-Aristotelian – Biocosmological) principles and substantiate them in the general scholarly sphere of cultural knowledge.

Essentially, scholars (civilizationists) are evidently responsible for providing politicians and public figures with reliable and scholarly sufficient information (and which is true in the scientific meaning, regardless of the political preferences, because our Nature is the one and coherent). This information cannot but include the principles of the naturally Triadologic essence of life (sociocultural) processes and their (conscious) safe and favourable development.

As the main conclusion we can say that Pitirim A. Sorokin has discovered (in the sociocultural sphere) that the World (Kosmos) and its sociocultural evolution basically is driven ‘*from within*’ (by the inherent causes – “immanent causality”), and not ‘*from without*’. Still, however, the foundations of our modern (of the 21st-century) scholarly activity refer to the opposite (of the 17th-century) foundational idealistic principles of Dualism and Anthropocentrism (and its mathematical physicalism), thus placing Sorokin's essential scientific Organicism (and its cornerstone “*immanent causality*”) beyond the scope of modern scholarly sense of concern and attention. Under such conditions (of civilizationists’ and other scholars’ persisting inability to see the realistic causing factors of civilizational development), crises-conflicts-clashes-wars are inevitable. The time is, therefore, to draw correct – Realistic – conclusions and proceed to doing right things.

References

- Aristotle. (1999). *Physics*. Trans. Robin Waterfield. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Charles, David (2000). *Aristotle on Meaning and Essence*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Cooper, Robert K. and Sawaf, Ayman (1997). *Executive EQ: emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.
- Herzen Alexander I. (1946). *Letters on the Study of Nature*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat. (In Russian)
- Jeffries, Vincent (2005). “Pitirim A. Sorokin’s Integralism and Public Sociology.” *The American Sociologist* 36 (3): pp.66–87.

- Johnston, Barry V. (1999). "Pitirim A. Sorokin on Order, Change and the Reconstruction of Society: An Integral Perspective," *Comparative Civilizations Review* No41, Fall 1999: pp.25–41.
- Johnston Barry V. (2001). "Integralism, Altruism, and Social Emancipation: A Sorokinian Model of Prosocial Behavior and Social Organization." *The Catholic Social Science Review* 6: pp.41–55.
- Khroutski, Konstantin S. (2011). "From the three-dimensional reality in the integral sociology of Pitirim A. Sorokin – to the construction of the triune universalizing (Bio)cosmological approach," *Biocosmology – neo-Aristotelism*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Autumn 2011): pp.369–395. URL: <http://en.biocosmology.ru/electronic-journal-biocosmology---neo-aristotelism>
- Khroutski, Konstantin S. (2013). "Forming an Evolutionary Vector to the Aristotelian Pole of Scientific Organicism (Biocosmology)," *Biocosmology – neo-Aristotelism*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter 2013): pp.28–52. URL: <http://en.biocosmology.ru/electronic-journal-biocosmology---neo-aristotelism>
- Lane, Jan-Erik and Ersson, Svante (2005). *Culture and Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Morowitz, Harold J. (2002). *The Emergence of Everything: How the World Became Complex*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Nichols, Lawrence T. (1999). "Science, Politics, and Moral Activism: Sorokin's Integralism Reconsidered." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 35(2): pp.139–155.
- Nichols, Lawrence T. (2006). "The Diversity of Sorokin's Integralism: Eastern, Western, Christian and Non-Christian Variants." Pp. 59–69. In: *Integralism, Altruism, and Reconstruction*, edited by Elvira del Pozo Avino. Spain: University of Valencia.
- Nichols, Lawrence T. (2012). "Sorokin as Lifelong Russian Intellectual: The Enactment of an Historically Rooted Sensibility," *The American Sociologist* 43 (4): pp.374–405.
- Palencia-Roth, Michael (2011). "The 1961 Salzburg Conference and Contemporary Reflections of Its Overarching Themes and Participants," *Comparative Civilizations Review* No.65, Fall 2011: pp.106–142.
- Phillips, Denis C. (1976). *Holistic Thought in Social Science*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Rand, Ayn (1963). "Review of J.H. Randall's Aristotle." *The Objectivist Newsletter*. May 1963.
- Randall, John H.Jr. (1960). *Aristotle*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Remm, Tiit (2010). "Time in spatial metalanguage: the ambiguous position of time in concepts of sociocultural, social and cultural space," *Trames*, 14(4): pp.394–410.
- Richards, Michel P. (2010). "Introduction to the Transaction Edition". In: *Social and Cultural Dynamics: A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics*,

- Law, and Social Relationships*. 4 vols. 1937 (vols. 1-3), 1941 (vol. 4); rev. 1957 (Fourth printing 2010), Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Rummel, Rudolph J. (1975). *Understanding Conflict and War*. 5 Vols (1975–1981). Vol. 1, New York: Sage.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. (2010). *Social and Cultural Dynamics: A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law, and Social Relationships*. 4 vols. 1937 (vols. 1-3), 1941 (vol. 4); rev. 1957 (Fourth printing 2010), Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Talbutt, Palmer (2001) “Retrospectus and Prospectus: The Discursive Humanities” *Comparative Civilizations Review* No.54, Fall 2001: pp.32–50.
- Targowski, Andrew (2019). “Towards a Composite Definition and Classification of Civilization.” *Comparative Civilizations Review* No. 60. Spring 2009: pp.79–98.
- Targowski, Andrew (2011). “Civilization’s impact upon education in the IIIrd Millennium,” *Dialogue and Universalism* 21 (1): pp.5–31.
- Targowski, Andrew (2013). *Harnessing the Power of Wisdom: From Data to Wisdom*. New York, Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Weinstein, Jay (2004). “Creative Altruism: The Prospects for a Common Humanity in the Age of Globalization.” *Journal of Futures Studies*, August 2004, 9(1): pp.45–58.