

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIOETHICS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CHRISTIAN SPIRITUAL TRADITION

<sup>a</sup>IRYNA VASYLIEVA, <sup>b</sup>NATALIIA MOZGOVA, <sup>c</sup>DMYTRO BILOZOR, <sup>d</sup>TETIANA HLUSHKO

<sup>a,c</sup>*Bogomolets National Medicine University, 34, Peremogyi Prosp., 03057, Kyiv, Ukraine*

<sup>b,d</sup>*National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, 9, Pirogovy Str., 01030, Kyiv, Ukraine*  
*email: <sup>a</sup>ivafilos1403@gmail.com, <sup>b</sup>mozgova@gmail.com, <sup>c</sup>belozordima@gmail.com, <sup>d</sup>tetyana.glushko@gmail.com*

**Abstract:** The article aims to explicate the Christian spiritual tradition in the context of philosophical-religious and bioethical discourse. The methodological basis of the work is an interdisciplinary approach, philosophical and generally scientific methods: systemic, dialectical, historical, hermeneutics, comparative analysis, etc., the principles of objectivity, confessional unbiasedness, world outlook, and methodological pluralism inherent in modern religious studies. As a result of the research, three levels of integration ties were identified and analyzed: interdisciplinary synthesis within individual groups of sciences; between disciplines belonging to different groups of sciences (natural, humanitarian, social, technical); the tendency towards the convergence of science and various forms of extra-scientific knowledge, religion, inherent in the education of bioethics as an integrated direction of modern knowledge. It is grounded that the basis of this process should be a model of complementarity and dialogue between science and religion, secular bioethics, and religious approaches, in particular Christian moral theology. In the context of fundamental norms and principles inherent in the Christian spiritual tradition, the author analyses the problems associated with interrupting human life in the initial and final stages: abortion, selective termination of pregnancy, the use of assisted reproductive technologies, euthanasia.

**Keywords:** Bioethics, Christian spiritual tradition, Dialogue, Religion, Science.

### 1 Introduction

In connection with the actualization in modern society of the issues of metaphysical, axiological, and moral-ethical comprehension of life, health, and death of a person, it is of particular importance to appeal to the Christian spiritual tradition based on humanistic values, universal moral norms, and principles.

Based on the study of the characteristic features of the Christian spiritual tradition, its crucial importance in the formation and development of bioethical approaches, taking into account the dynamics of religious life in the modern post-secular world, it can be concluded that the deepening of dialogue and cooperation between science and religion, philosophy and theology is one of the main directions in the development of bioethics in the XXI century.

In the context of the coronavirus pandemic, issues of life and death, health and well-being, moral regulators of human behavior, the functioning of health systems, political and state institutions have acquired existential urgency. According to Judit Sandor, in this situation, "...we all gradually became participants in the textbook of ethical dilemmas" [23]. In conditions of limited economic and medical resources, many states, like many people, are essentially forced to choose between moral, ethical, and economic imperatives, the safety of life, health, and material well-being; between the attitudes of utilitarian ethics on selective medical care and social justice, the humanistic principles of bioethics; between individualism, national egoism and mutual assistance, "unconditional solidarity" (A. Surozhsky), "the beauty of brotherhood" (Pope Francis).

In such crisis, borderline situations, as history shows, it is traditional social institutions (family, religion) that are spiritual support for many people. In this regard, it is relevant to appeal to the Christian spiritual tradition, which was of great importance in the development of bioethics in the United States, Europe, including the countries of Eastern Europe, which experienced socialist atheistic experiments in the 20th century. Despite the 70-year history of forced quasi-atheization, on the whole, there is a positive trend in the religious level of society in Ukraine. According to the results of a study by the sociological service of Razumkov Centre (2019), the number of those who define themselves as believers is 66%, among which 64.9% consider

themselves to be Orthodox; 1.6% – to Roman Catholicism; 9.5% – to Greek Catholicism; 1.8% – to Protestantism; 8% identify themselves as "just a Christian" [21].

Taking into account the specifics of the situation, we focus not so much on the differences between various Christian confessions and denominations, but on clarifying the general, which is characteristic of the Christian world, its ethos. The purpose of this article is to explicate the Christian spiritual tradition in the context of philosophical-religious and bioethical discourse.

### 2 Materials and Methods

The theoretical and methodological basis of the article is biblical texts, documents of Christian churches, works of Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant theologians, founders of bioethics, modern researchers in the field of bioethics and biomedical ethics. The versatility and complex nature of the problem under study necessitated the use of interdisciplinary approaches, philosophical and generally scientific methods: systemic, dialectical, historical, hermeneutics, comparative analysis, the principles of modern religious studies – objectivity, confessional non-involvement, worldview, and methodological pluralism.

### 3 Results

The occurrence of bioethics in the 70s of the XX century most researchers associate with the name of the American humanist, biochemist, oncologist Van Rensselaer Potter, in particular, with the publication of his works "Bioethics: the science of survival" (1970), "Bioethics: a bridge to the future" (1971). He linked the way out of the growing ecological catastrophe and other crisis phenomena that humanity faced in connection with the rapid, but uncontrolled development of the latest technologies with "building a bridge" connecting the natural science and humanitarian cultures. According to V.R. Potter, humanity urgently needs new wisdom, which would be "knowledge of how to use knowledge" for human survival and improve his life. The science of survival should be not just a science, but new wisdom that would unite the two most important and vital elements are biological knowledge and human values. Based on this, I propose a new term for its designation – "Bioethics" [19].

It is important to note that Potter's bioethics project included in the scope of its research not only humans but also the world of all living things. In the book "Global Bioethics Building on the Leopold Legacy" (1988) V.R. Potter identifies two interrelated areas of bioethics-medical and environmental, substantiating the need to integrate medical and environmental bioethics within the framework of global bioethics, which "...focuses on protecting human health, protection of the land and the whole world" [18].

Despite the controversial nature of issues about the subject of bioethics, its status in the system of modern knowledge, Potter's idea of the interdisciplinarity of the "new ethics" is, in fact, axiomatic in bioethical discourse. However, the substantiation of this specificity of bioethics requires a certain concretization based on paradigmatic approaches in the philosophy of science, taking into account various levels of integration ties. As it is known, in the history of the development of science a complex, contradictory combination of processes of differentiation and integration is manifested. In the process of scientific, technical, and cultural progress of mankind, the need for the synthesis of knowledge increases, which is manifested in the strengthening of the tendency towards integration, the creation of interdisciplinary ties, especially characteristic of non-classical and post-non-classical science.

The non-classical model of science, which is based on evolutionary approaches, polysystems, and the population style of thinking, has actualized the importance of interdisciplinary

synthesis within individual groups (subsystems) of sciences. This level can be conventionally designated as the first level of interdisciplinary synthesis. For example, manifestations of this level of integration ties in the natural sciences were the emergence of bioorganic chemistry, biochemistry, biophysics, astrobiology, etc., the strengthening in medicine of the orientation towards taking into account the relationships and interdependencies between the organs and systems of the human body, the formation of an approach to the person (patient) taking into account the integrity his entire body.

With the formation of post-non-classical science, which is built on the foundations of holism, pluralism, the anthropic principle, the methodology of synergetics, an interdisciplinary synthesis of the second level intensively develops: between disciplines that belong to different groups of sciences [1]. The manifestation of this trend is not only the convergence of natural and humanitarian sciences but also the humanization of applied, technical knowledge. Disciplines related to the study of various aspects of human health, medicine as a social institution: sociology of medicine, sociology of health, sociology of disease, the psychology of disease, etc. can also be classified as natural-socio humanitarian areas based on the interdisciplinarity of this level.

The development of a tendency of a higher level of integrative ties – the mutual convergence of science and various forms of extra-scientific knowledge – is also associated with post-non-classical science, especially of the late XX - early XXI century. The formation of the phenomenon of "post-scientific", "superdisciplinary synergetics", "implicit thinking" (J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, M. Polani), developing against the background of postmodernization, post-secularization goes beyond science and is a general cultural trend of modern society. Bioethics goes beyond the boundaries of interdisciplinarity to the level of interdisciplinarity, since we talk about the integration of scientific (rational) and value-normative approaches that are contained not only in philosophy, ethics but also in other forms of spiritual culture, primarily religion.

The idea of turning science to humanistic values and moral norms of religion can also be traced in Potter's project of creating a "new ethics". The very formulation of the issue of bioethics as "new wisdom" contains an appeal to the syncretic, ethos foundations of modern knowledge, which unite not only rational, cognitive but also psychological, moral, ethical, spiritual, and practical components. V.R. Potter repeatedly returns to the problems of religion, in particular Christianity, proceeding from the fact that "humanity needs a combination of biology and humanistic knowledge (diverse in its origin), from which it is necessary to forge the science of survival and, with its help, establish a system of priorities (italics I.V., N.M., T.G., D.B.) [19]. He praised Teilhard de Chardin's teachings as "an attempt to build a bridge between religion and science" [19].

However, the tendency towards rapprochement between science and religion does not mean leveling its qualitative features as different forms of human comprehension of reality. This process can be most adequately explicated based on complementarity and dialogue models. The complementarity model implies that science and religion refer to the same reality from different perspectives, providing not competing, but complementary explanations [2].

Establishing the dialogue between science and religion in the modern post-secular world presupposes not only the recognition of the autonomy of science and religion, the full rights of secular and religious institutions, but also the overcoming of mythologemes about the incompatibility of science and religion; omnipotence, progressive science, and conservatism of religion. It is not difficult to notice that these issues are of particular importance for post-socialist, especially post-Soviet countries, including Ukraine. St. Luke (V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky), Archbishop of Simferopol and Crimea during the years of militant atheism in the USSR, showed the groundlessness of the atheistic mythologem about the incompatibility of science and religion.

According to the archpastor, the needs for science and religion are the needs of the human spirit, which are rooted in the depths of human nature. If science is a system of attained knowledge about the phenomena of reality we observe, that is, the manifestations of life, nature, but not about its essences (phenomena, not noumena), then religion as a relation to the Absolute, God, communication with God (reunification) is a transcendental form of human comprehension of reality. For this reason alone, science cannot reject the existence of God, for this topic lies outside its competence, like the entire area of essences [31].

Approaches to the issues of the boundaries of scientific knowledge, "dangerous knowledge" [18, 19] overcoming the antagonism between the "world of faith and the world of science", the dialogue between science and religion today unite theologians not only of various Christian confessions but also of other humanistic religions. Indicative in this respect is the dialogue of Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio (since 2013, Pope Francis) with Rabbi Abraham Skorka [3]. Sharing the opinion of A. Skorka about the autonomy of science, the establishment of a dialogue between religion and science, "which excludes the claims of one side to take the place of the other", Jorge Bergoglio notes that the autonomy of science should be respected and encouraged "...except when scientists go beyond their competence and interfere in the realm of the transcendent." "However, be careful: when the autonomy of science does not set limits itself and goes too far, it can lose control over its creation... Having fallen into the trap of his pride, a person creates monsters that can escape from his power" [3].

Concern about the uncontrolled development of scientific and technological progress, biomedical, information, and other technologies that open up the possibility of intrusion into the fundamental foundations of life, human nature, and his integrity as a person is also expressed by other Christian denominations. In 2000, at the Jubilee Council of Bishops, the social concept of the Russian Orthodox Church was adopted, which was the "authoritative conciliar response of the Church to the challenges of the new time", including the problems of bioethics, ecology (sec. XII, XIII) [22]. The appeal of the Orthodox Church to the problems of modern civilization, including the development of science and technology, is evidenced by the content of the document "For the life of the world. Towards the Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church", open for discussion (2019). "Perhaps the primary task of the Church, which seeks to comprehend the rapid development of technology in modern times and to gain a foothold as a place of spiritual stability in the face of a continuous stream of scientific and social changes, should be to overcome any obvious antagonism between the world of faith and the world of science" [8]. Therefore, the Orthodox Church opposes both any manifestation of religious fundamentalism and ideological "scientism", metaphysical "materialism".

The Christian spiritual tradition had a special influence on the formation and development of bioethics. In the context of this influence, as well as personalistic bioethics, common European values, we also consider the substantiation of the principles of bioethics in the international research project BIOMED II "Basic ethical principles in European bioethics and bio-law": individual autonomy, human dignity, integrity, and human vulnerability.

The rationale in bioethics of the principle of human dignity has largely supplanted the monopoly of the principle of autonomy since this principle has a more fundamental and universal significance. As it is known, the principle of autonomy provides for respect for the choice of a competent patient, that is, one who is capable of making reasonable decisions on his own and consciously guiding his actions. At the same time, the principle of human dignity reflects the objective self-worth of a person from his conception to the end of his life and justifies the need for a decent attitude towards him even in situations when a person, for some reason, is deprived of the opportunity to act autonomously. The general human content of this principle is quite clearly traced in secular bioethics. According to the definition of the Belarusian scientist T.V. Mishatkina, "dignity –

in a broad ethical context – is an intrinsic value that every person possesses by his birthright since he is a human" [4].

Christian spiritual tradition substantiates the uniqueness of the godlike dignity of man as a single creation in the world, created by God in his image and his likeness (Gen. 1:26). If a person received the "image" when it was created by God, which testifies to the reflection of the Divine nature of the Absolute in human nature, then a person must achieve "similarity" through perfection, transcendence, to meet our calling to become partakers of the Divine nature. The idea of the God-Man in Christianity reveals not only the "path from above": the descent of God to man through the Incarnation, but also the opposite path: the ascent of man to God, revealing to him the image of God in faith, love, virtues, moral actions and deeds, i.e. deification. "If the inalienable, ontological dignity of every human person, its highest value, is raised to the image of God in Orthodoxy, then life befitting dignity is correlated with the concept of the likeness of God, which, by Divine grace, is achieved through the overcoming of sin, the contraction of moral purity and virtues" [15]. Thus, the concept of human dignity has not only ontological but also deep spiritual-moral, transcendental content.

In the context of the Christian spiritual tradition, the principle of human dignity has a more fundamental and universal meaning than the principle of autonomy, since freedom is only one of the manifestations of the specific nature of man as a gift from God. According to the Catholic moral theologian and bioethicist Ignacio Carrasco de Paula, "the deepest foundation of human dignity is not that he is individual (unique and unrepeatable). And not that he is free (one to himself), but above all that he is transcendental: as the scholastics said, *capax Dei* (able to participate in God)" [12].

It is generally accepted that among Christian confessions a greater focus on personal autonomy is inherent in Protestantism. However, this provision requires clarification, taking into account the peculiarities of Protestant anthropology and ethics, in particular its fideicentrism. According to M. Luther, we are talking about Christian freedom (italics I.V., N.M., T.G., D.B.), which frees the human heart not only from all sins but also from laws and commandments. Such freedom is impossible without the help of divine powers, without Faith, which means unlimited love for God and His creatures. "...Through faith, the soul is made from the Word of God holy, righteous, true, peaceful, free and filled with all good" [11]. Therefore, we talk about the freedom of the "inner", spiritual person. The principle of individual autonomy is explicated by Protestant moral theologians in the context of the "ethics of responsibility", not only active but also moral, the sacred attitude of a person to all living things, which differs significantly from the interpretations of this principle in the liberal-radical model of secular bioethics.

The methodological significance in the development of bioethics has to do with life as an invaluable gift from God, which is characteristic of the Christian Eucharistic ethos. Orthodox theologian, Metropolitan John Zizioulas focuses on the initial understanding and implementation of the Eucharist as an expression of gratitude for the gift of being [33]. "And since everything, including our being, is a gift, we cannot help but assume that the giver is behind everything." This is the Eucharistic path to faith. With this way of thinking, atheism appears as a form of ingratitude, the absence of a Eucharistic ethos" [33].

Since life is a fundamental good for a person, the following will be a morally justified attitude towards it: directly - it should be an attitude of accepting life as a gift that must be cherished, nourished, and loved; indirectly – one must accept death when it becomes inevitable.

Catholic theology has given a special strength to this primary moral core, established the following criteria for it:

- 1) The principle of the sanctity of human life;
- 2) The principle of inviolability of innocent human life;

- 3) The principle of the inalienability of the right to life from the moment of conception to the natural end of life [12].

In the context of the Christian spiritual tradition, let us consider some controversial problems in bioethics related to the interruption of human life in its initial and final stages. Without exaggeration, one of the most acute problems of the modern secularized world is abortion. According to the WHO, about 40-50 million abortions are performed annually in the world: approximately 125 thousand abortions per day. The positive dynamics of artificial abortions of pregnancy can be traced in recent years in Ukraine. The number of abortions, according to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine in 2019, amounted to 74 thousand 606, of which 727 were done under the age of full [5].

As it is known, bioethical assessments of artificial termination of pregnancy are based on two fundamental issues: about the status of the human embryo; the relationship between the mother's right to autonomy, reproductive choice, and the right of the unborn child to life. Although, in our opinion, the current formulation of the issue of the status of the embryo, in the broad sense of this term, does not quite accurately reflect the essence of this problem in bioethics. After all, the emphasis on the embryo (a human being from 2 to 8 weeks of intrauterine development) leaves in the shadow the primary, pre-embryonic stage of development, the moral and ethical assessment, which distinguishes the Christian tradition not only from the moderate (graded) approach in secular bioethics but also from other religious versions.

Today, the common Christian position is the recognition of the inherent dignity and value of the human being from the moment of conception and including all subsequent stages of its intrauterine development. It should be noted that the formation of this approach in Christianity was largely facilitated by the development of science, in particular embryology, genetics. It is no coincidence that Pope Francis qualifies the problem of abortion primarily as a scientific problem. "It is unethical to hinder the further development of a creature that is already endowed with a full-fledged human genetic code... To have an abortion means to kill a defenseless one" [3].

Scientific research shows that from the moment the gametes merge, a new human being, which is provided with a new information structure, begins to act as an individual unity, controlled by its coordinating genetic system. This is a "new human cell", and therefore a "new human individual", which begins its life cycle, constantly develops under the appropriate external and internal conditions. Human genetic development does not include a change in his nature, but presupposes the manifestation of those capabilities and inclinations that he has from the very beginning [28].

It is possible to bring not only biological but also theological, philosophical arguments in favor of the possession of dignity by every human being from the moment of his conception. The principle of human integrity is of particular importance in the Christian spiritual tradition. Modern Christian and philosophical anthropology (M. Scheller, N. Berdyaev, V. Frankl, S. Krymsky, and others) emerge from the triadic model of man, according to which man exists in three dimensions: bodily, mental, and spiritual. The human body is not separate from itself. Pope John Paul II spoke of a "spiritualized body" and "an inculcated spirit" [16]. This approach was also developed by the outstanding Orthodox archpastors of the 20th century, the doctor Archbishop Luke (V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky) and Metropolitan Anthony Surozhsky. Professor of medicine, V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky, substantiating the inextricable relationship between the spirit, soul, and body of a person as a single entity, noted: "Every person receives and has the breath of the Holy Spirit. No one is born of the spirit of Satan", "...the spirit forms it in the embryonic state of the body. Spiritual energy is inherent in all cells of the body, for they are alive, and life comes from the Spirit" [32].

In general, there is a common Christian position concerning other debatable problems of bioethics associated with the

interruption of human life in the prenatal period: eugenic abortion, the use of assisted reproductive technologies, the use of embryonic stem cells in regenerative medicine, etc.

According to Catholic theologians, the identification of developmental defects or hereditary diseases of the fetus during prenatal diagnostics should not be the equivalent of his death sentence, since "...the embryo is inviolable, no one has the right to take his life, even if it develops incorrectly or is superfluous" [30]. This position is supported by representatives of Protestantism and Orthodoxy. As noted in the Fundamentals of the Social Concept of the Russian Orthodox Church, "Every person has the right to life, love and care, regardless of whether he or she has certain diseases. According to the Holy Scriptures, God Himself is the "intercessor of the weak" (Jud. 9.11). The Apostle Paul teaches "to support the weak" (Acts 20:35; Thess. 5.14); likening the Church to the human body, he points out that "members ... who seem to be the weakest are much more needed, and the less perfect need "more care" (1 Cor. 12.22.24). It is completely unacceptable to use the methods of prenatal diagnostics to choose the sex of the unborn child desirable for parents [22].

At the same time, this problem is extremely complex and causes a far from unambiguous attitude among the laity. This is evidenced, for example, by the mass protests of women in traditionally Catholic Poland against the prohibition of selective abortion in cases of detection of fetal defects. At one time, Metropolitan Anthony Surozhsky, based on his many years of medical, life, and pastoral experience, shared the canonical, moral, and purely medical aspects of this issue. In fact, this approach is traced in the document "For the life of the world. Towards the Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church", which notes that the Orthodox Church does not recognize the eugenic termination of a new human life as justified. At the same time, the Church cannot claim competence in how best to act in each specific case and must entrust this issue to the prayerful reflection of parents and doctors [9].

In recent years, there has been a tendency in Christianity for a more positive, realistic attitude towards the use of assisted reproductive technologies. Evaluations of artificial insemination as a "deadly sin" [10] increasingly inferior to differentiated approaches that take into account the medical and technological characteristics of specific methods, moral, ethical, social, and other consequences of its application. According to the head of the Synodal Department of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for Healthcare and Pastoral Care of Medical Institutions, Metropolitan Filaret of Lviv and Galicia, if artificial insemination with the husband's sex cells can be attributed to acceptable methods of medical care since it does not violate the integrity of the marriage union, then in vitro fertilization causes significant violations of the moral order. First of all, natural processes are disrupted, which lead to the destruction of family ties during "fertilization in a test tube", and the status of embryos is also issued, since during IVF – fertilization more than 90% of human embryos die [26]. Given the latter, it is considered unacceptable from the standpoint of Christian morality and the receipt of stem cells from human embryos in regenerative medicine.

Euthanasia is one of the most controversial issues in biomedical ethics. At first glance, the very term "euthanasia" was introduced in the 17th century by F. Bacon (<gr. Ev – good, peaceable, Thanatos – death), i.e. "Blessed", painless death, etymologically corresponds to the very spirit of Christian ethics: the commandments of love, sympathy, and empathy for pain, the suffering of neighbor. Today, euthanasia, in one form or another, is legalized in many states, including Europe (Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, etc.). To what extent does this phenomenon of secular society correspond to the Christian spiritual tradition?

In the encyclical *Evangelium Vitae*, euthanasia is defined as an action or inaction which, by its nature and intention, means killing a person to prevent suffering [16]. Thus, firstly, euthanasia is assessed as a violation of God's commandment:

"Thou shalt not kill"; secondly, active euthanasia is distinguished (intentional actions leading to the death of the patient through the use of special, medical preparations) and passive (inaction, i.e., the termination of artificial maintenance of vital functions of the body in connection with the hopeless state of the patient). The separation of these types of euthanasia is of fundamental importance since their moral assessments differ significantly in the modern Christian world. As Pope Francis notes, "Our morality recommends, in cases where the end is imminent, limiting oneself to necessary, simple measures... The great power of medicine in hopeless situations is not so much that the patient should live three days or two months longer, but that his body should suffer as little as possible. A person is not obliged to preserve life by extraordinary methods. This can degrade his dignity. Active euthanasia is another matter: this is already murder" [3].

As already stated, the Christian ethos is distinguished by the Eucharist, the acceptance with gratitude of life as a gift of God. Only God by his will bestows and takes life away from a person. As the Holy Scriptures say: "...There is no God but Me: I kill and give life, I smite and I heal, and no one will deliver from my hand" (Deuteronomy 32:| 39). J. Stott, a recognized leader of the modern evangelical movement, noted that religious freedom provides for life in harmony with nature, given to us by God, and "not in rebellion against it, and the concept of full autonomy of man is considered a "myth" [25]. Therefore, various forms of active euthanasia are a manifestation of human pride in his striving to become like God, invading the sacred spheres of life, subject only to the Creator. This leads to the desacralization of human life and human dignity.

#### 4 Discussion

In the works of foreign and Ukrainian scientists, different approaches to the definition of the subject of bioethics are traced. Moskalenko and Popov identify and critically analyze the following positions: consideration of bioethics as a new philosophical discipline; assessment of bioethics as a section of applied ethics [13]. However, the most common are approaches that equate bioethics with medical or biomedical ethics.

American physician, founder of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics A. Hellegers viewed bioethics as *maieutics*, that is, a science that can explain values through a dialogue between medicine, philosophy and ethics [27]. E. Pellegrino and D. Thomasma, focusing on the doctor-patient relationship, defined bioethics as medical ethics that preserves the traditions of Hippocrates and denies medical paternalism [17]. S. Spinsanti considered bioethics as a continuation of medical ethics [24]. It is not difficult to notice that the principles that have become classical today, developed by American scientists T. Beauchamp and J. Childress, can be considered as bioethical only if bioethics and biomedical ethics are identified.

These approaches to bioethics, predominantly in a medical context, dominating in the scientific tradition of the United States, were later adopted by scientists from other regions, including the countries of Eastern Europe (I.V. Siluyanova, P.D. Tishchenko, G.T. Tereshkevych, etc.). The well-known Russian scientist P.D. Tishchenko defines bioethics as an interdisciplinary field of knowledge that covers a wide range of philosophical and ethical problems that arise in connection with the rapid development of medicine, biological sciences, and the use of high technologies in healthcare [29].

One of the first to raise the issue of the need to demarcate bioethics and biomedical ethics based on the principle of the relationship between the general and the singular was raised by the Belarusian researchers T.V. Mishatkina, S.D. Denisov, Ya.S. Yaskevich. "Bioethics is a practical ethics focused on the development and establishment of a morally understanding attitude to Life in general and any Living One, to caring for the rights of the bios based on the Schweitzer principle of reverence for life; biomedical ethics – applied ethics, the subject of which is the moral attitude of society as a whole, professionals-physicians and biologists – to a person, his life, health, death,

both in the process of treatment and in the course of the research conducted with his participation" [4].

Approaches to bioethics in a wide context, different from the subject field of biomedical ethics, as one of its directions, can be traced in the works of Ukrainian researchers (V.L. Kulinichenko, S.V. Vekovshinin (Pustovit), N.V. Popov, I.V. Vasiliev, V.G. Napadista and others). According to S.V. Pustovit's definition, bioethics is an interdisciplinary branch of knowledge and human practice, the purpose of which is the preservation and development of life using ethical mechanisms and principles [20].

Considering the complex, systemic nature of the problems of preserving life, including human life and health in the conditions of modern technogenic civilization, it should be noted that the use of bioethical approaches is of great importance today not only in medicine and health care but also in the regulation of other spheres of society: economic, social, legal, educational system, etc. [1]. For example, the VII National Congress on Bioethics (Ukraine, Kyiv, September 30 - October 2, 2019) raised issues of urban bioethics (T.V. Gubenko, V.A. Smiyarov), bioethical aspects of journalism (Yu. Dमितenko), medical tourism (E.E. Petrovsakaya, A.B. Zhabinskaya), sports (G.V. Korobeinikov, L.G. Korobeinikova, V.S. Mishenko) and others [14].

One of the topical subjects of modern philosophical and bioethical discourse is the problem of the relationship between science and religion, secular bioethics, and religious, in particular Christian moral and ethical approaches. In approaches to this issue, a very wide range of assessments is observed - from accusations of representatives of Christianity in "biological conservatism" to attempts to synthesize secular ethics and theology, orthodox Christian faith [7, 6]. Noting the vital importance of the Christian spiritual tradition in the formation and development of bioethical approaches, it should be borne in mind that today the tendency of globalization of bioethics as a sociocultural phenomenon increases. The creation of various "models" of bioethics, mainly on religious and confessional foundations, can become a new conflict-generating factor in the modern unstable polycultural, polycentric world. Further development of bioethics, in our opinion, is associated not with the "fusion of Christian and secular ethics," but with the deepening of a multi-vector dialogue: between theologians and representatives of secular science; between Christians of different denominations; between Christendom and non-Christian religions; between the Church and the state, society, since the issues of bioethics and biosafety affect the interests of every person in the modern world.

## 5 Conclusion

The Christian spiritual tradition, being open to the realities of the modern world, the achievements of science, culture, is in constant development, updating doctrinal approaches. At the same time, it is distinguished by a universal system of values and moral norms, based on the main commandment of Christianity – absolute love, respect for human dignity, sacredness, and inviolability of life from conception to natural death. This determines the special significance of the Christian ethos not only in determining the attitude towards the most controversial problems of bioethics associated with the beginning and end of human life but also in counteracting relativistic, scientist-technocratic, and liberal-radical approaches, consumer attitude towards man and his life.

## Literature:

1. Abolina, T.G. Vasilieva, I.V., & Yermolenko, A.M. (2013). Bioethics and biomedical ethics. *Theoretical problems of modern ethics*. A textbook for university students, 2nd ed. reworked and add. Kyiv: PH "Avicenna", 189-209, 190-191.
2. Alexander, D.R. (2017). *Models of the relationship between science and religion*. Available at: <http://www.st-edmunds.cam.ac.uk>.

3. Bergoglio, J. & Skoroka, A. (2017). *In heaven and on earth*. Translated by D. Karateev. K.: Spirit and Letter, 264.
4. Bioethics. (2011). *Bioethics: dictionary-reference*. Compiling editor - T.V. Mishatkina. Minsk: Prospect plus, 186.
5. Catholic Observer. (2020). *Last year, Ukrainian women performed more than 74,000 abortions, according to official data from the Ministry of Health*. Available at: <http://catholicnews.org.ua/toric-ukrayinki-zrobili-ponad-74-tis-abortiv-oficijni-dani-moz>.
6. Engelhardt, T.H. (2000). *The foundation of Christian bioethics*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers, 438.
7. Fletcher, J. (1966). *Situation ethics. The new morality*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 176, 283.
8. Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. (2020). *For the life of the world*, 8, 71. Available at: <http://www.goarch.org/social-ethos>.
9. Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. (2020). *Towards the Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church*, 8, 26. Available at: <http://www.goarch.org/social-ethos>.
10. Lisets, A. (2013). Problems of medical ethics in the context of Christian morality. *Eastern European Journal of Public Health*, Special Issue, 91-97.
11. Luther, M. (2013). *On the freedom of a Christian*. Ufa: Publishing house "ARC", 81.
12. Melina, L., Herr, T., Carrasco de Paula, I., Bonandi, A., & Bresciani, C. (2007). *Moral action of a Christian*. Under the general supervision of L. Melin. M.: Christian Russia, 324.
13. Moskalenko, V.F. & Popov, M.V. (2005). *Bioethics: philosophical-methodological and socio-medical problems*. Vinnytsia: New Book, 218.
14. National Congress of Bioethics. (2019). VII National Congress of Bioethics dated on September 30 - October 2, Kyiv, Ukraine. K.: National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine, Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 158.
15. Orthodoxy and Problems of Bioethics. (2008). *Fundamentals of the Teaching of the Russian Orthodox Church on Dignity, Freedom and Human Rights*. Moscow, June 26, M.: LLC "Format", 123-144.
16. Paul, J. (1995). *II Encyclical Letter Evangelium Vitae*. Vatican, 190.
17. Pellegrino, E.D. & Thomasma, D.C. (1988). *For the patient's good. The restoration of beneficence in health care*. New York: Oxford University Press, 19-29.
18. Potter, V.R. (1988). *Global Bioethics Building on the Leopold Legacy*. Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 203.
19. Potter, V.R. (2002). *Bioethics: a bridge to the future*. S.V. Vekovshinanina and V.L. Kulinichenko (Eds.). Kyiv: Publishing House "Vadim Karpenko", 216.
20. Pustovit, S.V. (2009). *Global bioethics: the formation of theory and practice (philosophical analysis)*. K.: Arcturus, 2009, 22, 324.
21. Razumkov Centre. (2019). *State and Church in Ukraine - 2019: Results of the year and prospects for the development of relations (information materials)*. Kyiv: Razumkov centre, 70. Available at: <https://razumkov.org.ua/uploads/article/2019Religiya.pdf>
22. Russian Orthodox Church. (2008). Foundations of the social concept of the Russian Orthodox Church. Available at: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/419128.html>.
23. Sandor, J. (2020). Bioethics for Pandemic. *Project Syndicate*. Available at: <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/bioethics-principles-for-covid19-response-by-judit-sandor-2020-05/russian>.
24. Spinsanti, S. (1987). *Etica bio-medica*. Milano: Paoline, 5-28.
25. Stott, J. (2004). *New Problems of Christians*. Cherkassy: SMIRNA, 685.
26. Synodal Department of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. (2010). Report of Metropolitan Filaret on the Church's view on the technologies of Regenerative Medicine. *Church's view on modern and latest technologies in medicine. Regenerative medicine*. Available at: [http://www.orthodox-medical.org.ua/ind ex.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=182:2010-09-26-17-06-17&catid=26:2010-03-09-08-26-52&Itemid=33](http://www.orthodox-medical.org.ua/ind ex.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=182:2010-09-26-17-06-17&catid=26:2010-03-09-08-26-52&Itemid=33).
27. Tereshkevych, G.T. (2014). *Fundamentals of bioethics and biosafety*. Ternopil: TNMU, 400.

28. Tereshkevych, H. & Vasylyeva, I. (2012). The problem of unborn human status in the context of bioethics: public and legal aspect. Efficiency of public administration. *Collection of academic papers of Lviv Regional Institute of Public Administration of National Academy of Public Administration office of the President of Ukraine*. Edited by the corresponding member, V. Zagorski, assistant professor - A. Lipentseva. Lviv: Publisher LRIPA NAPA, 30, 90-96.
29. Tishchenko, P.D. (2001). Bioethics. *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Ethics*. Edited by R.G. Apresyan and A.A. Huseynov. M.: Gardariki, 39-41.
30. Vatican. (1987). The gift of life: Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation Replies to certain questions of the day. Available at: [http://www.vatican.va/roman.curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_19870222\\_respect-for-human-life\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman.curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19870222_respect-for-human-life_en.html).
31. Voino-Yasenetsky, V.F. (2009). *(Saint Luke) Science and religion*, 2nd ed. Simferopol: Simferopol City Typography (SCT), 33, 41.
32. Voino-Yasenetsky, V.F. (2010). *(Saint Luke) Spirit, soul, and body*. K.: PH "Avicenna", 208.
33. Zizioulas, J. (2012). Communication and otherness. New essays on personality and church (translated from English). *Series "Contemporary Theology"*. M.: Publishing House BBI, 12, 407.

**Primary Paper Section: A**

**Secondary Paper Section: AA**