The Life-Centered Science: Building a New Knowledge Ecosystem

Agustín Ostachuk

EVOLUTIO Research Center, Buenos Aires, Argentina

aostachuk@evolutio.ar

Abstract. Contemporary science finds itself caught in a profound epistemic contradiction: while presenting itself as the primary engine of knowledge, it increasingly operates within a techno-economic apparatus that reduces inquiry to commodity production, managerial optimization, and competitive games of prestige. This structural entanglement with capitalist rationality produces a mode of knowledge that is self-referential, conservative, and fundamentally extractive—one that filters novelty through bureaucratic metrics, rewards strategic assimilation over conceptual risk, and neutralizes ideas that do not reinforce existing circuits of power. The resulting scientific landscape is not merely limited; it is systematically incapable of generating the transformative frameworks required to address the evolutionary, ecological, and civilizational challenges of our time. This manuscript argues that such limitations are not correctable from within. They arise from the core architecture of the scientific-academic system itself, whose epistemic, institutional, and economic foundations preclude the emergence of genuinely alternative thought. In response, we propose the construction of a new organizational and conceptual ecology for knowledge: EVOLUTIO. Conceived as a life-centered research ecosystem, EVOLUTIO advances an epistemic orientation in which inquiry unfolds as a creative, relational, and ontologically grounded process, rather than as a market-driven production of publishable artifacts. It is organized to protect conceptual originality, to nurture long-form inquiry, and to cultivate a mode of science that is aligned with the generativity of life rather than the logics of capital. By articulating the conditions that impede renewal in the current system and proposing the foundations of a life-centered science, the manuscript outlines a disruptive and necessary reconfiguration of how knowledge can be produced, sustained, and allowed to evolve.

1 The Current State of Science

1.1 Science under Capitalist Technological Power

Contemporary science appears deeply entangled with the technological, economic, and ideological structures of global capitalism (29). Rather than functioning as an autonomous search for understanding, it increasingly resembles a *marketed commodity*, shaped and constrained by the interests that finance and govern it. The scientific-academic system, being subordinated to these forces, no longer provides a hospitable environment for the development of creative, alternative, or heterodox thinking. Research lines that deviate from the discourse sanctioned by *official scientific power* are often *resisted* or quietly *excluded*. The result is a *monopolization of scientific discourse*, a narrowing of conceptual horizons, and the progressive impoverishment of the scientific agenda through its *commercial and mercantile commitments* (4, 21).

This dynamic resonates with classic analyses of *power/knowledge formations*, in which institutions control not only what can be known but who is authorized to speak (6). Within this structure, dissenting ideas are not merely debated—they are often rendered *invisible*. The uniformity of contemporary scientific discourse is therefore not accidental but structurally produced.

1.2 Industrial Organizational Models and the Factory Logic of Knowledge

The co-optation of science by capitalist organization has led it to inherit the institutional forms of the First and Second Industrial Revolutions. Contemporary research institutions replicate the *factory model*, a system grounded in *mechanization*, *segmentation of tasks*, and the relentless pursuit of *production efficiency*. This is the *Taylorist logic*: workers (and now researchers) are compelled to *alienate* themselves in order to *adapt* to the machine and its procedures.

As noted in earlier work, this structure emerged only through substantial *capital investment*, which rendered it *elitist* and *hierarchical* from the start (30). As Jeremy Rifkin describes:

"The modern rational business bureaucracy is characterized by a number of essential elements. The structure itself is pyramidal, with authority flowing from the top down. There are preestablished rules that govern all operations and detailed instructions for how jobs are defined and how work is to be carried out at every level of the organization. To optimize output, tasks are broken down by division of labor and the work is organized in a fixed series of stages" (31, p. 109).

Such a model may produce nuts and bolts with remarkable efficiency, but it is profoundly ill-suited for generating new ideas. Yet this is precisely the model that dominates the contemporary scientific-academic system: rigidly *hierarchical*, *centralized*, *bureaucratized*, and *segmented into hyperspecialized compartments*. A small *elite* at the top of the *pyramid* defines *what counts as science*, *which problems merit attention*, and *who will receive funding*. Under these conditions, genuinely novel ideas pose a structural threat to the *existing hierarchical order* and are therefore either *rejected* outright or *absorbed through processes of conceptual appropriation and repackaging that preserve the status quo while obscuring their original sources*.

This mirrors Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of *scientific fields as arenas of struggle over symbolic capital*, in which *dominant*

agents maintain control by preserving established norms and marginalizing heterodox innovations (2, 4).

1.3 Capital, Funding, and the Structuring of Scientific Agendas

The absorption of science into the capitalist system can be understood historically: *capital funded scientific research, and scientific agendas aligned accordingly*. Aldous Huxley articulated this dynamic clearly:

"In applying the results of disinterested scientific research, inventors and technicians have paid more attention to the problem of equipping large concerns with the expensive machinery of mass production and mass distribution than to that of providing individuals or cooperating groups with cheap and simple, but effective, means of production for their own subsistence and for the needs of a local market. The reason for this is that there has been more money in working for the mass producers and mass distributors; and the mass producers and mass distributors have had more money because financiers have seen that there was more profit for them, and more power, in a centralized than in a decentralized system of production" (12, p. 13).

The point is not merely that disinterested research was applied in ways that favored capital, but that *scientific research itself*—its orientation, priorities, and conceptual frameworks—*became shaped by capitalist imperatives*. Scientists and technologists were not passive victims of an external influence; *they were embedded within an ideological and institutional environment that conditioned what could be imagined or pursued*.

This is consistent with Bruno Latour's description of scientific production as deeply intertwined with networks of funding, institutional interests, and material infrastructures (16), as well as with Mirowski's analysis of the neoliberal restructuring of scientific research (21).

1.4 From Class-Based Science to Capital-Centered vs. Life-Centered Science

In this respect, Alexander Bogdanov's early insight remains strikingly relevant. Bogdanov argued that the *dominant ideological system* penetrates deeply into people's minds and shapes their subsequent behavior, leading him to posit the existence of a *bourgeois science* and a *proletarian science*, each aligned with its respective class interests (25, 26).

While his terminology was historically situated, the underlying diagnosis endures: *scientific activity is never ideologically neutral*. We propose reframing Bogdanov's dichotomy in more general and contemporary terms as *capital-centered science* and *life-centered science*.

A capital-centered science serves the priorities of *accumulation*, *technological expansion*, and *market value*. A life-centered science serves the *flourishing of living beings*, *ecosystems*, and *communities*. As argued elsewhere, one of the central challenges of the 21st century is to *place life at the center of our existence*, restoring economy to its proper place—at the service of life, not the other way around (27).

This not only redefines scientific priorities, but opens the possibility for an entirely different mode of inquiry—one grounded in a renewed sense of responsibility, relationality, and ecological belonging.

2 The Health of the Scientific-Academic System

The dynamics previously described lead naturally to a broader diagnosis: the scientific-academic system has ceased to be a space that nurtures thought. Instead, it operates as *a bureaucratic mechanism that continuously demands compliance, submission, and alignment with its internal norms*. It increasingly resembles what Kafka portrayed as "the castle" (15): *an opaque, inaccessible structure whose power is unquestionable yet elusive, and where individuals perpetually respond to requirements they did not choose*.

To clarify this argument, it is useful to distinguish three interconnected dimensions of this system: (1) its *psychology of obedience*, (2) its *cascading hierarchy and reproduction of domination*, and (3) its *self-legitimating ideology of meritocracy*.

2.1 A System that Rewards Obedience and Penalizes Originality

Because the contemporary scientific-academic system is built on *hierarchical-centralized structures* derived from industrial and bureaucratic organizational models, it tends to select for people capable of *adapting*, *pleasing*, and *obeying*. In institutional terms, this is the expected *habitus*: a set of dispositions that align individuals with the implicit rules of the field (3). In psychological terms, it incentivizes personalities predisposed to *submission* or *conformity*.

This "adaptive intelligence"—*efficiency in complying with expectations*—is celebrated as "competence". The result is a form of *herd behavior that homogenizes thought and narrows the space for genuine originality*. Yet the creation of new ideas requires precisely the opposite: the ability to *question the framework*, to *withstand periods of isolation*, and to *tolerate forms of exclusion* that often accompany original heterodox thinking. The system thus produces two kinds of actors: the *complacent-adaptable*, who thrive as "good members of the herd", and the *creators-pioneers*, who inevitably occupy the position of "black sheep".

2.2 Hierarchy and the Reproduction of Domination

In any hierarchical-centralized organization, most members occupy an ambiguous dual position: they are subordinated in relation to those above them, yet dominant in relation to those below. This structural fact produces what Alvin Gouldner identified as the *bureaucratic personality*, marked by *strict obedience upward* and *discretionary authority downward* (9).

Within academic life, this becomes a *chain of power transmission* that is often *sadomasochistic* in its dynamics: *mistreatment*, *psychological pressures*, and *abuses of authority* flow from one level to the next. Senior figures, legitimized by institutional hierarchy, often act as if they were entitled not only to the labor of their subordinates, but to their time, creativity, and even their future prospects. Such practices—completely

normalized in many institutions—range from subtle *psychological manipulation* to overt *abuses of power*.

When subordinates are sufficiently *compliant*, they are *rewarded*: *mentorship*, *recommendations*, *access to resources*, and *opportunities*. These rewards appear as evidence of "merit" but function in practice as *instruments of discipline and loyalty*. Here the system reveals its inner logic: *obedience is converted into patronage, and patronage is masked as merit*.

2.3 The Ideology of Meritocracy as a Mask for Political Power

The *reward structure of academia* makes it appear to be a *meritocracy*, but as Robert K. Merton already warned, the *ethos of science* is often contradicted by its institutional realities (20). In practice, funding, recognition, and advancement depend less on creativity or intellectual independence than on *political positioning within networks of influence*. *What circulates is not merit but capital—symbolic, social, institutional* (2).

In such a context, the competition that emerges is not a competition of ideas but a *competition of alignments*. The system is ostensibly organized around excellence, but *structurally organized around loyalty*. As a result, it is practically impossible for genuinely new ideas—those that challenge the dominant paradigm—to receive institutional sponsorship. Gatekeepers fund their own agenda or minor variations of it. No one in a position of power has incentives to support work that *destabilizes the status quo from which they benefit*.

This transforms the scientific-academic system into a kind of *organizational assembly line*, where career advancement depends on satisfying the expectations of one's superiors. People react differently to this arrangement: some *deny* the problem and *identify* with the system; many simply *endure* it; others *suffer* trauma to varying degrees; and a small minority *refuses to play by these rules*.

For those who refuse, the principles are simple and non-negotiable: *equal opportunities*, *recognition of talent*, and *space for original thought*. Without these, the emergence of new ideas is not merely difficult—it is structurally impossible.

3 Another Science for Another Society

The question arises almost inevitably: *Is the current model the only possible way to do science?* Must scientific practice be structurally tied to *capital-intensive infrastructures*, *hyper-specialization*, and *bureaucratic institutions*? Or is this *form of science*—its *scale*, its *organization*, its *priorities*—already shaped by an *ideological framework* rather than an intrinsic necessity?

These questions are not merely academic. They concern the future of knowledge production and the percentage of humanity that will benefit from the innovations of the current system. *If today's science is inseparable from capital, then its results will inevitably serve capital*. *To imagine a different future, it is necessary to imagine a different science*.

To articulate this shift, we can distinguish three levels: (1) *the ideological dependence of modern science on capital*, (2) *the historical origins of hierarchical-centralized knowledge production*, and (3) *the emerging horizon of decentralized and democratized scientific practice*.

3.1 The Ideological Bond Between Science and Capital

Modern science, as it is usually practiced, grew within the economic and political frameworks of industrial modernity. Its institutional architecture—large labs, centralized universities, competitive grant systems—reflects what Lewis Mumford called the "megamachine": *a sociotechnical apparatus that fuses science, bureaucracy, and capital into a single system* (22).

As long as scientific research depends structurally on *capital-intensive infrastructures* and *centralized funding mechanisms*, its orientation is largely predetermined. It becomes exceedingly difficult to develop ideas that do not serve existing economic imperatives. This is why Ivan Illich argued that *institutions built around industrial logics inevitably become self-referential and self-perpetuating* (13).

Thus, the question is no longer merely whether science is influenced by capital, but whether *it can even conceive of alternative goals while remaining tied to capital-intensive structures*. If this bond is not broken—or at least significantly loosened—*science will remain locked into producing more capital*, regardless of its stated ideals.

3.2 How Hierarchical-Centralized Science Came to Be

The deeper problem, as I noted in earlier work, lies in the historical separation between *organizational-administrative functions* and *productive functions* (30). This split—caused by the development of *intensive production methods*, *agriculture*, and the *technology* necessary to carry them out—generated the structural conditions for *hierarchical-centralized organizations*.

Once the producer no longer decides *what* is produced or *how*, the possibility of autonomy is lost. This applies as much to science as to agriculture or industry. With the rise of large-scale laboratories in the 20th century, described by Noble as *the managerial revolution in science* (23), scientific labor increasingly resembled industrial labor: individuals became specialists within a chain of command rather than autonomous creators.

This structure is not natural. It is historical. It emerged under specific technological and economic conditions. And because it is historical, it is changeable.

3.3 The Horizon of Decentralized-Distributed Science

The emergence of *decentralized-distributed organizational models* offers a real alternative. As I argue elsewhere, reintegrating organizational-administrative and productive functions is the key to scientific autonomy (30). This reintegration becomes feasible when technologies enable *local production*, *local decision-making*, and *local control of resources*.

Jeremy Rifkin's prediction that the 21st century will be shaped by a Third Industrial Revolution is relevant here. In his words:

"In the coming half century, the conventional, centralized business operations of the First and Second Industrial Revolutions will increasingly be subsumed by the distributed business practices of the Third Industrial Revolution; and the traditional, hierarchical organization of economic and political power will give way to lateral power organized nodally across society" (31, p. 5).

This revolution is characterized by the convergence of Internet communication and renewable energy infrastructures. For the first time, individuals can generate their own information and their own energy—two pillars previously controlled by centralized structures. This shift is profoundly democratizing.

If each person can become the producer of what they need—energy, information, tools, knowledge—*then hierarchical organizations lose their structural monopoly*. Science, too, can be reclaimed from centralized institutions and practiced in decentralized-distributed networks where autonomy is possible.

3.4 The Case for Intermediate Technology

However, a deeper transformation may require not more intensive technologies but *less intensive* ones—precisely what Ernst Schumacher called *intermediate technology* (33). In this sense, decentralization is not only a technological possibility but also an ethical and epistemological choice.

Schumacher's insight aligns with the work of Illich and later scholars who argued that *tools shape forms of life* (13). *Technologies that require large-scale infrastructures inevitably produce dependency, inequality, and centralization. Technologies that can be built, repaired, and used locally create autonomy and community*.

Thus, the project is clear: *to decentralize is to democratize. To decentralize science is to democratize knowledge*. This opens the path toward *another science*—one not constrained by the *industrial logic of capital*, not *subordinated to hierarchical structures*, and not *dependent on institutions designed to maintain their own power*. It opens the possibility of *a science rooted in autonomy, creativity, and care for life*.

4 A New Organizational Model for Original Scientific Research: Building a Self-Sustaining Research Center

4.1 Reclaiming the Conditions for Independent Thought

To develop new ideas, theories, and worldviews, it is essential to build a research environment unbound from the limitations imposed by the scientific–techno–capitalist conglomerate. As analyzed earlier, contemporary scientific production is structurally dependent on *capital-intensive infrastructures*, *bureaucratic funding mechanisms*, and *institutional logics* oriented toward *competition*, *prestige*, and *accumulation* (2, 21). This entanglement significantly constrains the emergence of alternative paradigms.

Freeing research from these constraints requires, first and foremost, freeing research from *capital's normative and organizational dominance*. Only by reducing this dependence can science recover its autonomy and its capacity to explore questions and frameworks that do not reproduce existing power structures. In this sense, the central challenge is to design an organizational model capable of sustaining scientific work while remaining independent of the incentives, metrics, and hierarchies of the *state-capital apparatus*.

4.2 The Vision: EVOLUTIO as a Self-Sustaining Research Space

In response to this challenge, we propose the creation of a new research space: *EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development*. Its purpose is to function as an institutional ecology in which original scientific research can unfold free from the bureaucratic, economic, and prestige-driven constraints that currently govern knowledge production.

To achieve this, EVOLUTIO must operate as a *self-sustaining organization*, supported by two primary sources:

1. Voluntary contributions, memberships, and partnerships from individuals and organizations aligned with the center's mission.
2. The development and ethical commercialization of products and services derived from our research, guided by the principles of the *Social and Solidarity Economy* (SSE).

This dual model provides several advantages. First, it allows EVOLUTIO to bypass state and corporate funding agencies whose decisions, as extensively documented, tend to *reinforce established structures of knowledge* and *reward institutional conformity* over *conceptual innovation* (7, 17). Second, it enables direct engagement with the broader society—the ultimate recipient and beneficiary of research. This proximity fosters a more grounded understanding of real needs and allows our work to remain *oriented toward life* rather than toward *bureaucratic or commercial imperatives*.

This vision outlines the conditions required for a *life-centered research ecology* to emerge.

4.3 Social and Solidarity Economy as a Transitional Pathway

Our adherence to the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) arises from the broad alignment between its values and our objectives. SSE offers a *transitional organizational framework* capable of supporting *research autonomy* while embodying principles of *solidarity*, *cooperation*, and *ecological responsibility* (5, 18).

SSE exists as an alternative to both public and private economic logics, forming what is commonly referred to as the "third sector". It includes diverse organizations—cooperatives, mutuals, community associations, ethical enterprises—that are:

- *non-profit*,
- *democratically governed*, and
- *oriented toward the reproduction and flourishing of life* rather than profit maximization.

As Coraggio notes, social economy organizations aim to "*contribute to ensuring the reproduction with increasing quality of life of their members and their communities of belonging or, by extension, of all humanity*" (5, p. 47).

This orientation provides a conceptual bridge between research and societal well-being: *an economy whose purpose is to sustain life* aligns with *a science whose purpose is to understand and serve life*.

4.4 The Principle of Fair Price and the Ethics of Research Sustainability

A central concept within SSE is the *fair price*. This is not a price designed to extract surplus value but one calibrated to ensure:

- the self-sustaining operation of the organization, and
- the expansion or diversification of its activities only when this directly improves the services and benefits offered to society.

This model contrasts sharply with the *profit-driven logic of capitalist accumulation*. It provides a sustainable economic foundation for independent scientific inquiry while preserving the ethical integrity of research. Moreover, it resonates with the broader traditions of *knowledge commons* and *open scientific cultures* (11), in which knowledge is approached not as a commodity but as *a shared resource for collective flourishing*.

5 Research Organization: Ideas-and-Values-Driven Scientific Inquiry

5.1 Research as Service: Placing Life at the Center

The central objective of *EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development* is twofold. First, we seek to explore new concepts and worldviews concerning biological evolution and development. Second, we aim to investigate the social, political, and ecological conditions required for the evolution of a healthy, life-affirming society—one that is harmoniously integrated with nature and governed by the principle that life, rather than the economy, constitutes its true foundation.

All our work is oriented toward promoting just modes of coexistence and forms of living that are compatible with life in all its dimensions. Our research is conceived as a mission and a service to the community, not as a strategy for accumulating academic prestige, symbolic capital, or institutional status. In this sense, EVOLUTIO positions itself beyond the dominant incentive structures of the scientific-academic system, which often reward prestige-seeking behaviors and competitive hierarchy more than genuine contributions to knowledge or social well-being (3).

5.2 Another Science for Another Society

We begin from the conviction that there is no single, universal way of doing science. Scientific practice is always shaped by underlying values, implicit ontologies, and cultural assumptions—even when these are disavowed under narratives of neutrality or objectivity (10, 14, 25, 26, 28).

For this reason, our guiding motto is: *Another science for another society*. We distinguish between:

- *life-centered science*, oriented toward the flourishing of human and non-human life, and
- *capital-centered science*, oriented toward competition, accumulation, and institutional power.

The difference is not solely *organizational* but *ontological*: each mode of science presupposes a different understanding of *what life is*, *what knowledge is for*, and *what relationship science should have with society and nature*.

5.3 A Research Model Driven by Ideas and Values

Because epistemic practices are always value-laden, we explicitly acknowledge that *our research is guided by ideas and values*. Among these are: *equality*, *cooperation*, *solidarity*, *inclusion*, *sharing*, *sensitivity*, *curiosity*, and *creativity*. These values are not incidental; they are constitutive of a *life-affirming epistemic culture*.

However, such values cannot take root or flourish within competitive, elitist, and exclusionary structures—*life organizational forms* that characterize the contemporary scientific-academic-capitalist system. Numerous studies show how competition-driven environments erode epistemic diversity, inhibit cooperation, and reproduce hierarchies that marginalize alternative voices and epistemologies (19, 32).

In this context, EVOLUTIO seeks to cultivate a new *epistemic ecology*, one in which values are not hidden or suppressed but consciously integrated into the research process. This constitutes our model of *ideas-and-values-driven scientific research*.

5.4 Relational Ethics: Building a Peer-to-Peer Research Community

Implementing this model requires not only different *research priorities*, but also a different *relational infrastructure*. Our center will intentionally foster *reciprocal*, *mutual*, *cooperative*, and *horizontal relationships*. In contemporary terms, this can be described as a *peer-to-peer (P2P) mode of organization—distributed*, *participatory*, and *non-hierarchical* (1).

We regard all members and collaborators as equals. We do not consider ourselves superior or inferior to anyone, and we expect others to engage on the same footing. We will not seek to *subsume*, *appropriate*, or *instrumentalize* the work of others, nor will we allow others to do so to us. This *non-appropriative ethos*, which resonates with the already mentioned movements toward *knowledge commons* and *shared intellectual stewardship* (11), affirms an understanding of research as *a collective, life-oriented endeavor* rather than *a competitive struggle for symbolic capital or ownership*.

6 Our History So Far

6.1 Origins: An Act of Intellectual Independence

EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development was founded on July 9, 2022, coinciding intentionally

with Argentina's Independence Day. The date symbolizes our commitment to *epistemic independence*: *the freedom to think, inquire, and create scientific ideas without subordination to institutional norms or the prevailing structures of academic authority*.

The center emerged from a concrete necessity. Within the scientific-academic system, developing original ideas had always been difficult; in recent years, it had become virtually impossible. The increasing *bureaucratization* and *gatekeeping* characteristic of contemporary academia—well-documented in sociological analyses of scientific fields (2, 35)—left little room for genuinely independent conceptual innovation.

EVOLUTIO was created precisely to counter this: *to build a space where ideas could unfold without being constantly forced to adapt to external demands, strategic incentives, or institutional expectations*.

6.2 Building a Self-Sustaining Ecology of Research

EVOLUTIO represents the concrete realization of the vision outlined above. From the outset, the center adopted a *self-sustaining model*, rooted in the principles of autonomy and mutual support. This model has been successful thanks to two main pillars:

1. The contributions of individuals and organizations aligned with our mission (Evolutio Support).
2. The creation and sale of products derived from our research, offered through the Evolutio Store, following the principles of the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE).

In practice, this dual structure has enabled EVOLUTIO to bypass the dependency logic of traditional funding agencies—often guided by *political negotiations*, *institutional interests*, or the *reproduction of dominant paradigms*—and instead creates *a shared, community-supported space for the production of new knowledge*. Some scholars call this a *knowledge commons* (11).

Our website has become the central hub of this ecosystem. There, anyone can explore our ongoing research initiatives (Evolutio Projects), and freely access all academic publications produced by the center (Evolutio Publications), reaffirming our commitment to open intellectual access and the democratization of knowledge.

6.3 Institutional Milestones: Growing an Independent Infrastructure

The development of EVOLUTIO has been marked by the creation of several key institutional branches, each reflecting a dimension of our broader mission:

• 2023 — Evolutio Academia

Conceived as a new *transformational educational space*, *Evolutio Academia* cultivates shared inquiry into evolution, development, science, and philosophy. It is grounded in a conception of *education as a formative, collaborative, and creative process—critical, inquiry-driven, intellectually free, life-centered, and rooted in Earth and nature*.

• 2023 — Evolutio Journal

A *transdisciplinary research journal* and *integrative knowledge ecosystem* devoted to the development of original theoretical, philosophical, and empirical work on life, evolution, development, and the conditions of knowledge itself. The journal provides a space for rigorous inquiry that does not reduce scientific value to formal metrics, disciplinary boundaries, or performative compliance. Instead, it cultivates contributions guided by conceptual depth, internal coherence, and relevance to life-centered questions. By operating beyond the incentive structures that dominate contemporary academic publishing, the *Evolutio Journal* enables forms of thought and research that require time, intellectual risk, and epistemic independence to unfold.

• 2024 — Evolutio Press

An independent publishing imprint dedicated to the cultivation of long-form intellectual work that requires conceptual depth, temporal continuity, and editorial care to fully unfold. *Evolutio Press* supports books that develop original theoretical frameworks, philosophical syntheses, and transdisciplinary inquiries oriented toward life-centered questions. Rather than organizing publication around market trends or short-term visibility, the imprint prioritizes coherence, intellectual integrity, and lasting relevance. In doing so, it contributes to the emergence of editorial ecosystems capable of sustaining forms of thought increasingly marginalized within accelerated and commercialized publishing environments (34).

• 2025 — Evolutio Concepts: The Evolutio Semantic Web

This initiative establishes a *structured conceptual architecture* designed to clarify the genealogy, definitions, and interrelations of EVOLUTIO's core ideas. It functions simultaneously as a *conceptual map* and as a *timestamped record* of intellectual development.

Its purpose is threefold:

– *to maintain a precise lineage of concepts*;
– *to avoid distortions, assimilations, and erasures in a landscape where conceptual misappropriation has become common*;
– *to safeguard the originality and coherence of Evolutio's theoretical framework*.

By grounding conceptual legitimacy in internal rigor, explicit genealogy, and transparent semantic relations—rather than institutional validation—*Evolutio Concepts affirms epistemic sovereignty and protects the integrity of long-term intellectual work*.

• 2025 — The Unfolding: The EVOLUTIO Magazine

The Unfolding is a publication dedicated to accessible, agile, and philosophically grounded essays aimed at a broad audience. Unlike the *Evolutio Journal*, which is oriented toward sustained theoretical development and transdisciplinary research, the magazine serves as a rapid channel for reflection, outreach, and public conversation.

Its purpose is to bridge the gap between rigorous conceptual work and cultural transformation by offering readable, inspiring, and intellectually substantial pieces. It forms part of EVOLUTIO's commitment to cultivating a public-facing discourse that remains coherent, meaningful, and grounded beyond the noise of digital networks.

Together, these initiatives form an *integrated epistemic architecture—a self-governed constellation of research, education, and publication*, fully aligned with the center's values and commitments.

6.4 Our Community: The Foundation of Everything

At present, our primary focus is on strengthening and consolidating our community, which is the living foundation of the entire project. We nurture this community through monthly newsletters and ongoing dialogue across social networks, seeking to cultivate a relationship grounded in transparency, accessibility, and trust.

Our contributors are not passive donors; they are the *true sponsors* and *co-sustainers* of EVOLUTIO. Their support allows us to remain independent, and their engagement helps shape the direction of our work. Consistent with models of *participatory knowledge production* (8, 24), we aim to develop new strategies for deeper interaction with our community—giving them closer access to our research, answering their questions, and allowing them to accompany the evolution of our ideas in real time.

In this sense, EVOLUTIO is not simply a research center. It is a *collective project*, rooted in shared values and sustained by a community that believes in the possibility of a different way of doing science.

7 Conclusion: What Comes Next?

The path traced throughout this manuscript reflects a movement both personal and collective: *a transition from dependency on inherited structures of thought toward a self-determined, life-centered practice of knowledge*. What began as a lucid recognition of the structural limits, distortions, and epistemic vulnerabilities embedded in contemporary knowledge institutions has matured into a coherent ecology of research, education, and publication grounded in sovereignty, integrity, and unfolding. EVOLUTIO emerged not as a refuge from the academic system, but as an *epistemic sanctuary*—an ecosystem designed to protect the conditions of genuine thinking, where ideas can grow according to their own logic, and where intellectual work is not constrained by the imperatives of visibility, networks, or institutional gatekeeping.

At the heart of this trajectory is a simple but demanding principle: *life must be the center of thought*. Not economy, not prestige, not institutional allegiance—life in its dynamic, evolving, unfolding character. This manuscript has attempted to show how *a life-centered orientation reshapes both the content of knowledge and the conditions under which knowledge can be generated*. It calls for a practice of inquiry that is rooted, attentive, and open to emergence. Sovereignty is not a gesture of isolation, but the capacity to remain faithful to this principle even when dominant systems reward its abandonment.

The institutional developments described here—*Evolutio Academia*, *Evolutio Journal*, *Evolutio Press*, *Evolutio Concepts*, and *The Unfolding*—represent concrete expressions of this principle. They are not separate ventures, but *interconnected components of a broader ecosystem that allows ideas to unfold* in their own time, with their proper density, tone, and orientation. Each branch contributes to a shared architecture: the Academia cultivates spaces for transformational learning free from academic standardization; the Journal supports demanding theoretical and empirical work; the Press curates and publishes books whose depth, scope, and rhythm require an editorial environment guided by intellectual integrity rather than market optimization; the Concepts project creates a semantic web that preserves lineage, coherence, and clarity; and *The Unfolding* opens a bridge to a wider public yearning for depth without dogma. Together, they embody a new mode of intellectual life—one that grows from within rather than reacting against the outside.

Yet EVOLUTIO is not a solitary endeavor. Even in its commitment to independence, it affirms the essential role of community: not as a crowd, but as a constellation of people willing to think, create, and question with integrity. *A community grounded in mutual recognition rather than competition; in shared purpose rather than opportunism; in the slow, patient unfolding of ideas rather than the accelerated rhythms of digital discourse*. The future of this project depends on those who feel called to inhabit this *mode of life and knowledge*, who resonate with its *ethos of rootedness* and its refusal to *trade originality for acceptance*.

What comes next is not a mechanically executable blueprint. The future of EVOLUTIO—like the evolution and development it studies—is formally prefigured, yet cannot be imposed or accelerated by force. Its unfolding depends on sustained agency, discernment, and fidelity to the conditions that allow form to actualize in time. The task ahead is therefore not to dictate outcomes, but to continue cultivating the conditions in which new ideas can emerge without distortion: spaces of quiet rigor, fertile collaboration, and conceptual clarity. The work remains grounded in the same commitment that gave rise to EVOLUTIO in the first place: to think in fidelity to life, to act in coherence with what seeks to come into being, and to build structures capable of supporting that unfolding over decades rather than news cycles.

This manuscript closes, but the unfolding does not. The door remains open to all who sense that *another way of knowing is possible*—one rooted in freedom, coherence, and a renewed relationship with the living world. The invitation is not to follow, but to *join in the work of cultivating an autonomous ecology of thought*. The future will grow from there.

References

[1] Bauwens, M. (2005). The political economy of peer production. *CTheory*. https://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/ctheory/article/view/14464/5306.

[2] Bourdieu, P. (1975). The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason. *Social Science Information*. 14(6): 19-47.

[3] Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[4] Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Cambridge: Polity.

[5] Coraggio, J. L. (2011). *Economía social y solidaria*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

[6] Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

[7] Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

[8] Funtowicz, S. O., Ravetz, J. R. (1993). Science for the post-normal age. *Futures*. 25(7): 739-755.

[9] Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. New York: The Free Press.

[10] Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14(3): 575-599.

[11] Hess, C., Ostrom, E. (Eds.) (2006). *Understanding knowledge as a commons: from theory to practice*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

[12] Huxley, A. (1950). *Science, liberty and peace*. London: Chatto & Windus.

[13] Illich, I. (2006). *Tools for conviviality*. New York: Harper & Row.

[14] Jasanoff, S. (Ed.) (2004). *States of knowledge: the co-production of science and social order*. London: Routledge.

[15] Kafka, F. (2009 [1926]). *The castle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[16] Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[17] Latour, B., Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

[18] Laville, J. L. (2014). The social and solidarity economy: a theoretical and plural framework. In: Defourny, J., Hulgård, L., Pestoff, V. (Eds.). *Social enterprise and the third sector: changing European landscapes in a comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

[19] Longino, H. E. (2002). *The fate of knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[20] Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science: theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[21] Mirowski, P. (2011). *Science-mart: privatizing American science*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[22] Mumford, L. (1967). *The myth of the machine: technics and human development*. New York: Harcourt.

[23] Noble, D. F. (1979). *America by design: science, technology, and the rise of corporate capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[24] Nowotny, H., Scott, P., Gibbons, M. (2001). *Rethinking science: knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.

[25] Ostachuk, A. (2015). Bogdanov e a teoria das duas ciências. *Sociologia em Rede*. 5(5): 114-118.

[26] Ostachuk, A. (2015). La teoría de las dos ciencias: ciencia burguesa y ciencia proletaria. *Revista Iberoamericana de Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad*. 10(Suppl 1): 191-194.

[27] Ostachuk, A. (2018). La vida: el centro de nuestra existencia. *Ludus Vitalis*. 26(50): 257-260.

[28] Ostachuk, A. (2019). The ideological matrix of science: natural selection and immunity as case studies. *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*. 15(1): 182-213.

[29] Ostachuk, A. (2024). *Eutopian life: a thinking life-science for a rooted dwelling on our Home-Earth*. Buenos Aires: Evolutio Press.

[30] Ostachuk, A. (2024). *Power to the people: a network analysis of dystopian and eutopian life organizational forms*. Buenos Aires: Evolutio Press.

[31] Rifkin, J. (2011). *The third industrial revolution: how lateral power is transforming energy, the economy, and the world*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[32] Santos, B. S. (2015). *Epistemologies of the south: justice against epistemicide*. London: Routledge.

[33] Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small is beautiful: economics as if people mattered*. New York: Harper & Row.

[34] Thompson, J. B. (2010). *Merchants of culture: the publishing business in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Polity.

[35] Whitley, R. (2000). *The intellectual and social organization of the sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evolutio Registry

This article is registered in the Evolutio Knowledge Registry.
DOI: https://www.evolutio.ar/id/EJ82584529

How to cite

Ostachuk, A. (2025). The Life-Centered Science: Building a New Knowledge Ecosystem. *Evolutio Journal*. 2025: EJ82584529.

About the Author(s)

Dr. Agustín Ostachuk is a transdisciplinary researcher investigating the fundamental nature of life, evolution, and development. His work bridges theoretical biology, philosophy of biology, evolutionary biology, and complexity science. He is the author of the *Evolutio Unfolding Theory* (2020), a teleological account proposing that evolution unfolds through formal agents embedded in morphogenetic fields. He is the Founding Director of EVOLUTIO, an independent research center devoted to advancing new frameworks for evolution and development, and to cultivating a life-centered, Earth-rooted mode of existence.