2. *Бондаренко О. В.* Економічна ментальність України: етапи історичного розвитку (соціологічний вимір) / О. В. Бондаренко // Нова парадигма. – 2004. – № 36. – С. 210-215.

3. *Герасимова Е. М.* Економічне знання у дискурсі становлення глобалізованого світу: соціально-філософський аналіз : монографія / Е. М. Герасимова. – Чернігів : ЧДІЕУ, 2008. – 336 с.

4. *Злупко С. М.* Персоналії і теорії української економічної думки / С. М. Злупко. – Львів : Євросівт, 2002. – 528 с.

5. *Мала* енциклопедія етнодержавства / відп. ред. Ю. І. Римаренко. – К. : Довіра-Ґенеза, 1996. – 658 с.

6. *Михальченко М. І.* Україна доби межичасся. Блиск та убозтво куртизанів / М. І. Михальченко, З. К. Самчук. – К., 1998. – 156 с.

7. *Нарис* історії філософії на Україні. – К. : Наук. думка, 1996. – 656 с.

8. *Шевченко В. І.* Концепція пізнання в українській філософії / В. І. Шевченко. – К. : ІСДО, 1993. – 188 с.

UDC 165.744

Barbara Krygier
International Cyrillo-Mefodievska Academy Slavonic Englishtenment

The mind and the world are linked together,
depend on each other, participate in each other's existence.
Henryk Skolimowski «The Participatory Mind», 1994

CREATING NEW COGNITIVE MAP OF THE WORLD

We consider evolutionary function «maps» of the world. The modern image of the world and rose-standing of the nature of man and his role in this world. Grounded spiritual and material unity of the universe. The principles study of the world - organicism, partitsipizm, holism.

Key words: *«map» knowledge of the world, philosophy, image world, organicism, partitsipizm, holism.*

Розглянуто еволюційну функцію «мапи» світу. Проаналізовано сучасний образ світу, а також розуміння сутності людини та її ролі в цьому світі. Обґрунтовано духовно-матеріальну єдність Всесвіту. Сформульовано принципи дослідження світу – органіцизм, партиципізм, холізм.

Ключові слова: *«мапа» пізнання Світу, світогляд, образ світу, органіцизм, партиципізм, холізм.*

Рассмотрена эволюционная функция «карты» мира. Проанализировано современный образ мира, а также понимание сущности человека и его роли в этом мире. Обосновано духовно-материальное единство Вселенной. Сформулированы принципы исследования мира – органицизм, партиципизм, холизм.

Ключевые слова: *«карта» познания Мира, мировоззрение, образ мира, органицизм, партиципизм, холизм.*

Our deeply rooted beliefs about the nature of what surrounds us and what we are make up our worldview, which is a certain cognitive map of the World. We use it unconsciously when we assess the reality we are confronted with in our lives. This culturally established beliefs come often from the deep past, when humankind's knowledge about the surrounding reality was based on entirely different experiences, collected in principally disparate conditions.

Now, considering the contemporary achievements of many domains of new science we can reach a justified conclusion that our disseminated and established in culture cognitive map of the World is not only obsolete but also false. And that false cognitive map is the main obstacle in understanding reality and participating in its transformation.

However, there is no reason to fall into pessimism about that shocking statement because in front of our eyes and with our contribution a new image of the World emerges, i.e., a new worldview worthy of the third millennium. Some of its parts are already very clear, other are still rather faint but quickly gain clarity.

Generalised Image of the World. We sometimes wonder what is the worldview for us and what role does it play in our lives. However, more often we think about the worldview of other people, especially when it significantly differs from ours, conceived as the image of the world – the image we believe to be the right one. Well, according to the definition used in anthropology, the worldview is a generalised image of the world and the concept of the human beings' role in the world. Usually, one "has" or "possesses" the worldview and is not really interested in its origins and how it has become a part of them. It seems to be as natural and evident as the air we breathe; evident, thus "true" – we think. However, as it turns out, it is neither that evident, nor true as we think.

Hence, a question may be asked whether in the light of the present knowledge we can even speak about one *true* image of the world formulated within any culture that exists on our planet. Maybe one should rather think about what is the world image – a dynamic mental entity subject to change and organised as a notion network in our mind, on the one hand, and a cultural record that is created by the human beings in their specific development, on the other. Another question arises, namely, what is its evolutionary function?

In the first meaning, the image of the world is an individual notional network in the mind of a particular human being. An individual neural network in our brain is a biological foundation for it. This image realises itself on the basis of the genetic record and is formulated under the influence of the cultural record, which has been acquired in the educational process. Moreover, it is enriched and actualized through the experience of various impulses in the dynamic process of our adaptation to the environment and adaptation of the environment to us. At the same time, the world image as the cultural record fulfils the role of the matrix that assists in creating an updated individual notional network. It is also passed to the next generations in each culture.

In our intellectual tradition the image of the world is considered as an aesthetic-literary narration about the formation and structure of the world that is an accumulation of cultural experiences. However, why are we willing to insist that image of the world,adoptedin the educational process andfrom the cultural environmentclose to us, is "the only rightful one," although it is largely arbitrary and not proven? It is probably so because we do not realise how limited and selective our perceptionis. We know very little about the ways of perception and we do not keep distance to it. It is difficult to see the cognitive "cocoon," while staying in side of it.

It would be better if we could treat that prevalent in the culture image of the world as merely an indicative description thatsupports our actions in the endeavour towards harmony with the process of evolution. It may rather function as a certain "cognitive map of the world," which we set out with for our personal path of search and discovery.What we decide to discover depends largely on ourselves. It also depends on us whether we perpetuate in a legible way the results of our quests in a form of cultural record to share it with others.

Let us accept then that the worldview is a generalised image of the world and the way of comprehending the role of the human being in this world. Having a certain worldview is a basic human need because it decides about the human being's hierarchy of values. In consequence, it decides also about the choices made and the approach towards one's own life path, other people, individual relations and the community he is a part of. The worldview determines particular criteria of behaviour in life. The human being, guided by it, carries out a spe-

cific line of life to which an order of occurring events and their meaning for a particular human being are bound.

Therefore, every human being has a certain worldview independently whether they realise it or nor. The worldview refers, above all, to the understanding of the nature of the world and the nature of the human being. The better the nature is understood, i.e. the worldview is more coherent, the better it serves the human being in choosing and realising the path of life and attaining happiness: the development of the creative potential, achieving overall health and psychological balance, and good relations with the social and natural environment.

The Problems with the Worldview. The constant problem is a large differentiation of worldviews, which are represented by the people of the so called Western civilisation, and even more so by exponents of other cultures. The difficulties of mutual understanding seem insurmountable if we do not fundamentally change the attitude towards both our own worldview and the worldview of others.

As long as we believe that our personal worldview is based on unquestionable truths, we will stubbornly fight in defence of these truths and will not allow the thoughts that other worldviews may be equally "good and true." In reality, almost all the worldviews existing today are fragmentary and obsolete. It becomes progressively clearer that they are not any more appropriate to the nature of reality recognised and described by new science. It is confirmed also by our intuition.

The misunderstanding stems from the fact that without any reason we absolutise our subjective, internalised image of the world, which is our proper way to determine our individual comprehension. At the same time we forget that it is merely a generalised mental model of a certain area of reality, which is available to our observation and experience. Moreover, as it has been scientifically demonstrated, the limits of our observation are imposed on us not only biologically but also culturally by the adopted in the educational process cultural pattern and the worldview, which exists in our closest environment, and which we unconsciously assimilate.

It has come to that that people can easier communicate, cooperate, or even become friends, if they omit the issues that are of highest importance, the so called fundamental truths. The attempts of establishing and finding out the "common truths," i.e. such, that could be accepted by all, usually end up badly and the majority of people go back to their established mental habits. It is a significant obstacle in the endeavour to create an auspicious organisation of social structures, starting with family, local community, and ending with international community. Moreover, it can be rightly stated that it is the largest obstacle in defeating today's civilizational crisis and carrying out the evolutionary leap.

Towards a New Paradigm. One of the most common examples of the discrepancy in thinking about the world is an infinite worldview conflict between materialists and idealists. The former insists that there were no rational forces involved in the creation of the world, and that everything we see are just manifestations of the laws of the development and action of matter, and the mind and everything related to it are simply derivatives of biological development of forms of matter. On the other hand, the idealistic conception places the Rational Divine Source in the centre of creative processes on the Earth and in the Universe, and unnecessary rejects entirely the materialistic standpoint and belittles the achievements of exact sciences.

Within those main worldview currents there are of course various mutations. However, in the light of the knowledge reached in the 21st century on account of new science and concerns

the processes of Cosmo genesis and the emergence of bio matter, i.e., the animated matter (what is mainly meant here is new physics, new biology, astrophysics and cosmology), it is necessary to verify our existing image of the world and the way we perceive the essence of the human being and his role in this world. In consequence, it is indispensable to update the worldview as a "cognitive map of the world" in such a way that it would become more detailed, and hence more helpful description of the nature of that what really exists in the Universe. The question on what is our nature and role in the biosphere as a conscious factor of evolution requires answering. Already more and more well described elements of that vision has emerged.

When the new vision of the Human Being as a creation and co-creator of the Cosmos gets maturity, it will not be a return to the pre-scientific understanding of reality but a holistic creative synthesis of knowledge obtained in the past and in modern times. Then, we anew see our place and role in the Universe as the beings who share their evolutionary past with the Cosmos, whose bodies originated from the stardust. We shall see that thanks to us the Cosmos undergoing evolutionary development may watch itself. Then, the role of the human being in the world becomes more intelligible, just as the meaning of his actions, which may both foster the development or lead to destruction of life of the biosphere and the planet.

Spiritual and Material Unity of the Universe. At the current stage of human knowledge the disputes about the material or spiritual nature of the Universe are unfounded. The knowledge already existing allows to not only presume but claim that this nature is both material and spiritual, what was also proclaimed long time ago by religious and philosophical systems such as ancient Taoism, Buddhism or Vedanta, and what is nowadays rediscovered and tried to be broader described as new science – quantum physics, new biology, astrophysics and cosmology. Moreover, they take into account rich and convincing experimental material.

It is already commonly known that it has been scientifically proven that there are in the Universe, and thus in our Galaxy, two fundamental components: Energy and Matter. They are closely linked with each other and the manifestation of one is impossible without the presence of the other. Each of them can take two basic forms of existence; in the case of energy, it is force and information; in the case of matter – substance and field. On the grounds that they exist in an indissoluble relationship, they pursue, by their constant interaction, after transforming themselves into various combinations of all possible forms, and all those transformations are interdependent.

Therefore, in the Universe there is an operating principle of constant transformation of its elements according to a closed circle: Energy – Field – Matter – Energy. This process is infinite. From that principle it follows that it is impossible to arbitrarily establish what is primary and what secondary because the result of observation is dependent on the choice of the phase occurring alternately in the unremitting process. Yet, the claims about the antecedence are the main reason of the worldview conflicts about the nature of the Universe.

In accordance with the law of conservation of energy, which is the fundamental law of nature, energy in nature neither comes from nothing, nor disappears without a trace. It may only go from one form to another. The transformation of matter occurs then through the agency of energy with the full conservation of its original amount. The properties of this process were described by physics long time ago.

If we treat consciousness as a resource of information introduced by energy in previous transformations of matter into the appropriate forms – substance or field, it becomes self-

evident that both matter and field possess consciousness. Also according to Buddhist knowledge, dualism: matter – consciousness, is a false problem because neither matter, nor consciousness possesses independent existence. Energy, as a matter of fact, is simultaneously a bearer of information and a creator of forms of matter. The origin of all forms of matter is directly related to energy that while undergoing transformations generates matter, of which special kind is bio matter, what is, in our understanding, life. In the spaces of the Universe and our Galaxy everything is governed by ablaze Energy that is also able to create life. Therefore, we may accept that Energy comes from the Rational Cosmic Source of Light, which everything that exists stems from.

At this point the curious ones have the right to ask – What is the efficient cause of that Source? If one decided to try to answer this question, they should engage in theological considerations. However, there is a hidden danger in such an approach of creating a contentious situation by entangling oneself into interpretations of the understanding of the original notion of GOD, which was used from the dawn of history to denote the idea of the higher powers.

While facing this problem, it would be better, if we humbly agree that words of natural language we use to express our thoughts do not possess an adequate power of expression as well as the degree of sufficient generality; thus, they are not ample for the description of the Highest and Unintelligible Being. It is worthy to remember that, as it is proven by linguistics and neurobiology, the relation *word/meaning* is largely subjective; it is, by its nature, strongly determined by individual features of the human being and by mental patterns imposed by the culture he was raised in.

Probably a deep understanding of these determinants by antecedent to us bearers of wisdom was manifested in that that in some cultures with very old tradition it is not allowed to verbally specify the meaning of the notion of God (for example, in the tradition of Chinese Taoism). In many other traditions the practice of presenting a substantiated images of God does not exist.

Nowadays, we all feel that the centuries-long religious conflicts and eruptions of hatred between the followers of particular faiths have depleted their actuated force. Instead of guiding the civilisation to the higher level of consciousness, they progressively have become more backward and absurd. Indeed, we already understand in general the universal value of religiosity and spirituality, as an attribute of humanity. At the same time we see, in the scale of the planet, a large cultural differentiation of forms of expression and cultivation of religious experiences. There is an increase of common longing for peace, cooperation, and mutual respect for religious feelings as well as for leaving artificial divisions behind. Simultaneously, the consciousness of our human, species community and co-responsibility for the future fate of the Earth grow as well.

The undertaken ways of overcoming that impasse have turned out so far to be ineffective mainly because instead of reaching for the depth and essence of our spirituality, too much importance is given to the differentiating of the recording forms, either linguistic or iconographic. These, however, due to their historically and culturally conditioned character, inevitably bear the stigma of the epoch and the coloration of the civilisation they originated from. One, then, does not see, or at least it is very difficult, that they are essentially pertinent to the same, universal, and arduous to express matters. The canon that prevails is the one that has been previously accepted, well-rooted, and believed to be the only accurate and binding for every-

one. The dispute about infallibility of the adopted doctrine is senselessly prolonged, the battle for the abstract after all "rightness" is on. The attention is directed to secondary differences and the salutary, desired Unity disappears from the horizon.

Indeed, all religious systems existing in the world accept the presupposition that the Rational Higher Power participates in all processes in the Universe, especially in its creation and development, now and always. This is exactly the belief that unites all religions in the world. On account of that we can hope that it is possible to create a spiritual plane common for the whole humankind, or to be more precise, a common understanding of the spiritual dimension of the human being. Then, the conflicts about the "superiority" of any faith become entirely futile.

The ways leading to the understanding of our spiritual nature, and in consequence, to the understanding of our connection with the Source of Existence may be of various kinds, just as different may be the paths leading to the apex of the same mountain. It is worthy, in our generalised reflection, to deeply rethink that ancient metaphor of climbing the mountain, because it shows well the character of the process of gradual obtaining of understanding of the spiritual aspect of life as a Whole. It also points at the diversity of ways that lead to one goal.

This is why respecting and cultivating various religions should not be an obstacle in the effort of realising the unifying idea of the humankind as a Whole. Cultural diversity is not only our spiritual richness but it also allows to preserve beautiful rituals that connect us and out relatives with the tradition and experiences of our own national community and it's past.

Religion and Science Are Not Contradictory. In the 21st century, considering the great development of knowledge about the world, there no longer are any justifications to maintain the conflict between religion and science. They are different but complementary ways of learning, describing and experiencing the same reality. The one common and unifying factor that lays at the basis of everything and which joints human worlds of religion and science is *units mundus* – the one and the same world to which both relate, and which they explain and describe in their specific ways.

Moreover, contrary to scientific fundamentalism, it turned out that new science abandons many old, previously inviolable fundamental presuppositions related to the structure and principles of functioning of the Universe, because new scientific achievements deny those assumptions. Quite often new presuppositions, for example regarding the structure of matter, begin to be similar to the descriptions formulated on the grounds considered up till now not as scientific but rather as religious ones – for example, in Buddhism or Hinduism. At the subatomic lever there is nothing we could call conceivable matter.

Above all, classic science was forced to question the infallibility of its own methodological pillars, on which it has based the feeling of certainty. It especially refers to those that turned out to be the ones that limit its further development the most, like – mechanicism, objectivism, reductionism, and determinism.

It Is Time to Abandon Obsolete Myths. We know already that we cannot treat the world as soulless machinery. Neither our Earth – Gaia is a mechanism, nor, all the more, we – the conscious particles of its biosphere, are machines. As a whole, we are a living, complex organism. Moreover, such a standpoint is not, by all means, new – we know that it was expressed long time ago by Paracelsus and that he based on it his successful medical activity. Paracelsus believed that the Universe is a living being and that it undergoes the same developmental phases as all other organisms. He wrote that the human being is a microcosms built

of the same elements as the macrocosms and that there is a spiritual mutual relation of all things in the cosmos. The same belief was *explicate* expressed by James Hutton in 1785 during one of his lectures in Edinburgh, when he openly said: "I consider the Earth to be a superorganism and that it's proper study should be by physiology."

Nowadays, the formulated by James Lovelock Gaia hypothesis has come upon a favourable ground. It suits many people who are disappointed in partiality and banality of scientific hypotheses pertinent to the human being and the World. By contrast, thinking with the Gaia categories enables a better understanding of natural interdependencies and entirety of life processes. It helps also to accept many apparent antagonisms as mutually complementary and possible to harmonise phenomena. Even more so because the growing environmental knowledge convinces us that the attribute of life is not mutual exclusion of phenomena (as science often states) but their interdependence and complementarity. Harmony does not exclude rationality. On the contrary, it fosters maintaining proportional presence of all life dimensions. Already since the antiquity, the inextricable triad – "Beauty – Goodness – Truth" was the symbol of harmony. All phenomena are interdependent because they coexist in the same reality, whose functioning is based on mutual causality. Everything in the Universe is in one way or another connected to the whole.

At the turn of the 21st century many doubts arose about the liked and spread by classical science objectivism. New science undermines also the faith in its validity. One of the most significant discoveries of the contemporary physics is the principle of the unity of the object and subject of observation. The conclusion that stems from it is that it is impossible to separate the observed phenomena from the observer, and the change of the observation angle in the observation experiments also influences the course of the observed phenomena. Hence, we cannot claim that we are objective observers of the examined reality. A notion that we are its participants would have more sense. Therefore, as John Archibald Wheeler, a highly acclaimed in the world physicist, stated: "The universe does not exist 'out three' independent of us. We are inescapably involved in bringing about that which appears to be happening. We are not only observers. We are participators. In some strange sense this is a participatory universe."

Thus, speaking about objective reality, which would exist with the simultaneous lack of any observations simply has no sense. "The mind and the world are linked together, depend on each other, participate in each other's existence" – says Henryk Skolimowski, the creator of the conception of the participatory mind. The fate of the Universe interlocks with the mind of the observer in the mutually interdependent cause-effect loop (The Participatory Mind, 1994).

If we agree that we are not separated from the world, that we are a separate but still its immanent part, then the experience of foreignness of the world will be overcome and it will be possible to defeat the discrepancy and split between the messages of religion and science, which often, instead of connecting us to the world, mentally separate us from it.

If we have a holistic worldview, then we understand that we are a part of the nature and Cosmos. If we are a part, we gain a feeling of participating in the great epos of the Cosmos' evolution. We come from the cosmic material, our bodies are built of the stardust. We are both the material and co-creator of the Cosmos. If we consciously participate in this process, we understand not only our responsibility but also comprehend our unique value as co-creators. However, such an understanding of our role is possible only from the holistic perspective, when our belonging to the Whole becomes self-evident to us and is deeply experi-

enced. It is the rebuilding in our consciousness the feeling of unity with the environmental whole, and even more so – with the cosmic whole. It is the removal of the dominant and incapacitating pain of alienation and loneliness of the human being in the World. What follows is a joyful feeling of unity with a larger whole, and stemming from it, the sense of power. At the same time, the consciousness of co-creating the world in ourselves and around us is growing, which results in the increase of the consciousness of co-responsibility.

Holistic thinking creates broad perspectives because it enables crossing tight materialistic boundaries determined by the reductionist approach. However, first it requires facing the overwhelming power of determinism, which until now has a strong position in the paradigm of classic science. For that reason, it has disseminated in common thinking and has created convenient justifications for human irresponsibility.

A particular strengthening of evolutionary determinism, that presumably entirely steers human actions, occurred in relation to deciphering the human genome and the search for generic causes of any diseases. It has led to fixing the dogma that life is controlled the DNA. However, new biology proves that it is not the case. It is another myth of mechanistic sciences, which luckily for the future of our thinking, has been recently refuted. New biology proves that genes are only respondents of perceptions received from the environment by the cell membrane. “Through the action of the cell membrane we can actually control our genes, our biology and our life and we have been doing it all along although we have been labouring under the belief that we are victims” (Bruce Lipton: The Biology of Belief, 2005).

So, it is us who through our thinking and actions program the behaviour of our cells and thereby we may influence the behaviour of the genes and the change of their properties. That was the direction of the Lamarck’s evolutionary thought, unfortunately dismissed without mercy by the Darwinists, to the detriment of the further development of natural sciences. Now, new biology makes us aware that the belief that we are powerless regarding the “genetic programme,” and thus fully determined cannot be disseminated any longer.

In such a way the free will was “given back” to us, i.e. we regained the belief that we have the possibility of making choices and making our own responsible decisions fostering our health and the development of our organism potential and our life happiness in general. This has a direct influence on our social and natural environment.

We are also not helpless in regard tothe falsely interpreted by Darwinism principle of survival of the strongest individuals in evolution. Darwinism considered the struggle for survival to be the main driving force of evolution, what became a dangerous argument for egoistic attitudes and the acknowledgment of the ruthless force as the prerogative in social life. That common belief that the driving force of evolution is the struggle for survival justifies morbid and dangerous eagerness to demonstrate power and makes our lives full of negative tensions, fear, and the sense of danger. In consequence, it leads to rapid explosions of force and uncontrolled total destruction.

The contemporary science demonstrates that in this case Darwin made a cardinal mistake. The differentiation of species does not depend solely on mutation and natural selection, which operate on account of competition, i.e., Darwinian struggle for survival. It is rather a cooperation and symbiosis which are the driving force of evolution. Cooperation, interaction and mutual dependency of various forms of life made the dissemination of life possible. Life develops through the creation of the interaction networks (L. Margulis: Symbiosis in Cell

Evolution, 1933). On every level of evolution cooperation, not conflict, leads to reaching a higher degree of development.

It becomes more and more evident that the reductionist way of thinking has exhausted its capabilities. Science is forced to adjust its methods to examine highly complex, dynamic, relational and fractal structures, which due to progressively deeper insight into the world of nature literary unveil in front of our eyes. The proper for classic science, linear character of discourse is useless for describing the structures that are being discovered by quantum mechanics and new biology. Life itself is limited, therefore the experience of life and research of the structures of life is limited, and not linear.

Another Worldview Emerges. In our contemporary cognition of reality more and more anew formulated research principles, besides evolutionism, come to the fore – organicism, participism, and holism. Essentially, these approaches of examining the world have always been present during the development of the civilisation and clearly stood out in the works of culture. However, after materialism gained control over European science, they were ejected to the margin by mechanicism, reductionism, and determinism. Now, it becomes clear that they regain their rightful position as more effective ways of learning the World.

In opposition to mechanicism that treats the world as machinery, organicism is a hypothesis of organicity that presents the World as a living organism. “The world is like an organism. Not only are individual human beings like this, but the whole biosphere and even the universe (…). The organicist hypothesis seems like a very new idea but it is actually a very old one. It only comes to us in a new guise, a more concrete and reliable guise, provided by the new sciences. But it is not difficult to grasp. It is just that we have been educated out of it” (S. Grof, E. Laszlo, P. Russell: The Consciousness Revolution, 1999).

Already at the turn of the 20thaRuthenian-Slavic philosophical current – Cosmism was formulated; it *a priori* presupposed organic unity of everything with everything and propagated the idea of the Cosmos as a living organism that constantly interacts with the creator.

In our times, the holistic approach becomes more and more important. In the world that is a unity, there is no separation between the micro and macro levels. How we perceive depends on the perspective of observation, which we choose ourselves. We examine one and the same shared reality. When we omit the differentiations of cultural records, especially the scientific ones, the unity of the world emerges from behind the curtain of the language of description.

The language of description is, above all, our natural language that we are limited with. On the one hand, language enables the access to the collected knowledge and experiences of other people, on the other, however, it reconfirms us in the belief that the limited consciousness is the right one. In order to overcome that constraint “we must learn how to handle words effectively, but at the same time we must preserve and, if necessary, intensify our ability to look at the world directly not through that half opaque medium of concepts, which distorts every given fact into the all too familiar likeness of some generic label or explanatory abstraction” (A. Huxley: The Doors of Perception, 2009).

Moreover, the scientific description that is focused on isolating differentiations observed on the detailed level makes it more difficult for us to comprehend the whole.

The problem of perception may be solved through the enhancement of our own skills of observation and perception by exercising the concentration of attention, purifying the mind from the deficient thinking schemata, and harmonising emotions. The way of personal devel-

opment may prepare us for a better reception of those exceptionally complex, dynamic structures of reality, which are being unveiled by quantum physics, new biology and cosmology. Such was, from time immemorial, the sense of Yoga as a path of development that leads to understanding of one's own structure as well as the structure of the Universe, which inherent aspect is spirituality. According to Yoga philosophy "Spirituality is not some external goal (…) but part of the divine core of each of us, which we must reveal." Spirituality – as Iyengar B.K.S. (Light on Life, 2006) tries to explain "is not some external goal that one must seek but part of the divine core of each of us, which we must reveal. Spirituality is not ethereal and outside nature, but accessible and palpable in our very own bodies. Indeed the very idea of a spiritual path is a misnomer. After all, how can you move toward something that, like Divinity, is already by definition everywhere?"

Liberating ourselves from the myths of the past we can see our own nature in the new light of the obtained experiences and broaden knowledge. First of all, we begin to perceive that we are not foreigners in the mysterious and unknown Universe. On the contrary, we already know that we were born by the Universe and out of the same material; that we are a part of it, and even more, an extremely privileged part because able to gain consciousness.

It means, that in general and holistic grasp, it becomes clear that we are also a part of the cognitive process. We are directly "in-side" of the process of learning about the world and at the same time we influence the shape of that process because our mind is participatory. However, this new approach to our role in the Universe is not yet widespread. Usually, it does not harmonise, and if so, it does with large difficulties, with our obsolete worldview, at the basis of which there is a fragmentary knowledge and old patterns of thinking. This dependency is the main argument for creating a new worldview.

The contemporary knowledge about the nature of the cognitive process confirms the thesis, propounded already long time ago, that it is us who construct the image of the World, which we pompously call the "objective reality." The vision of the World is a reflection of the consciousness state. Our level of consciousness decides on what we see in the world.

It would seem that the statement that the image of the world we possess comes, in majority, from us is a pessimistic conclusion. Indeed, it questions the hitherto overused category of objectivism, and even rationalism. However, if we take a closer look at our cognitive relation with the world, then the conclusion may turned out to be an optimistic one. On the basis of the knowledge about how our world image comes into being we can understand that we have got a large influence on its form and that we essentially are its co-creators. This sounds not bad. If, however, the canvas for that creativity is the previously formed false worldview, it directs and limits the search for information about us, and the social and natural environment. At the same time, it leads to falsification and premature generalisation of accessible information.

This dependency is easier to understand and sense, if we get aware of the "paradigmity" of the worldview. This feature, described by T. Kuhn, was theoretically accepted by science, although in practice the aforementioned in this essays paradigms, which lost their usefulness, still remain untouched. It is so called "paradigm blindness."

How we conceive the World obviously influences our ethical attitudes. The most important is whether in our cognitive approach towards the World we understood the principle of our own participation in the process of life, in the evolutionary process, and hence, the responsibility for the form of our own life.

The worldview is the source, which the hierarchy of values stems from. However, if it is a reductionist, fragmentary, kaleidoscopic worldview, such is, respectively, the pseudo-hierarchy of values, or rather an incoherent set of often antagonistic values and goals.

If we are a part of a whole, and are given the possibility get aware of that whole, then the key of cognition is inside of us. Therefore, creating such a consciousness begins with "knowing oneself." We have heard and read it many times but still we have got the tendency to look outside for the answer. This is why the question about human nature is so important.

First of all, we are a cosmic creature. We came from the Cosmos and to Cosmos we belong. Modern cosmology has discovered that life of the human being is written in the properties of every atom of the star, galaxy, and in every physical law that rules the Cosmos. (Such an opinion was stated by a famous astrophysicist Aleksander Wolszczan in Warsaw in 2009 during a lecture entitled "The Children of the Universe"). We are built of the same material as the Universe and we have participated in the evolution of the Universe from the beginning of our existence in it, whether we realise that or not.

Our nature is energetic, just like energetic is the nature of everything that surrounds us. Looking at the human being as an energetic structure has a long tradition. The current physical knowledge entirely confirms that indeed, we exist, first of all, as an energetic structure, included in the energetic field of the Cosmos. Moreover, it is known already that all the processes of change have their beginning in our energetic body, and then they manifest themselves in the physical body. Nowadays, the developing energetic medicine (called also vibratory medicine) adopts the energetic conception of the human being as the basis of its functioning.

Additionally, in the last decades it was proven that the process of our personal integration takes place on account of the activation of the connection with the biosphere through the heart. For the first time in official science there is a discussion about the heart not in a metaphorical sense but as a steering centre, the main organ of perception closely linked to the brain that always acts in cooperation with it (Heart Math Institute).

In internalising the image of the World we cannot wait until the integrative activity of our brain brings about a noticeable to us result, which can be an increase of consciousness after many years of individual development. First, we should accept, even if it is difficult to understand, that from the beginning of our existence the cells of our body are gifted with physiological intelligence. Otherwise, our bodies would not be able not only to develop but also to survive. That view will seem quite natural, if we accept the aforementioned conception of the Universe as organism, one aspect of which is consciousness.

In order to understand our role in the World, we need to look at the human being as a cosmic being. According to the contemporary knowledge we are, as particles of larger whole, included in the process of evolution, so the dynamic of the Universe refers to us as well. Hence, speaking about our human structure makes sense only if we assume its changeability and perpetual participation in a bigger evolutionary process of development and transformation. We are a multidimensional structure, and on that account there is a large differentiation of the aspects of our being. To comprehend the richness of that structure we also have various possibilities and ways of perception of all signals from the environment. It is necessary due to the constant adaptation to the environment and, on the other hand, the adaptation of the environment to our visions and needs.

It is already known that proper to us individual energetic configuration makes us participate in the energetic field of the Cosmos, regardless whether we know about it, or not. With all certainty we beings who may lead themselves by freely chosen principles and who are no isolated. We are included in the field, which is of resonant nature, we are a part of it and, at the same time, the centre that is able to modify that field on account of our properties and conscious behaviour.

Equally important is to realise that in the literary meaning our perception centre of the environment and making choices is the heart that makes us participate in the biosphere and its biological rhythm, which is characteristic for everything that lives.

The Worldview – It Is Already There … The worldview that emerges in front of our eyes and with our participation is ready. Many answers to the haunting us questions are to be found in great articles and books, which have been published in the last decades. Some of them have reminded us the deep and forgotten knowledge of the antiquity, which is now confirmed by new science.

Independently from the detailed forms with which we creatively fulfil our emerging image of the World, it forms as: COSMIS, HOLISTIC, DYNAMIC, EVOLUTIONARY and CREATIVE, and simultaneously HEROIC and UNIVERSAL.

References

1. *Childre D.*, Martin H. The Heart Math Solution. – New York, 1999.
2. *Ciołkowski K. E.* Oczerki o vselennoj. – Kaluga, 2001.
3. *Grof S.*, Laszlo E., Russell P. The Consciousness Revolution: A Transatlantic. Dialogue. – London, 2003.
4. *Hawkins D. R.* Siła czy moc. Anatomiaświadomości. – Warszawa, 2010.
5. *Huxley A.* The Doors of Perception & Heaven and Hell. – New York, 2009.
6. *Iyengar B. K. S.* Light on Life: The Yoga Journey to Wholeness, Inner Peace, and Ultimate Freedom. – London, 2006.
7. *Krygier B.* Człowiek na nowo. – Warszawa, 2009.
8. *Laszlo E., Currivan J.* Cosmos: A co-Creator's Guide to the Whole World. – Carlsbad, 2008.
9. *Lipton B.* The Biology of Belief. – London, 2010.
10. *Lovelok J.* Gaja. Nowe spojrzenie na życie Ziemi. – Warszawa, 2003.
11. *Margulis L.* Symbiosis in Cell Evolution. – New York, 2003.
12. *Precht R. D.* Kim jestem? A jeśli już, to na ile? – Poznań, 2009.
13. *Rees M.* Nasz kosmiczny dom. – Warszawa, 2008.
14. *Skolimowski H.* The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and Universe. – London, 1994.
15. *Wilber K.* Małżeństwo rozumu z duszą. Integracja nauki i religii. – Warszawa, 2008.