

Review of: "[Commentary] Quo Vadis, Man? Common Sense Approach of Human Life Perspectives"

Daniel Rueda Garrido

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript deals with a huge number of topics, from education, politics, scientific knowledge, history, cosmology, biology and evolution to technology, ethics, religion, theology and aliens.

As you yourself admit, Mihail, this is not a scientific article. I would argue that it is not an article either. The structure is more like notes in a travel diary, although the journey is not only through various geographical areas, but also through a vast intellectual landscape (I don't know if there is any symbolic relation between the places visited and the subject matter, although it could be like a Hegelian return of the idea back home).

Having placed it outside the academic sphere, because apart from the structure, it suffers from a lack of specialisation and a lack of critical and bibliographical apparatus (academic sources), in general, your writing strikes me as an interesting reflection. In it you ask very important and pressing questions such as "from the historical perspective, how people should organize their society, families and their proper actions? Should we try to search as fast as possible to get a better understanding of who we are, why we are and toward what and where will we evolve in the Universe perspective?"

The general idea that runs through your writing should not meet with too much opposition, since living in a peaceful world, in which freedoms are respected and the development of each individual and each people is promoted from a global and communitarian conception of humanity, is an ideal that is perhaps connatural to civilisation, at least as a regulatory idea, if we listen to Kant in his book on perpetual peace, let alone Fichte and Krause. However, as always, problems arise when thinking about how to realise this ideal, but also about its implications.

Respect for all forms of life seems to me to be an ideal of fundamental generosity, including the life of animals and plants. But any top-down imposition, as you seem to suggest, ignores problems such as the following: who is going to control and impose this new form of life, which is political and ideological (even if it seems neutral); what is meant by a form of life; who is allowed to act in this way and who is not; are traditions like as that of women's submission and enslavement, stoning (still existing in many countries), ablation, or even capital punishment part of these forms of life to be respected; who has the power over bodies and minds (is it the individuals or is it the elites of these forms of life, be it religious, capitalist, collectivist, etc.?); if the nation state is to disappear, what would replace it? A world government, federation of nations, nations without a state... (something impossible from political theory and even more so from German idealism)?

Your writing raises many questions, and the relevance of the former depends on answering the latter adequately. For as I say, as it is expressed, it is the repetition of an ideal, which as such is universal. Moreover, if respecting life in all its

senses is the principle that would govern your ideal world, how does that combine with respecting the liberty of different forms of life and communities, such as those whose practices pollute the air, or who need enormous quantities of beef or pork, or simply, as you say, communities that eat dogs, or communities whose territory they are prepared to kill for... Is life or national territory worth more?

These are all difficulties that I think need to be considered, as well as raising the most radical of all questions with respect to your text... why does humanity necessarily have to survive? If humanity came into being, as you say, because it was good for the universe that it should be so in some sense, can its extinction not be to the benefit of the universe in some sense? If everything has a historical meaning, and what we have evidence of is the rise of some civilisations over others, and of some peoples over others, including the times of pax romana, pax americana, etc., times of peace precisely because of domination by the hegemon, why does history have to have another meaning than that, where does this alternative meaning come from, according to which humanity has a different mission? Is it not rather wishful thinking or the imposition of yet another ideology?

I believe that this critical sense can give your text greater scope.