

## DYNAMISM IN INTEGRATED BIOS

A comment on ‘Challenging Integralism’ – the article by Josef Bremer, Konstantin S. Khroutski, Rudolf Klimek, and Ryszard Tadeusiewicz: “Challenging integralism, Aristotelian *entelecheia*, *hyle* and *morphe* form), and contemporary concepts of information, touching upon the aetiological issues of carcinogenesis (with reflecting feedbacks of Paul Beaulieu, Ana Bazac, Anna Makolkin, Leonardo Chiatti, Milan Tasić and Dariusz Szkutnik)”; published in the *Biocosmology – Neo-Aristotelism* Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 2017):8–111.

Hans-Martin SASS<sup>1</sup>

The position paper “*Challenging Integralism*”<sup>2</sup> by four leading thinkers in biocosmology (J. Bremer, K. Khroutski, R. Klimek, R. Tadeusiewicz) is a major breakthrough in applying traditional Aristotelian philosophy of nature and bios to issues of modern science and life, and in improving our understandings of the dynamic cycles of information and health and disease. They identify *telos*, *dynamis* and *entelecheia* as the general and basic powers of being, of all beings, of all bios and all biotopes. Such a rediscovery of Aristotle succeeds in making the many shapes and fields of interdisciplinary and intercultural discourses more productive for both, scientific and interdisciplinary *theory* and for social and political *practice*. There are different shapes of complexity and integratedness such as dynamisms in the universe-multiverse, in inorganic self-organizing bios, in organic individuals, in communities and in biotopes. Following, I comment briefly on the following Aristotelian terms *integratedness*, *telos*, *dynamics*, *entelecheia* and refer for further details to my recent publication “Cultures in Bioethics”<sup>3</sup>.

INTEGRATEDNESS: Contemporary philosophies, attitudes and lifestyles lay strong emphasis on ‘autonomy’, following Kant’s and other enlightened philosophers understanding of the ‘free will’ and the request for ‘self-determination’ as a moral demand and an emancipating tool for individual and social cultures against dominating and suppressive powers of religious and political rulers. If understood within the narrow biotopes of social, political and spiritual self-determination and autonomy, such as vision definitely has not lost any of its emancipatorial greatness. But at the same time we have forgotten our basic biological and cultural integratedness which is cause and part of our natural bios: Our ‘free will’ cannot stop

<sup>1</sup> Ruhr-University Bochum, GERMANY.

<sup>2</sup> See: Bremer, Josef; Khroutski, Konstantin S.; Klimek, Rudolf and Tadeusiewicz, Ryszard. (2017). “Challenging integralism, Aristotelian *entelecheia*, *hyle* and *morphe* (form), and contemporary concepts of information, touching upon the aetiological issues of carcinogenesis (with reflecting feedbacks of Paul Beaulieu, Ana Bazac, Anna Makolkin, Leonardo Chiatti, Milan Tasić and Dariusz Szkutnik),” *Biocosmology – Neo-Aristotelism* Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 2017):8–111.

<sup>3</sup> Sass, H.M. 2016. *Cultures in Bioethics*, Zuerich: Lit.

breathing for only 10 minutes, even we want to; we cannot stop eating, drinking, sleeping beyond naturally given limits. We would not survive without the microbes in our gut that protect us against infections; we cannot digest any foodstuff without the mutual aid and benefit of billions of microbes in our intestine. We cannot change the seasons, but we can build homes and wear clothing for protection in different climates and seasons. We need healthy and sustainable agricultural and social biotopes in order to live, to live healthy and to survive as individuals, families and neighborhoods. We don't exist out of our free will; we all have a mother and a father. We cannot live a fully solitary life, we need social and economic support, the division of labor, exchange of goods, social coherence, networks of support and of mutual enjoyment, we need mutual aid, health care and social and political protection from burglars, terrorists, military aggression. We need peace of mind and social and cultural peace in order to thrive and to be healthy and happy individually and collectively. Immanuel Kant in 1784 defined 'Enlightenment' (Aufklaerung) as 'the human's release from self-incurred immaturity'. Aristotle and other great philosophers of the past in all cultures would agree, if for the 21th century and for the healthy bios of future generations and biotopes we hold, that the road of escape from self-incurred immaturity and slavery is not a one-way street from the past to the future, but also a recognition of lost maturity and capability due to individual and collective relapses of already gained maturity, wisdom and sustaining power. The Holocaust and other unspeakable horrors during the last decades are witness to the circularity of integrated bios.

TELOS: All individual and species bios has its individual and species forms and shapes; so have natural and cultural and political biotopes. *Telos* is the special and natural gift to species and individuals; it is rarely a finished property and is flexible in different shapes and shades, of different flexibility in species and also in individuals within a species. The Siberian woolen mammoth did not survive a changing Siberian climate while other species did; the spotted owl in Oregon's timber forests is threatened by our lumber industry harvesting woods for building human homes, but here as well the biotopes and many other species are successful in changing their integration and interaction within the boundaries of their inherited telos. As far as the telos of us humans is concerned, there seems to be an extremely broad inheritance of great adaptability and flexibility. Since hundreds of thousands of years ago we humans and our clans have left the trees of the African forests, we have demonstrated that we inherit an extremely rich telos in creating a wide variety of cultures, religions, settlement, tools, cities, corporations and states of different structures and successes. Iranian Sufi mystic Rumi described the different shapes and shades of this special telos of human bios this way: 'Allah the Most High created the Angels and placed within them intellect. He created the beasts and placed within them sensuality. And he created the children of Adam and placed within them both intellect and sensuality. So, he whose intellect donates sensuality is higher than the angels, and he whose sensuality dominates his intellect, is lower than the beast.'<sup>4</sup> It is here where integrated

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in Sass, 2016, p. 46.

bioethics in its various branches such as in environmental ethics, medical ethics, research ethics, academic ethics, business ethics, religious ethics, social ethics and political comes into play and calls for cultivating the various actually given biotopes.

DYNAMICS: We don't know how far and whether at all the dynamics of the bios in general are principle-based; if there are those principles then most likely they are those of trial-and-error and struggle-for-life. If a cat 'plays' with a mouse prior to finally king and eating her, this looks like play and is fun for the cat, but it is deadly torture for the victim. On the other hand, we have read about human babies found and adopted by wolves in the Indian jungle; this seems to be instinctual behavior of 'groupie' species, not a special expression of principle based 'ethics' as we would define it for humans. Wolves can be and indeed are cruel to other wolves as well within their clan for other reasons than they behave towards other species. When Hobbes wrote '*homo homini lupus*' he referred to those innergroup dynamics of dominating and caring, of killing and protecting, which have been beneficial for the health and culture of the group. While the Beatle's slogan 'make love, no war' and Jesus' 'love God and love your neighbor' seem to be the preferred and successful dynamics in good and healthy survival; but sometimes nations and communities have to use deadly weapons to defend their people and communities. It was not without having the *telos of humans and human cultures* in mind, that Fritz Jahr 1926 defined the "*Bioethics Imperative: Respect every living being in general as an end in itself and treat it, if possible, as such.*" In a later article he adds: "And if someone does not accept the validity of this principle, as far as it is concerned with animals and plants, then in repeating what already was said, one nevertheless should follow in recognition of the moral obligation towards human society in general ... Our entire life and activity in politics, in administration, in the laboratory, in the workshop, in the fields is ... in its reasoning and goals not focused on love in the first place, quite often rather focused on struggle with some sort of fellow competitors. Quite often we don't recognize it, as long as such struggle is without hate and in a legally accepted way. As much as we cannot avoid the struggle with fellow humans, similarly the struggle for life with other living beings is unavoidable. Nevertheless, neither in the first nor in the second case, we will lose the idea of moral obligations as a principle."<sup>5</sup> Thus, it seems that the millennia old Vedic commandment '*tat tvam asi, this is also you*' – i.e. the plant, the tiger, the rat, the suffering fellow human, the natural habitat, the social and corporate environment – in the long run will support prosperity and stability in applying, what I have called the '8 C's'<sup>6</sup>: *communication and cooperation, competence and competition, contemplation and calculation, compassion and cultivation*. In different shapes and shades we find all these eight competencies in one way or the other in other species and also within biotopes, but for the human bios they seem to be the essential properties who have made our cultures and ourselves the

<sup>5</sup>Jahr, F. (2013). *Essays in Bioethics*; Miller I and Sass HM eds, Muenster: Lit, 21; 39.f

<sup>6</sup> Author's "8 C" likewise refers to the following 8 words starting with a C: "Communication, Cooperation, Competence, Compassion and Cultivation as principles in Clinical Care and Clinical ethics, and all the fields of integrated bios and bioethics".

way we are and which we need to guide our human dynamics for stabilizing and furthering our cultures and our telos in integratedness and the 8 C dynamics in human application.<sup>7</sup>

CONTENT AND GOAL OF ENTELECHEIA: Is there any definite and precisely definable *entelecheia* in human bios, individual or collective? History tells us that great scientific, technical, social, environmental, spiritual, political successes have been achieved for over 5000 years of human history; but also great fallbacks, disappointments, distortions and exploitation have occurred. Nothing is ‘written in stone’ neither in human DNA nor in the telos of any other bios or biotope. But a certain and special dynamic vision of *human telos* can be identified in the libraries and manifested action of many cultures, one of them is the challenge to the personal telos of each and every human as suggested by Lao Zi 2500 years ago: “Cultivate virtue in yourself and virtue will be real. Cultivate it in the family and virtue will be abound. Cultivate it in the village and virtue will grow. Cultivate it in the nation, and it will be abundant. Cultivate it throughout the world, and virtue will be everywhere”.<sup>8</sup> But for good and healthy survival and successful and sustainable cultivation, however, there does not seem to be one single recipe only; diversity and flexibility seems to be a survival skill in all bios, not all least in human bios and its cultures. Writes devoted Rabbi and enlightened philosopher Moses Mendelsohn: ‘Brethren, if you want true peacefulness in God, let us not lie about consensus when plurality seems to have been the plan and the goal of providence. No one among us reasons and feels precisely the same way the fellow-human does. Why do we hide from each other in the most important issues of our lives, as God not without reason has given each of us his/her own image and face’<sup>9</sup>. In the Qu’ran we read similarly: “And if the Lord truly had wanted, he would have made humankind one single community (*ummawaqhida*); but they are still arguing (*muhtalifun*), except those in the grace of God (*rahima*)”<sup>10</sup>. The influential Muslim Hanafi law school argues similarly in favor of diversity and discourse: “Differences of opinion in the congregation must be considered as a special grace of Allah”.<sup>11</sup> The future is open, that seems to be the telos in the dynamic of bios, including the human bios integrated into the many other shades and shapes of bios and integrated bios. Thus, in paraphrasing a slogan of Karl Marx of 1848, we may say ‘*bioethicists of all cultures unite* in the protection and cultivation of our own and all integrated bios as good as we can!’ This is best done by applying and cultivating the eight C’s – communication and cooperation, competence and competition, contemplation and calculation, compassion and cultivation – in our specific human shapes.

<sup>7</sup> See Sass 2016, 41–56.

<sup>8</sup> HouCai, 2017, *The Guodian Bamboo Slips*; Miller I, Sass HM eds, Zuerich: Lit 2017, 91.

<sup>9</sup> Mendelsohn, M. 1819 *Jerusalem oder ueber die Macht und Judentum*, Ofen: Burian, 201.

<sup>10</sup> Sura 11:118f.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted in Sass 2016, 53.