Globethics Repository



Biomedicine as the allembracing science

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Khroutski, Konstantin
Publisher	Eubios Ethics Institute
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-15 10:34:30
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/225321

Biomedicine as the all-embracing science: Biocosmological perspective

- Konstantin Khroutski, Ph.D.
Novgorod State University after Yaroslav-the-Wise
Novgorod Velikiy, Russia
Email: hrucki@mail.ru

"For, truth is rightly named the daughter of time, not of authority. It is not wonderful, therefore, if the bonds of antiquity, authority, and unanimity, have so enchained the power of man, that he is unable (as if bewitched) to become familiar with things themselves."

Francis Bacon (from " Novum Organum", 1620)

Introduction: The need of an 'Evidence Based Philosophy and Ethics'

The Author's primary claim (already advanced in the previous publications: Khroutski, 2001–2008) is that we actually need, equally with the progress of modern scientific (i.e. modern conventional Western medicine), including its main foundation of EBM (evidence based medicine) – we likewise actually need the introduction of a kind of the EBPE ('evidence based philosophy and ethics') for the *Bio*-medicine[5] as the all-embracing science.

Using a medical language, – we currently are experiencing 'a disease' which diagnosis is the 'Cosmological insufficiency' of our global cultural evolution, including the incompetence of our 'cultural organs' that are responsible for the organization of an effective exploratory activity, firstly, – for the realization of efficacious medical aetiological explorations, capable to disclose the causes of all the existing diseases.

Indeed, on the one hand, at present we are enjoying the modern (Western) biomedicine that uses hi-tech approaches and is based on the scientifically proved facts, for, – we daily are taking the advantages (with respect to the maintenance of our health) from numerous achievements of the evidence based medicine (i.e. – from the modern "scientific" or physicalist biomedicine). In general, modern medicine has brought us to the high level of our capabilities for treatment of diseases: A. Of healing – restoring to health – from acute diseases; and B. Treatment – management – of chronic diseases: i.e. CNID – chronic non-infectious diseases, and CNTD – chronic non-traumatic diseases.

'Global Aetiological Paradox'

However, on the other hand, – we have run (long ago) into the so-called 'global aetiological paradox' in our 'modern' philosophical and scientific development. This paradox means that modern medicine, notwithstanding its hi-tech scientific achievements in the treatment (of acute) and management (of chronic non-infectious and non-traumatic) diseases, in spite of this, – modern biomedicine is unable to disclose the aetiogenesis of the CNID (CNTD) and, hence, is impotent, in principle, – to realize a healing approach (that makes complete recovery) for the (radical) treatment of chronic diseases. Indeed, from the essential point of view, – this is a human rights abuse.

A gist is that the theory of causation was founded by Aristotle and, hence, – Aristotle originated and founded aetiology on the whole. However, in fact, modern notion "aetiological" has the insignificant reference to Aristotle, but basically means the explanation in terms of causal precedents that are opposed to the intentions of an agent (thus deleting the main Aristotelian *causa finalis* from the scope of biomedical search) and, hence, – factually overturning the theoretical bases of Aristotle. Hence, paradoxically, although modern philosophers and scientists explore causation on the basis of Aristotelian conceptual framing (and, paradoxically, – on behalf of Aristotle's theory), however, – they all place now the basic principles of the founder (Aristotle) in a contrary order and direction – "upside-down".

"To Throw the Baby out with the Bathwater"

The conclusion of a famous American philosopher (objectivist) Ayn Rand is really noteworthy: "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." (1963).

Likewise, the finding of an eminent explorer Prof. J.H. Randall (1960) is valuable, – he disclosed that the early scientists (including Bacon and Descartes, and further Kant) had discarded Aristotle in rebellion against his religious interpreters, although (as Professor Randall points out) their scientific achievements had, in fact, partially an unacknowledged Aristotelian base and were carrying out the implications of Aristotle's theories.

Indeed, the gist of the 'global aetiological paradox' boils down to the evident fact – modern

[5] The type of '...'-brackets, or the typing from capital letter is used for the designation of author's own terms, metaphors, expressions, etc., whereas "..."-type – for citing and the use of generally accepted words. As regards "Bio-" (that is taken from Gk. *bios* "life"), it signifies, herein, – all forms and levels of life: biological, ecological, personalist, sociocultural.

biomedicine has radically reduced aetiology: It does not use at present the full (but applies the reduced) set of the known active natural (cosmic) forces (causes); i.e., notwithstanding its inability to grasp and explore the essence of the CNID and CNTD, – modern medicine has deleted Aristotelian *causa finalis* and *entelechy*. At the same time, a great paradox is that these (purposeful and whole-organizing) causes, in reality, – is the main essential property of a living subject.

Another great paradox is that we have the objective (natural sciences' – evident) truth that all living forms (all life processes) are absolutely universal – ultimately are reducible to the same basic molecules of DNA and the other common structures and their functional reactions (at least, this is an evident fact since the discovery of the structure of DNA by Watson and Crick in the 1953). Likewise, this discovery has disclosed the evidence of the psychosomatic unity of a living subject (for instance, of genetic transmission of the psychic properties to the human being through the tangible molecules of DNA).

However, modern biomedicine still (and definitely) lacks both the full aetiological search and universal scientific approaches, and, in the natural outcome, – modern biomedicine actually needs a universal theory (i.e., its own theory) – that could explain the phenomenon and process (ontogenesis) of the entire human's life (personalist ontogenesis), but which still is absent and unavailable.

Global Aetiological Paradox Calls for the Cosmological Substantiation of Modern Biomedicine

On the contrary, still, modern medicine is based on the fundamental physicalist principles (which are natural, but which relate, in principle, to the non-organic world). Likewise, modern biomedical theorizing is fully man-made, i.e. – is the entire product of human reason and, hence, – is unnatural or artificial (not determined by the order of nature). In the result, the present situation shows an extreme scientific pluralism and relativism, – that "reflections on the meaning of the complex dynamical nature of living systems show an overwhelming multiplicity in approaches, descriptions, definitions and methodologies" (Van de Vijver 2003:101).

As already stated above, we now rightly praise evidence-based medicine (evidence based healthcare), but, paradoxically, – we pass over in silence that modern medicine totally lacks its own realistic (evidence based) philosophical principles – 'evidence-based truths – *realistic philosophical foundations*' – that could build on a needed own (of universal essence) theory of biomedicine (precisely, – theory of the Individual's health during her/his entire life span or ontogenesis). Inasmuch as aetiology (etiology, aitiology, – from αἰτία, *aitia*, "cause"; and -λογία, -logia) – the study of causation, or origination – is the first issue of cosmology, and inasmuch as we have the 'global aetiological paradox' in modern medicine, – we actually need the advancement of new cosmological foundations in biomedicine.

A key point is that Aristotelian aetiology is the expression (development, product) of his fundamental cosmology. Aristotle's cosmos is exactly "*bio*-"cosmos – i.e. organic, whole, hierarchical *Cosmos*, in which every (living) entity has its inherent place and destination in the one whole (organic) self-evolving cosmic world. Substantially, likewise, modern (rational) aetiology started exactly from Aristotle's theorizing who had originated the cosmological conception of four main natural causes – *material*, *formal*, *efficient* and *final* (likewise, he distinguished accidental and essential causation).

However, in modern medicine (in modern science on the whole, with its basic relation to the so-called "scientific method"), – we do not meet the name of Aristotle and the references to his originative influence on the development of the whole issue. In medicine, for instance, aetiology refers exclusively to the causes of diseases or pathologies that refer to the tangible factors (mainly of the surrounding, i.e. external world) like infectious pathogens or various traumatic (of any physical origin) influences.

'New Cosmology' instead of the "New Scientific Method"

This example – of the expulsion of Aristotle, founder of the modern aetiology and the "philosophical Atlas" for the entire Western rational cultural edifice, – this example shows clearly (to author's firm conviction) that we deal (in the Modern era) rather with a *new cosmology* than with the new "*scientific method*"[6].

In other words, exactly the cosmological foundations (that are inherent to Aristotle's philosophy) had been overturned in the beginning and during the evolution of the current (post)Modern era. What had been radically changed – firstly, these were exactly the cosmological foundations, while the scientific method was (and is, and will be) one the same

[6] Likewise, the hint by famous Francis Bacon might be taken into consideration (which is put into the epigraph) – that the dominant bases of science (and culture on the whole) are to be replaced regularly.

(invariable, uniform) in all times, being constituted of the three main structures (stages):

1. INPUT: of the empirically tested and rationally organized data;
2. CENTRAL PROCESSING: intellectual processing of these data by using this or that approach and method (that exactly are dependent from the cosmological disposition of an explorer);
3. OUTPUT: of the results of scientific (practical) work, which are open for the empirical and rational testing and are realized in the forms of rational construction of theories; or the advancement of methodologies for practical activity, or in any other 'product' that will be used in the effective practical activity.

Aristotelian Cosmology is Quite Antipodal to Modern Astrophysics

Really, Aristotle's cosmos is quite different (opposite, polar) to the modern treatment (notion) of cosmos that has the astrophysical meaning (of the empty space that is filled with material objects and physical processes). The latter comprises a fully *antithetical (antipodal*) significance to Aristotle's cosmos. Indeed, Aristotle's cosmos is substantially *finite, qualitative and hierarchically differentiated*. Actually, Aristotle's "cosmos" (precisely in metaphysical meaning) is substantially more than a planetary model and is quite distinct from the modern concept of Universe (infinite, quantitative and homogeneous, where space, time, matter, and cause are absolute and uniform).

On the contrary, in Aristotle's Cosmos there is no space (only place) and everything ever is the whole combination (integration) of matter and form (*hylomorphism*), wherein any change (movement and development in Cosmos) is based on the entire and inseparable set of the main causes – i.e. on the Four Causes: material, formal, efficient, final. In this order, *causa finalis* has the decisive significance – all entities in the world are basically moved and are (self)evolving due to their inner immanent (natural) goals. Thus, Aristotle has made teleological explanation the most fundamental of the four interacting and integrated ways of explaining nature.

The decisive significance of the use of 'essential metaphor'

In the proposed *Bio*-realistic (Biocosmological – neo-Aristotelian) approach that puts into practice the universal philosophical and scientific exploration, – the role of the so-called '*essential metaphor*' takes on the decisive value. The gist is, due to the evident universality of the entire living world on Earth, – we can (and ought to) stop "invent the wheel" (by maintaining the "overwhelming" amount of conceptions for the explanation of the one universal world of our real living in), but start to transpose the already explored and gained scientific data and laws from one sphere (level) of life processes into the other level wherein we have actual issues for the resolution.

For instance, the evident reality of the triune synchronous activity (but with the successive domination) of three autonomous nervous (sub)systems (within a whole organism and integrated into the one vegetative (super)system) – of parasympathetic, sympathetic and metasympathetic (sub)systems – is a valuable clue for the understanding of natural (normal, healthy) processes with respect to the personalist ontogenesis or social history on the whole.

The original notion of cosmology

At any rate, we are to restore the original notion of 'cosmology'. This field of exploration naturally deals with four main issues:

1. A study of the Universe in its wholeness (including life processes) – for the resulting presentation and development of a complete ("global") outlook, i.e. fundamental rational representation about the world as a whole;
2. A definite rational resolution of the issue about active (driving) forces in the cosmic whole, which foremost cause wholesome evolutionary processes in relation to the conscious subjects, including ontogenesis of each person and ascending cycles-stages of the evolutionary process of social and ecological development;
3. A definition of fundamental (universal) laws in respect of both physical (Non-Organicistic) phenomena and processes, and equally, – in relation to life (Organicistic) phenomena and processes, and, herein, – universally referring to all spheres of life (biological, ecological, anthropological, psychological, personalist, social, culturological, etc.);
4. Elucidation, in the accepted cosmological sphere, of the place and role of a person in current evolutionary processes of the one cosmic universal evolution of the life on Earth.

In this light, it is necessary to recognize modern "astrophysical" representation of cosmology (as the section of modern astronomy and physics, that studies properties and evolution of the material Universe) – as a natural scientific field, but, in its current dominating status, – only as a certain successive cycle-stage (of the Western civilization) in the evolution of the one global culture.

Indirect and direct arguments for the actuality of Biocosmology

The aforementioned global paradoxes in biomedicine (and science on the whole) are the

clear (although *indirect*) arguments for the actuality (and the urgent need) of the adequate cosmological exploration and the advancement of proper cosmological (philosophical) foundations for the cultural (scientific) present-day activity.

In turn, we have the evident *direct* argument of the need for new cosmological bases in the global cultural development. Indeed, "cosmology" – from the realistic standpoint – is ever Biocosmology. In a straightforward way, the evident truth is that the Earth itself (and, hence, – all the Earth's processes, including life evolutionary processes and personalist ontogenesis as well) – all and at all times are naturally the product (and the inseparable integrated part) of the one whole Cosmic evolution. Therefore, logically, – if we have the organic evolution of the life on Earth (which is the product and integrated unit of the one whole Cosmic evolution), – then Cosmos is actually the organic whole (any other statement is contradictory, i.e. false).

Hence, our modern ('scientific') separation of Earth from Cosmos (Nature-natural from Cosmos-cosmic) is one more artificial construction and artificial termination (of the one whole evolution of the world culture) by modern Western ('global') philosophy and science. As a matter of fact, every process (every process of life) on Earth is essentially Cosmic (at that, independently of an ontological standpoint we prefer: astrophysical or theological, or mystical, or any other: of panspermia, or self-origination, etc., – every life (Bio-)process on Earth always originates from Cosmic matter and energy, always is integrated into the whole Cosmic processes, always is the product of the one Cosmic evolution, and always is the inseparable unit of the Cosmic whole, i.e. – always is the Biocosmological process. Therefore, equally, – the human's (personalist) ontogenesis is essentially the inseparable unit of the one self-evolving organic Cosmos, essentially the product of the universal Cosmic evolution and essentially (naturally) is subdued to the universal Cosmic laws, – i.e. always (basically and ultimately) is the subject for Biocosmological exploration.

Universal cosmic laws (*Bio*-realistic fundamental principles)

Modern physics is based on the natural fundamental (cosmic) principles like gravity, electromagnetism, affinity, etc., while *Bio*-sciences, paradoxically, still lack their own natural (i.e. Cosmic – universal – underlying every life phenomenon or process) principles. It is very noticeable, that these Organicistic universal principles (laws) are quite evident and easy for disclosure (especially, by using the method of 'essential metaphor'). First of all, the aforementioned global paradoxes (as 'indirect') and the 'direct' argument itself serve as a valid basis for the advancement of the fundamental *Cosmist* and *Biocosmological* principles for biomedicine (and any other science that deals with life processes) – every life process on Earth (including personalist ontogenesis) has the Cosmist origination and naturally is the subject for Biocosmological exploration.

The author highlights 16 universal principles (i.e. realistic fundamental laws, of the caliber like "gravity" for physics or "affinity" for chemistry), i.e. that refer to (underlie) each life process on the Earth, including the personalist wholesome ontogenesis. In the given context, the Biocosmological fundamental principles of '*bipolar unity*' and '*evolutionary triadicity*' are of special value. Factually, already on the basis of aforesaid (with respect to the philosophy of Aristotle and its historical transformations), – we are to recognize the real existence of a bipolar sociocultural world, both poles of which are based and integrally constructed on their own (opposite – polar) cosmological foundations.

Herein, the first example is the aforementioned Aristotelian cosmology and its antipode – modern Western cosmology (that is quite polar – anti-Aristotelian – AntiCosmist). The other example comes from the physiological sphere, e.g., – the evident universal synchronous functioning of the two poles – parasympathetic and sympathetic autonomic (sub)systems – of a one vegetative involuntary nervous (super)system. Likewise, we have the polar spheres (and cycles) of Awake activity and Sleep processes within the given organismic wholeness.

In this exploratory perspective, however, we are to recognize, firstly, the incredible scientific contribution (in the historical, sociological and culturological fields of research) by Pitirim Sorokin – the eminent Russian-American sociologist and thinker. Already in the 1930s, resulting really the titanic empiricist work (for instance, – he and his assistants processed more than 100,000 scientific sources on the research topics), Sorokin had made a startling discovery – the disclosure of the *three-dimensional* (and *three-stage cyclic*) – evolutionary dynamic essence of a sociocultural reality. His other essential conceptions are: "law of polarization"; "autonomy in social (super)systems" and basically inherent self-regulation of sociocultural systems (Sorokin's notion of the *«immanent determinism of a sociocultural system"*); his famous "integralism" principle; the basically immanent inherent interrelations between Culture and Personality, and other. Substantially, however, Sorokin's main philosophical-ethical ideas are still beyond the due attention and study.

Bipolar and Three-Dimensional Sociocultural World

Firstly, Pitirim Sorokin had revealed these great laws in his *magnum opus* – the *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (1937–1941). In this work, Sorokin had unveiled the three-dimensional and evolutionary dynamic essence of a sociocultural reality – the synchronous existence of the three essential types of sociocultural reality – three vitally necessary sociocultural supersystems: Two polar ("ideational" and "sensate") and one intermediate or transitional – ("integral") type, as well as their inherent self-regulation and natural alternation in the dominance (i.e., the interchange of their dominating activity, while all three universal types of sociocultural supersystems are always and synchronously active, i.e. all three always synchronously symbiose in the integral active form).

In this light, Sorokin's basic generalization is likewise significant, – that each of the three super-systems (revealed by him) embraces in itself the corresponding type of the constituting basic cultural systems (they, according to Sorokin "are language, science, philosophy, religion, the fine arts, ethics, law, and the vast derivative systems of applied technology, economics, and politics".). Therefore, as Sorokin stated, 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.

Although Pitirim Sorokin explored sociocultural reality, it is important to highlight that his achievements are essential for the true evolution of biomedicine – the attainment of its own universal theory, first of all, – of a *Bio*-medical theory that is capable of resolution the issues both of ailment (bodily or mental disorders) and health ("a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity", due to the WHO's definition of Health in 1948). Primarily, Pitirim Sorokin has substantiated, in essence, the (cosmological) foundations for the entering a new scientific 'cosmos' – of applying the three-dimensional dynamic (evolutionary) approach to the rational (scientific) exploration of the actual world. Basically, he advanced the scientific (and philosophical) comprehension of the triune essence of a sociocultural reality – every sociocultural organization exists synchronously in the three universal autonomous forms. However, now, we are to unfold this great principle into a more apprehensible rational form.

Initially, it is relevant to conduct a comparison between the basic notions of P.A. Sorokin's theorizing and the key ideas of author's BioCosmological conception (this idea is implemented in the form of a comparative table):

In the theory of P.A. Sorokin (3 main types of sociocultural supersystems)	*In metaphor*	*In the author's BioCosmological conception*
Sensate	*Sleep* processes of organic reconstruction and growth	AntiCosmism (*Humanistics*)
Integral	*Transition* (Awakening, or the transition from Awake to Sleep)	ACosmism (*Holistics*)
Ideational	*Awake* goal-directed activity	RealCosmism (*Realistics*)

Table 2: Triune Universal (All-Embracing) Bio-medicine

Criteria	**Western medicine**	**Eastern (CAM) medicine**	**Biocosmological medicine**
Cosmological basis	AntiCosmism (*Humanistics)* – 'Ontological Pluralism'	ACosmism (*Holistics*) – 'Metaphysical Dualism'	RealCosmism (*Realistics*) – 'Cosmological Monism'
The main cosmological driving force	'*Causa efficience*'	'*Causa formalis*'	'*Causa finalis*'
The type of essentialism (main cosmic driving forces)	*Transcendental subjective* (dualistic) essentialism – realization of the a priori abilities of a human reason to construct (firstly, adapt to) the world	*Transcendent teleological* essentialism – Absolute-determined, purposeful driving forces that are realized by a person	*Immanent teleological* essentialism – subject's and personalist goal-directed inherent needs, intentions and activities (uppermost, of its/her/his ontogenetic entelechy)
The ultimate, true reality-value	*The human's Transcendental* (*a priori*) abilities (*reason*) that realizes survival (adaptation to) and development (construction of) the surrounding material world	*The Absolute* – a *Transcendent substance* that determines the harmonic order of the given ("*in situ*") life phenomenon	*The Universal (Organic) Hierarchical Cosmos* wherein every life subject self-realizes its/her/his immanent telic Basic Cosmist Evolutionary Functionality (BCEF)

Type of universality	Universal in the physicalist – reductionist – relation, or the subjective transcendental 'atomization'	Universal due to the wholesome integration of an Individual into the given milieu – "*in situ*"	Universal in the praxeological evolutionary relation (of the subject's ontogenetic self-realization)
Basic rational philosophy	Platonism, British Empiricism, French rationalism, German Idealism (Kantianism), American Pragmatism	Thomism, Modern integralism (including systems science), as well as the sources from Ayurvedic and traditional Chinese medicine	Aristotelism, Russian Organicism (Functionalism). After the year 1917 – Russian philosophy was realized by the exiled (living abroad) Russian thinkers
Position of a subject in the cosmos	Outside (*without)* the material (physical) cosmos	*Integrated* into the given organic wholeness (the wholeness of mind-body-milieu)	Inside (*within*) the organic (self-evolving Organicistic) Cosmos
Gnoseology	'Epistemological Dualism'	'Gnoseological Monism'	'Gnoseological Pluralism'
The kind of the philosophical bases of science	Rational, but non-realistic (transcendental, idealistic)	Realistic, but non-rational (transcendent)	Realistic and rational
Exploratory essence	*Bio-logical*, reducible to the physicalist structural-functional units or the '*Transcendental subjective*' experience of a person	*Bio-philosophical*, all the units are integrated by the '*Transcendent Absolute*' (God, Matter, Spirit, System, Information, Field, Energy, Pattern, etc.	*Bio-realistic,* reducible ultimately to the subject's (personalist) '*ontogenetic entelechy*' and the goal-directed '*causa finalis*'
The basic topic of reference (primary issue of research)	The *physical-chemical* structures and their (causal) interactions; as well as the *Human's* (anthropocentric) needs (rights) that are opposed to the surrounding world, and which satisfaction (on the physical, societal and spiritual levels) is the highest goal	The *Holon*, i.e. the organism, person or society (in turn, each is a unit of the Holarchy), – its/her/his/ harmonious condition and wholesome contribution to the integral well-being and the sustainable development of the holarchy (supersystem) under exploration	The Subject's (Personalist) '*ontogenetic entelechy*' (BCEF) and the derived '*causa finalis*' – goal-directed and purposeful life processes and behavioral activities
Regarding the position of an explorer	A kind of '*external*' (causal) epistemology	Subject of cognition (equally with the object of cognition) is included into the systemic integrity (that is determined by the transcendent Absolute)	A kind of '*internal*' (teleological) gnoseology
Exploratory interrelation of an explorer with the world	*subjective–objective*, which is the dominating form in the current (global) scientific milieu	'*Subject–Absolute–Objective*'	'*Subject-Subject*' – from the 'Cosmist Organicistic Hierarchical' standpoint
The leading method (mechanism) of exploration	'Explanatory'	'Understanding'	'Definitive'
Methodology	Physicalist–(Bio)Logical (Scientism)	Integrativist (Holistic, Systemic), founded on a Transcendent basis	Bio(Cosmo)Realistic-Functionalist
Anthropology	Anthropocentrism	Anthropoholism	Anthropo(Person)Cosmism
Ethics	*Deontologism* – anthropocentric and society-centric – Ethics of inner personalist Obligation for the realization of extrinsic societal Duty. Herein, the reverse side of the medal is always the individualist hedonism	'*Moral holistic utilitarianism*' – deliberate transcendent harmonization of interrelations of the man or society with the world, doing it "*in situ*" and "*now and here*"	*Eudamonism* – PersonCosmist teleological self-realization of the one's virtual (inherent specific) talents – Ethics of universal Personalist Love and Happiness

The main thesis

In the light of what is stated above, my main claim is that we actually need to advance and realize (develop into the effective forms) the triune nature of biomedicine, and that the triune *Bio*-medicine is precisely capable of implementation the all-embracing medical theory and practice, primarily dealing with the subject-matter of the Individual's health but essentially covering the entire range of issues in respect to the person's well-being.

At the present point, the crux of the issue is the definition (by revealing the essential characteristics) of the three cosmologically autonomous types of biomedicine. Naturally, in the light of the aforesaid, they realize the triune essence of the *Bio*-sociocultural world, and, in the author's proposal, – accordingly represent the forms: A. Of the current Western (so called "conventional") medicine; B. "Complementary and alternative" (Eastern, CAM) medicine; and C. The proposed 'Biocosmological' or 'Bio-realistic' medicine.

Triune Universal (All-Embracing) Bio-medicine

Their characterization (and comparison) might be drawn in the form of a Table 2, in relation to the various criteria of their characterization.

In conclusion

Although the basic idea is simple – to restore Aristotelian aetiology in its full meaning, i.e. of the integrated wholeness of all four causes (material, formal, efficient and final) but with the leading role of the *causa finalis* (and *entelechy*), – basically, the presented matter is aimed at the realization primarily of the cosmological project, for, the first need is to rehabilitate Aristotle's cosmology on the whole, i.e. his treatment of the world (cosmos) as exactly "*bio*-"cosmos – i.e. organic, whole, hierarchical cosmos, in which every (living) entity has its inherent place and destination in the one whole (organic) self-evolving cosmic world. The most remarkable feature of Aristotelism (Aristotelian cosmology) is – to be rehabilitated – that it restores (reinstates) the natural unity of philosophy and science (metaphysics and physics), for, they both naturally belong to (reflect) one the same universal (organic) world.

The author's main thesis is: "*What is medical*" exists *synchronously in the three autonomous realms* which (in the integrated organicistic mode) realize the *all-embracing* knowledge and possibilities (perspectives, vectors, trajectories) – aimed at the actualization of the person's whole individual evolutionary (ontogenetic) health.

Encountering these complex tasks (in the proposed Biocosmological perspective of development), the author is glad to inform colleagues (who become interested in the project) about the preparation of the regular scientific meetings on Biocosmology, in Novgorod Velikiy, Russia. The first seminar is planned in the July, 2010. The main idea, herein, is to apply Biocosmology (firstly, the three-dimensional cyclic evolutionary approach) to all spheres and levels of the exploration of living processes (biological, ecological, anthropological, personalist (personological), sociological, culturological, philosophical, ethical, etc.), including the launching of the initial stages for a true medicine (as the universal all-embracing science) – in the form of autonomous (but organized by common ideas and ultimately integrated – with respect to the Individual's health) directions of exploration (this goal naturally includes and integrates all other directions of scientific research).

References:

Khroutski, K.S. Introducing Philosophical Cosmology // *World Futures* Vol. 57(3), 2001, pp. 201–212.

Khroutski, K.S. Russian Philosophical Cosmology: One Step Backward and Two Steps Forward – Approaching the Universal Evolutionary Future // *Journal of Futures Studies* Vol. 10(2), 2005, pp. 97–104.

Khroutski, K.S. Arousing a Dispute over BioCosmology. A Reply to Stephen Modell // E-Logos: *Electronic Journal for Philosophy 2007*. URL: http://nb.vse.cz/kfil/elogos/

Khroutski, K.S. Biocosmology – Rehabilitating Aristotle's Realistic Organicism and Recommencing Russian Universal Cosmism: Response to Arthur Saniotis// *EJAIB* 18 (7), 2008, pp. 98–105.

Rand, A. Review of J.H. Randall's Aristotle. *The Objectivist Newsletter* May 1963.

Randall, J.H.Jr. *Aristotle* Columbia University Press, 1960.

Sorokin, P.A. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Volumes 1–4, New York: American Book Co., 1937–1941.

Van de Vijer G., Van Speybroeck L. Reflecting on Complexity of Biological Systems: Kant and Beyond? // *Acta Biotheoretica*. 51(2). 2003. P. 101–140.

Medical treatment and Buddhism – Reflections from the discussion on brain death and organ transplantation in Japanese Buddhism

- Tobias Bauer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Kumamoto University Faculty of Letters, Japan
Email: bauer@kumamoto-u.ac.jp

Introduction

This paper approaches the question "What is medical?" from the viewpoint of religious studies. Religious factors seem to play a significant role in discussing whether a certain mental or physical condition should be considered to require or justify human interference by means of medical treatment or not. In the current debate on medical ethics, religious aspects exert their influence not only through attitudes and beliefs of individuals, but also in the form of answers that religious organizations and denominations try to formulate