

Homo Conscious as an Exit from the Crisis of World Politics

By Alexey KOZHEMYAKOV Ph.D./Dr. of Sc.(Law)

Independent Expert in International Affairs

Visiting Professor in Moscow Universities

President of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Human Society (Saint-Petersburg)

November 2016

1. To answer the question of the GIPRI Conference “**What peace? Which World order?**” the participants are well aware in advance that world affairs are not going well, at least this is the perception by expert community from different continents. The same applies to the vision of the new world order, which is far from being unanimous.
2. Returning to the sources of such situation (apologies for doing this at the end of the Conference), I would say that the world affairs’ historical panorama is looking rather as a “going around in circles” process: participants, actors, names of countries, elites and peoples changed drastically, but looking at these changes in an international relations context, we have an **impression of “*déjà vu*”**. Without doubt some important changes of the whole system and its functioning have taken place from time to time, but the fighting for famous “national interest” remained at any time and in any circumstances at the core of state policy abroad (whether these interests were understood rightly or wrongly – this is another issue the answer to which was always brought only afterwards and through future development).
3. Coming to the present, there are **two selected particular features** proper to our time:
 - the first is structural and institutional, i.e. it is to recognize that the science of international relations, according to some assessment, at 80% is originating from American schools of thought (amazingly, it correspond to the same 80% which represents the Hollywood product on the world film market). As a consequence, in most cases we are all interpreting world politics in American science terms and logic (even when we disagree with US foreign policy);
 - the second is related to certain outcomes of the historical evolution: the “world’s expansion” (in its previous forms) is about to be saturated. The Western economic model is practiced everywhere (with different degree of success up to now, as well as in the foreseeable future). The Western “model of democracy” has either no visible and reliable alternative, at least for the time being.
4. The above was not motivated by the wish to declare the “increasing universality” of this world, or by an idea to formulate an appeal to change such situation. We simply must be aware that during at least the last hundred years we all are operating in our reflection and analysis by using **the same set of conceptual tools, terms and logic** to come to any

conclusion. National interest, weight of the state, search for allies, bloc policies, balance of power, mutual intimidation and equal security ... etc. - these analytical tools portray the world system as a permanent “game”, a “game” in which humans are participants and victims. With such approach the essence of a conflict, be it the Greco-Persian wars of the V century B.C. or the war in Syria today, is more or less the same: different in thousands of details, but similar in the substance of what a conflict is.

5. In such context of “**mental stagnation**” in front of a fast-changing world there is nothing surprising in the fact that actual discussion about “*new paradigm*” for world’s system represents rather a remake of a previous one. There is currently much discussion going on regarding the “number of poles” in the coming new world, but it does not provide a different prospective for the future, compared to the well known rivalry for the leading position and an enlarged number of competitors, compared to the former two. What is very significant also is that in all these concepts regarding “newly structured world” for XXI century there is literally no single innovation in terminology, logic and *axioms*.
6. A new concept formulated with the view of overcoming the above-mentioned difficulties (which gradually become more and more evident for critically minded experts) and to open really new *paradigm* (and world politics is only a part of it this opening) is called ***Homo conscious***. This concept radically moves away from one of the oldest concepts of political science (attributed to Aristotle) - the use of the term “political animal” with regard to human beings. Without going to the explanation of the background of this mistake in translation of “*zoon politicon*”, it is to be mentioned that this approach was perfectly reintegrated about 70 years ago by Hans Morgenthau, the founding father of the political pragmatism in international affairs: “... politics has its objective laws and their background resides in eternal and unchangeable nature of human beings”. Contrary to Morgenthau, based on our concept, one should admit that what is self-evident for *Homo sapiens* is not so much for *Homo conscious*, and this is also true (among many other domains of human existence) with regard to foreign affairs.
7. This evolution of our vision as to “what is the human being” corresponds to the prophetic idea of Martin Heidegger. When considering the increasing exploration by humans of the outside world (as relations between “subject” and “object”), he found that “...the science interpreting the outside world inevitably should turn to the science about human himself, so to anthropology”. Based on this, and with regard to the most recent achievements and discoveries in different domains of sciences dealing with the human being, we postulate when speaking about world’s affairs, the need of “**new political anthropology**”.

8. The concept of *Homo conscientious* is particularly needed (having in mind the gradual and unavoidable establishment of a “**united Humanity**” to whom belongs the future of the world. Actually, *Homo conscientious* existed through different ages called in the times differently, but mostly and commonly referred to as “not belonging to this world”. Conscientious attitude of many people is also present sometimes in everyday life, and when it concerns the person him/herself and other people demonstrates the vital linkage between the present and the future. With *Homo conscientious* the present starts to be “enlightened by the spirit of the future”, and this bilateral linkage provides “human dimension” to our existence in the world as a whole, giving moral and behavioral basis to human’s existence. Such is *Homo conscientious*, which is expected, in the coming era, to become the evolutionary future of *Homo sapiens*.
9. Here are some bullet-points highlighting the **difference between our well known *Homo sapiens* and *Homo conscientious***:
- Personal interests (material and non-material) prevail over any other, situation-oriented mentality, acting at present with the purpose to achieve objectives (as they see from the present time) in the future, completion-minded attitude towards other;
 - Rationality based on the perception of “common future of Humanity”, prevailing of “conscientious and therefore desirable image of the future”, possibility to evaluate properly the result of present actions in the future, as well as select appropriate action plan.
- As an example, the exploration of near space would hardly be possible in the long run by *Homo sapiens* (that is why even in the current international context the competing countries strongly opposed to each other continue their cooperation in space).
10. In the domain of international relations *Homo conscientious* bases his perception on the “future of common Humanity” rather than on the “future of human being”. As to the basis of his doctrine in this field this would mean gradual abandoning of the absolute priority of “national interests” which spoiled international relations during its recorded history. To be more explicit - it would be the **turn to the proper sense of human existence**. This scenario is not a new edition of utopian wishful thinking, but a perspective, which is as realistic, as the Renaissance, was in guiding the Middle Ages Europe to a substantially new direction.
11. The future coming of *Homo conscientious* into perception and assessment of the World Politics would mark the confirmation of the fact that ***Homo sapiens* is about to exhaust its evristical capacity** (as well as its conceptual and analytical tools) in the face of new challenges. At the same time these changes should not be seen as an appeal to accelerate the globalization and quicker establishment of “world government” – this would be the logical result of all previous transformations, rather than the condition for proper future development.

12. From the point of view of political anthropology the coming of *Homo conscientious* represents an objective process: characteristics proper to human upgrading will gradually grow, at least for the purpose of reducing the highly risky effects of steadily continuing technological development. Thus, *Homo conscientious* will not be a “cyber-homunculus” supported by artificial intelligence, but would represent the product of the long-term process of the increasing “**collective consciousness of Humanity**”. One should be prepared for a long and slow process of the emergence of these new capacities, and conferences like this will provide occasions to draw attention to the new perspective. The reason for this optimism resides in the fact that **we are still unaware of the kind of future we wish to have** and do not even attempt to formulate such an agenda. Perhaps a future where United Humanity and environment (both directly affecting the World Order factors) could contribute to the development of the human being.