

## The geoversal civilization and the unified method of substantiation of scientific theories

**Alexander Voin, Director, International Institute of Philosophy and Problems of Society, Kyiv**

**Abstract:** *The problems and threats facing humanity in the age of globalization require the unification of efforts of all peoples on the basis of a universal human value system and mutual understanding in ideas about the right path for further development. This is hindered by the lack of a common language, common to all system of concepts and a method of substantiating conclusions. The article shows that such a common language can only be the unified method for substantiating scientific theories developed by the author. The Chinese philosopher Zhang Shaohua, during the 5th World Congress of Geoversal Civilization, held on 16-21.7.2018 in Nairobi, developed the draft of the geo-global civilization. The task posed by the draft is the elimination of the contradictions of modern humanity (people, ideologies, etc.) which lead to numerous armed conflicts and the destruction of the environment. In this article I will discuss about the new value system proposed in which morality and responsibility will replace the pursuit of material goods and selfishness.*

**Keywords:** *Peace, development, concept, values, method of justification, modern contradictions, geoversal civilization, New value system, World Coalition Government.*

**Sommario:** *I problemi e le minacce che l'umanità deve affrontare nell'era della globalizzazione richiedono l'unificazione degli sforzi di tutti i popoli sulla base di un sistema di valori umani universali e di comprensione reciproca nelle idee sulla strada giusta per un ulteriore sviluppo. Ciò è ostacolato dalla mancanza di un linguaggio comune, comune a tutto il sistema di concetti e da un metodo per dimostrare le conclusioni. L'articolo mostra che un tale linguaggio comune può essere solo il metodo unificato per dimostrare le teorie scientifiche sviluppate dall'autore. Il filosofo cinese Zhang Shaohua, durante il V Congresso Mondiale*

*della Civiltà Geoversale, tenutosi il 16- 21.7.2018 a Nairobi, ha sviluppato una bozza di civiltà geo-globale. Il compito posto dal progetto è l'eliminazione delle contraddizioni dell'umanità moderna (genti, ideologie, ecc.) che portano a numerosi conflitti armati e alla distruzione dell'ambiente. In questo articolo l'autore tratta del nuovo sistema di valori proposto, in cui la moralità e la responsabilità dovranno sostituire la ricerca del benessere materiale e dell'egoismo.*

**Parole chiave:** *Pace, sviluppo, concetto, valori, metodo di giustificazione, contraddizioni moderne, civiltà geoversale, Nuovo sistema di valori, Governo di coalizione mondiale.*

Modern humanity is divided by deep contradictions between peoples, countries, ideologies and religions, which leads to numerous armed conflicts with the threat of self-destruction due to the growing number of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, scientific and technological progress has led to the emergence of other universal human threats and problems not related to armed conflicts, such as the destruction of the environment and the possibility of man-made disasters on a global scale, which would require all mankind to unite to overcome them. The task posed by the draft of the geo-global civilization, developed by the Chinese philosopher Zhang Shaohua and discussed at the 5th World Congress of Geoversal Civilization, held on 16-21.7.2018 in Nairobi, is the elimination of the above-mentioned contradictions and the uniting of mankind in the struggle for its survival and a worthy future on the basis of a universal ideology and value system in which “morality and responsibility” will replace the “pursuit of material goods and selfishness”. In this primacy will be given to the interests of all mankind, the value of the human person, human rights and the preservation of peace. And as a final goal the transition from the form of homo sapiens with his “physical desire” or “material desire” or “selfishness” or “ego” to a new “spirit-centered species” will take place over a 500-year period.

I do not look as far as 500 years ahead, but I agree with the above-mentioned goals of the geoversal project for the foreseeable future. However, there are obstacles to these goals. In particular, the creators of the project realize that “humanity, which has long been on the wrong path, will certainly resist the new thinking”. But it seems to me that awareness of these obstacles on the

part of the authors of the project is not enough and, consequently, a strategy for overcoming them has not been properly developed. In my opinion, the authors of the project overestimate the degree of determinism in the process of human development and underestimate the possibility of dramatic development, up to and including self-destruction.

On the path to the adoption of a new ideology and value system are not only individuals and groups, in particular national, state and other forms of selfishness, but also objective obstacles. The main one is the absence of a common language between representatives of different ideologies and value systems, as well as between different schools of humanitarian scholars, public figures and representatives of different religions, which these ideologies and value systems formulate and substantiate. By common language I do not mean English, Chinese, Russian, or any other, but a system of concepts common to all and a way of substantiating statements. This lack of a common language prevents countries and peoples from agreeing that there is a right way for the further development of mankind, and each country separately, and how to properly solve specific universal human problems.

International negotiations on the resolution of endless armed conflicts between countries gives us an excellent illustration of the absence of above-mentioned common language. Each side in such negotiations asserts that it strives for peace, for justice, for the interests of mankind and for all the various forms of good: for spirituality, for morality, etc. But everyone understands all these things in their own way. For example, the authors of the geoversal project hardly consider fanatical Muslim terrorists to be moral and spiritual people. But the fanatics themselves are deeply convinced of their morality and spirituality and the rightness of their goal. And in confirmation of this, they produce quotations from the Koran. Of course, one can say that they misunderstand the Koran. But it is not enough to say so, we still need to offer the correct interpretation of the Koran and, most importantly, to prove to everyone that it is the right one. And this applies not only to the Koran, but also to other scriptures. After all, in the history of Christianity, for example, there have been holy wars, the extermination of heretics, the Inquisition, and all this was done in the name of God, that is, in the name of spirituality. That means that calling for spirituality and not having an acknowledged and reliable method to determine the correct spirituality, we run the risk of not achiev-

ing the results we aspire to. This also applies to non-religious doctrines that teach us how to live properly, such as Marxism, and Freudianism. First of all then, a common language is needed, which is nothing more than a universally accepted and reliable method of substantiating the truth. And since there is none for today, we see that all the above-mentioned talks either do not lead to anything at all, or lead to an agreement that each of the parties considers unfair and harmful to humanity, and therefore it is soon violated.

The authors of the geoversal project propose to base a universal human value system on the general one that was in each civilization existing in history, and this, in their opinion, should provide a common language. Of course, when developing a universal human value system, one must take into account the general value that existed in previous civilizations. But this is not enough to develop such a universal ideology and value system that will ensure the safe, sustainable and acceptable development of mankind, and to persuade representatives of today's ideologies and value systems to accept it.

After all, as the authors of the geoversal civilization project justly assert, we live in an era of globalization that is different from all the preceding ones, and, I add myself, in an era of rapid scientific and technological progress which has radically changed the conditions of our existence in comparison with previous eras and in particular given birth to human problems unknown in previous eras. Therefore, not everything that is common to what was in previous civilizations may prove acceptable in our era. And among the priorities put forward by the authors of the geoversal project, there are such values the human person and human rights, which cannot be said to have been general to all previous civilizations.

The authors of the geoversal project also substantiate it by the fact that “embryo of (future) civilization is integrated from many contingencies in history and “probability” in reality which is the unique “inevitability” in the future”. Here, in an explicit or implicit form, there is a conviction of authors of the project in the objective inevitability and lack of variance in the future development of mankind and in the fact that they correctly describe this inevitable and only possible way and prove its uniqueness and inevitability. Of course, when designing the future, we must take into account previous development and “probability in reality”. This prior development and “probability” in reality” limit the possibility of an arbitrary development option in

the future. But is the assumption of the complete lack of variance in future development justified? As for the lack of invariance of the geophysical and biological evolution which have occurred to this day, scientists have no common opinion. And most of them tend to believe that this development was not non-alternative. Then how is it possible to derive from this the invariability of future development? This lack of variance also contradicts my theory of determinism (Voin 2015).

But let's say that future development is non-variant. Does this mean that the authors of the geoversal project correctly extract the trajectory of this future development from the past evolution and from the "probability" in reality? This is by no means self-evident. I fully share the call of the authors of the project to unite humanity in the name of its survival and better future. But this unity itself can be understood in different ways. In my opinion, the authors of the project understand this unity too literally, in the sense of complete unification up to the merging of all cultures into one, the replacement of all languages with new Esperanto. If we look at previous development, for example, in biological evolution, we will see that nature has avoided complete unification and cared for the conservation and enhancement of biological species, although it has in some senses rejected the unsuitable. And the unification, for example, of cells into organisms was due not to the unification of incoming cells, but to their integration into a complex organism while preserving their original individual properties and differences, supplemented with new properties or functions useful to the united organism. The integration took place simultaneously with the increase in the diversity of the unifying elements. Similarly, the evolution of human society took place. On the one hand, there was a union along the line: the family, the tribe, the people, the nation, humanity. On the other hand, within each new enlarged unit, there was a differentiation with division into parties, ideologies, interest groups – even up to football fans, who loathe some different teams and on this basis fight with each other, sometimes to the death. It follows that even if there is only one objective variant of future development that is rigidly determined by past development and the state of humanity today, then there may be different, alternative ideas about this path (and there are) and for all to accept the one correct one, a common language is necessary as a universally accepted method of substantiating of this correctness.

Finally, in what sense is the expression “inevitability” in the future used by the authors? As I understand it, it is used in the sense that this future is inevitable, provided that on the way to it humanity does not break its neck, for example, in a nuclear world war. This is as good as saying that if we do not follow the path indicated by the authors, then we are doomed. But even if we go along this path, we will reach the ultimate goal – we will turn into a new, absolutely spiritual species only after 500 years. But this interval of time must still be lived. And taking into account our present moral and spiritual state, well described by the authors, and the extraordinary creative and, moreover, destructive power that we have achieved thanks to constantly increasing scientific and technical progress, we must first of all be very careful living not only the next 500 years, but even the next 5 years. And for this we need to urgently negotiate new rules of coexistence on the planet. And since we have to negotiate, it still and in the first place requires a common language (in the sense mentioned above).

Even the idea of the World Coalition Government and Parliament (an idea that I fully support) proposed by the authors of project does not negate the need for a common language, because in this government and parliament there will be different parties, different groups and different opinions, and a common solution will have to be worked out. (Not to mention the fact that before the World Coalition Government and Parliament, you still have to live). And although the authors of the project offer solutions to all the visible problems facing humanity today – the organization of the economy, social life, culture, ecology – and even assuming that this is the only right decision, life will continue and new problems will appear, which will have to be solved; therefore, a common language will be needed to solve them.

But is there in principle such a common language, such a single and reliable method of substantiating the truth and, if so, what is it like? There are teachings in Western philosophy, the main part of which is post-positivism, whose representatives claim that such a common language does not exist in principle. These teachings are dominant today. The most categorical version of this view is expressed by Kuhn, who wrote that the concepts of science cannot be uniquely determined and, as a result, there cannot be a common language between scientists and representatives of different paradigms (fundamental theories). Others post-positivists argue that the concepts of science

are not tied to experience (Quine), that scientific theory is fundamentally fallible (Popper), that science changes the “justification layer” from time to time (Lakatos). In general, in one form or another and with some changes, they all share Kuhn’s view of the absence of a common language among scientists. But if there cannot be a common language between scholars of humanities and the public figures who formulate and substantiate ideologies and values, then there cannot be more between politicians, who try to resolve international conflicts on the basis of justice and between ordinary people who practise this or that ideology, religion and value system.

The above-mentioned philosophical schools, which still dominate the West today, the main points of which have still not been refuted, have a strong influence on the transformation of the system of values and morality, not only in the West itself but throughout the world. Under their influence, the Enlightenment era was replaced in the West by the era of modernism, and then post-modernism, the essence of which is reduced to the relativization of truth and morality under the slogan: “Everything is relative.” Indeed, if we cannot in principle have common concepts and cannot agree on what is truth, then the truth becomes relative – moral truth in particular. And from this it follows that the only reliable values are freedom and enjoyment, which can be obtained by any means. This new world view, which has spread far beyond the Western world, has a strong impact on the ability of countries, peoples and representatives of different ideologies to negotiate among themselves over conflicts between them and the solution of human problems. Not only is there no common language for mutual understanding, thanks to this worldview there is no desire to find a common language and no belief that there is a truth and justice common to all, about which it makes sense to negotiate. And all these talks about peace, justice and the interests of mankind have become only a propaganda cover for the achievement by each side of its narrow group goals. And only the theoretical defeat of post-positivists and other relativists of scientific knowledge can restore to mankind the belief that the truth is one and we can comprehend it.

How do the positions of the opponents of post-positivism and their attempts to refute post-positivism look today? The so-called axial religions – Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Buddhism – advocate the opposite point of view, namely that “God is one and the truth is one”, and each religion proposes

in its God's name a system of morality and values as the only correct one. The only trouble is that these systems not only of axial religions themselves, but also their numerous denominations, do not coincide and there is no common language for finding out which of them is right. Moreover, these contradictions have often led in the past, and continue to lead, to bloody wars between representatives of different religions and even denominations of the same religion. The most vivid example of such wars is the unceasing centuries-old war between the Sunni and Shia sects in Islam. Therefore, representatives of religion cannot refute the statements of post-positivists, who base them on the data of modern science and rely on its authority.

The position opposite to post-positivists and other relativists of cognition and morality is occupied not only by representatives of axial religions, but also by many philosophers from other schools, and by many scholars. However, none of them has so far been able to refute the post-positivists who cite the irrefutable fact that science periodically changes its concepts and inputs. (Newton's absolute time becomes relative in Einstein's theory; velocity is formed according to Galileo's formula in Newton's theory, in Einstein's it is formed according to the Lorentz formula, and so on). Based on the post-positivists conclusion that the concepts of science are not tied to experience, science does not have a unified method of substantiating its conclusions, and its conclusions are unreliable and do not guarantee us the truth. It is clear that if in science there is no unified method of justifying conclusions, then there is not and there cannot be a common language between scientists. And as I said, if it does not exist between scientists, it cannot hope to exist between politicians and ordinary people.

In my philosophy, I refute the conclusions of post-positivists and show that although science changes its concepts and conclusions in the transition from one fundamental theory to another, the method of justification remains unchanged – a unified method of substantiating scientific theories. (Voin 2015; 2017; 2nd edition). This method was developed in the process of the evolution of natural sciences, primarily physics, but until now it has not been explicitly presented and has existed only at the level of the stereotype of naturally scientific thinking. Therefore, natural scientists more or less have a common language among themselves and are capable of accepting concrete theories, even if not immediately, as provena and rejecting others. And representatives of the



humanities and social sciences, in which this method is generally unknown, do not have a common language and are divided into many schools that are incapable of agreeing and generally accepting this or that theory as proved. I presented this method explicitly and showed the possibility of applying it with appropriate adaptations in the field of humanities and social sciences.

I showed that although concepts and conclusions change in the transition from one fundamental theory to another, if both theories are based on a unified method of substantiation, then the concepts both of the old and new theories are tied to experience and only to experience (although in the new theory this binding takes place in a wider area of reality than in the old one). And also, that although the conclusions of the old and new theories differ qualitatively (ontologically), both are true (new ones in the extended field of reality) in the sense that they “predict the results of future experiments on the basis of past experiences” with a given accuracy and probability. (If we calculate the motion of a body in the region of velocities far from the speed of light according to the formulas of Newton or Einstein, we can guarantee the deviation of the result from the predicted value by an amount not more than given with a given probability). All this is only for theories substantiated by a unified method of substantiation and, naturally, under the conditions for which the theory is created. For theories that are not grounded on this method, we cannot guarantee anything. Part of a unified method of substantiation is the theory of concepts, in which I show that science can uniquely define its concepts and unambiguously bind them to experience and how exactly this is done.

Thus, a unified method of substantiation will give a common language to scientists, including in the humanities, to public figures and to all people if and when it is be introduced into the education system. I showed that by constructing, in accordance with the requirements of a unified method of substantiation, the theory of optimal morality (Voin 2015); “Determinism and freedom theories (Ibidem-, Parts 2 and 3 respectively, 2015); and “The rational theory of the spirit” (Ibidem., part 5, 2015). In the latter theory, I posited that spirit and spirituality do not necessarily have to be good, and that even a good spirit tends to deteriorate over time, and discussed how to distinguish a good spirit from a bad one and what to do so that it does not deteriorate. I also proposed a new interpretation of the teaching of the Bible based on my hermeneutics, based on the unified method of substantiation (Voin 2016a), the beginning of

a new macroeconomic theory “Starts a new macro-economic theory”, (Direct Media, M. – Berlin, 2014), also based on the unified method of substantiation. I also showed many examples in the books “A specific method of substantiating scientific theories” (Voin 2017) and “Science and Pseudoscience”, (Voin 2014) of the consequences of not applying the unified method of substantiation, especially in the humanities and social sciences. And in the book “Philosophy and the global crisis”, (Voin 2016) I showed how the state of modern science, in particular philosophy, connected with the absence in it of a recognized unified method for substantiating theories, reflects on the state of society and the processes taking place today in the world.

I believe that for the successful promotion and implementation of the project of a geoversal civilization it is very important to include in the project the unified method of substantiation of scientific theories and to promote it along with the theories of Zhang Lan underlying the geoversal project. Moreover, this method is organically combined with the requirements of The Oneness of All Matters, The Oneness of All Humanities, The Oneness of All Faiths, etc., which underlie the geoversal project.

## Biography

A. Voin, “Наука и лженаука”, (*Science and Pseudoscience*), Berlin, Direct Media, М., 2014.

A. Voin, “Неорационализм – духовный рационализм”. (*Neo-Rationalism – spiritual rationalism*), Berlin, Direct Media, М., 2015.

A. Voin, “Эволюция духа. От Моисея до постмодернизма”. (*The evolution of the spirit. From Moses to postmodernism*), Berlin, Direct Media, М., 2016a.

A. Voin, “Философия и глобальный кризис”. (*Philosophy and the global crisis*), Berlin, Direct Media, М., 2016b.

A. Voin, “Единый метод обоснования научных теорий.” (*A specific method of substantiating of scientific theories*), Berlin, Direct Media, М., 2017, 2nd edition.