

Whereas an observer is clearly far-fetched here by the ears!..

I

The naivety and a low-grade amateurism of the so-called anthropic principle is now being criticized by many serious experts. Although, in fact, in the model of the "pulsating Universe" (as well as in L. Smolin's very just relevant today evolutionary hypothesis), the choice of the initial free parameters is obviously not accidental. First, it can be assumed that they - as inviolable reference samples - are *entirely* passed from generation to generation. Secondly, even if they are formed anew at each next Explosion, it is due to having some kind of "through" ontological memory. But even with the culling away both of these facultative guesses, as a decisive unshakable argument against the imaginary anthropophilicity of our existence is what in absolutely any Universe there must present subtle demigods & angels (pranophytes) as well as, apparently, the smallest fragments of the mind (informons). This, of course, also applies to those cases when the self-assembly of heavy elements or molecules (and hence, the habitual life for us) would turn out to be too energy-intensive and de-facto unpromising from the astrophysical point of view.

But in general, we can imagine purely speculative two principled dynamic schemes of universe:

- a) a kind of swing "from energy (Will) \Rightarrow to information (Reason) and back";
- b) continuous experiments or even improvisations of Will itself (by the by, the old theosophical teaching about the previously existed 5 discarnate races also fits into here).

In the first case, predicting events (proscopy) is possible due to the global repeatability of history; and in the second - through the management of the events relevant for Will. As for the semi-fantastic idea of parallel worlds (or, say, multidimensional space), it doesn't, apparently, jump beyond this framework, and only brings some own colorful variety to the overall picture.

By the way, the seeming polarity of interests of Reason and Will is actually sometimes felt, perhaps, except that in the socio-historical plane. At the rest they are everywhere going side by side, as if complementing each other, and moreover under the general supremacy (for now, at least) of Reason. That's why we can oppose them each other on the scale of the Universe (and even then - as one of several permissible options) only in terms of time parameters: from the energy of saturated but structureless chaos - to an extremely structured but cold & lifeless Cosmos. And just at this finishing segment, due

to the critical shortage of energetic resources, the transition from the current living civilization to the hegemony of robots seems to be quite real.

II

So, what are the logical conclusions from this? Well, first of all, the fact that the "strong anthropic principle" on the version of J.A.Wheeler (*"Observers are necessary to bring the Universe into being"*), despite even its wit and ostentatious elegance, is actually a rather trivial, i.e. doesn't give researchers any practical benefit. As for the "weak" (a little earlier proposed by our countryman G.M.Idlis in such formulation: *"We are observing a deliberately not an arbitrary region of the Universe, but the one whose special structure made it suitable for the emergence and development of life"*) then here, alas, things are much worse. Not only is it, already inherently imbued with sophistry (having unceremoniously reshuffled cause and effect) but also does not correspond at all to the reality around us. Because for any corpuscular parameters, the probability of the emergence of intelligent life (and along with it - of an observer himself) remains all the same high enough! Well, perhaps only, however, not in vacuum space; and of course, not right there away - as if by a fleeting whim of a goldfish but at least after a few billion years...

Nevertheless some are trying to appeal here to the notorious Drake equation. They say, if even by the most moderate standards, in our galaxy should be 10 highly developed extraterrestrial cultures but there is not a single one of them so far - then, in their opinion, it means that the uniqueness of a formal observer is something for granted. Meanwhile, in reality, the last circumstance can, perhaps, testify only to the fact trite Laplace-Cartesian explanation here, alas, does not work. That is, more specifically, this indicates the etiological complexity of the origin of civilizations associated with the nonlinearity of the paths "from inanimate \Rightarrow to living" (which, as it were, is confirmed by the spread version about the 5 races that preceded us).

In general, comparing H.P.Blavatsky's theory of the root races with modern biologists' evolutionary tree, one involuntarily comes to the conclusion that the former quite might serve as a kind of well-adapted soil for the normal "growth" of the latter. In other words, at first for a pretty long time the primary bricks of organized matter (in the form of stable atoms and complex polymer molecules) took shape painstakingly from the ether, the astral, the mental body as well as proton substrate, and then everything already continued according to the familiar school scenario.

But, incidentally, only a rough simplified picture of earthly evolution was still given here. Since, in fact, both of these processes went on almost simultaneously

with each other; however at the preparatory stage, the laws of theosophy (or, if you like, astrophysics) "ruled" in it, while at the final stage they have already become predominantly of biological nature. In this regard, the emergence of a habitual phenomenon of life can be somehow discussed, perhaps, from the moment of a successful mutually beneficial synthesis of the mental sheath (responsible, as known, for ancestral memory) with the immanent sensitivity of organic rings.

Thus, here we - in contrast to the obviously far-fetched anthropic - come to the formulation of another principle, much more important for science. Its essence is that the Universe at this stage is being ordered in a qualitative aspect, disordering simultaneously in a quantitative (thermal) one. Moreover, this fundamental property should, apparently, apply to all laws of thermodynamics (and in particular, the second). Although the same concerns to synergetics either - contrary to what I. Prigogine imagined (supposedly, individual fluctuations arise against the background of a general increase in entropy, but all this is only in some limited space).

So, most likely, disordering goes along the energetic vector, and self-regulation along the informational one. But this dependence, however, is not linear, since a developed intellect creates new algorithmic products much easier and faster - without high energy consumptions (when compared with that was at the dawn of Universe's formation). And hence, the dilemma about "what namely (elementary micro-regulating or machine-human macro-intelligence) the current algorithms are spawned by" is no longer almost meaningful, since any modern intelligence, in turn, is a product of the streamlining. That is, the vast majority of today laws of physics, chemistry and biology (and especially the firsts of them) are the result of the action of self-organizing processes, for they all, in one way or another, are associated with orderly movement!

EMIR E. ASHURSKY
/Kiev, Ukraine/