

**Strategia supraviețuirii  
din perspectiva bioeticii, antropologiei,  
filosofiei și medicinei**

*Materialele Conferinței a 24-a Științifice Internaționale*

*Culegere de articole științifice*

**Vol. 24**

**The survival strategy  
in terms of bioethics, anthropology,  
philosophy and medicine**

*Materials of the 24th International Scientific Conference*

*Collection of scientific articles*

**Volume 24**

Redactor responsabil,  
*dr. habilitat în filosofie, prof. universitar*  
Teodor N. Țirdea

**CHIȘINĂU – 2018**

CEP „Medicina”

## CUPRINS

Cuvînt înainte .....	8
Foreword .....	9

### Partea I

#### ROLUL ȘI LOCUL PARADIGMELOR BIOETICE ÎN ELABORAREA ȘI REALIZAREA STRATEGIEI DE ASIGURARE A SECURITĂȚII UMANE

<b>Capcelea Valeriu</b> (or. Bălți, Republica Moldova) <i>Specificul eticii științifice în cadrul spațiului global de cercetare științifică</i> .....	10
<b>Cernica Niadi-Corina</b> (Suceava, România) <i>Sentimentul – etică și filosofie</i> .....	14
<b>Chashchyn N.A.</b> (Kiev, Ukraine), <b>Smaliko P.I.</b> (Kiev, Ukraine) <i>Biological and ethical aspects of personalized medicine</i> .....	16
<b>Cheshko V.T.</b> (Kharkiv, Ukraine) <b>Kosova Ю. В.</b> (Kharkiv, Ukraine) <i>Evolutionary (bio)ethics and rationalization of evolutionary process</i> .....	19
<b>Eșanu Anatoлие</b> (or. Chișinău, Republica Moldova), <b>Gonciaruc Valeriu</b> (or. Chișinău, Republica Moldova) <i>Bioetica globală în contextul conflictelor militare locale și regionale</i> .....	22
<b>Maria Aluaș</b> (or. Cluj-Napoca, România) <i>Metode interactive de predare a bioeticii: jocul de rol</i> .....	27
<b>Roșca S.</b> (or. Chișinău, Republica Moldova) <i>Biodiversitatea culturală, diversitatea culturală și bioetica: abordări conceptuale</i> .....	30
<b>Sprincean S.L.</b> (or. Chișinău, Republica Moldova) <i>Perspectivile de fortificare a securității umane în Republica Moldova și sistemul de expertizare bioetică</i> .....	32
<b>Țirdea T.N.</b> (or. Chișinău, Republica Moldova) <i>Înțelepciunea, cunoștințele periculoase și valorile general-umane în strategia de asigurare a securității umane: studiul bioetico-potterian</i> .....	36
<b>Архимандрит Адам В. Ахаладзе</b> (г.Тбилиси, Республика Грузия) <i>Компонент церковного сознания и воспитания в превенции насилия и агрессивности среди детей и подростков биотической аргументации</i> .....	40
<b>Будённый П.В.</b> (г. Рубежное, Украина) <i>Биоэтические и деонтологические аспекты медикаментозного купирования психотической симптоматики у суицидентов</i> .....	42
<b>Десятская Ю.В.</b> (г. Одесса, Украина), <b>Горностаева Н.Ю.</b> (г. Одесса, Украина), <b>Шевченко Н.М.</b> (г. Одесса, Украина) <i>Концепция биоэтики в современной медицине</i> .....	46
<b>Канитальчук М.В.</b> , (г. Тирасполь, Республика Молдова) <b>Семенко О.П.</b> (г. Бендеры, Республика Молдова) <b>Канитальчук А.И.</b> , (г. Бендеры, Республика Молдова) <i>К вопросу о правах растений</i> .....	49
<b>Катрунов В.А.</b> (г. Саратов, Россия), <b>Засыпкина Е.В.</b> (г. Саратов, Россия), <b>Девличарова Р.Ю.</b> (г. Саратов, Россия) <i>К вопросу о критериях административно-правовой ответственности врача за профессиональные ошибки</i> .....	51

#### EVOLUTIONARY (BIO)ETHICS AND RATIONALIZATION OF EVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

#### ЭВОЛЮЦИОННАЯ (БИО)ЭТИКА И РАЦИОНАЛИЗАЦИЯ ЭВОЛЮЦИОННОГО ПРОЦЕССА

**В. Чешко В.Ф.<sup>1</sup>, KosovaЮ. В.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Докт. философ наук, профессор, иностр. член РАЕН, профессор кафедры молекулярной биологии и биотехнологии Харьковского национального университета им В.Каразина

<sup>2</sup>*Преподаватель, Кафедра философии и политологии, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. С.Кузнеца, Харьков, Украина*

**Summary.** The one of the basic predispositions of the mentality of technogenic civilization (its Western variant) is the trend towards the liberation of the social role and social status of the individual from the conditioning of his biological substrate (genome) as the criterion of social (and evolutionary) progress. The second member of the logical syllogism reduces to the statement of the three-module structure of the stable evolutionary strategy of Homo sapiens. As a consequence, a dichotomy of the evolutionary mechanism is observed in the spontaneous and rationalistic components (adaptive inversion is equal to the blurring of the boundaries between the Reasonable Design and the Evolutionary Process based on the laws of nature). As result of transition from anthropic principle of participation to a scientific concept of integrating the rationalist principle into the global evolutionary process concludes: turns out to be antransdisciplinary field of knowledge on the mechanisms of integration and coordination of humanitarian-axiological (ethics), evolutionary and ecological scientific theories into a single system of ideas about the goals and technologies of rational evolution management (eco-ethno-ethics).

*Keywords:* anthropic principle, eco-evo-ethics, evolutionary strategy, evolution management technologies.

**Аннотация.** Одной из основных характеристик менталитета техногенной цивилизации (ее западного варианта) является тенденция к освобождению социальной роли и социального статуса индивида от кондиционирования их биологическим субстратом (геномом) в качестве критерия социального (и эволюционного) прогресса. Второй член логического силлогизма сводится к констатации трехмодульной структуры стабильной эволюционной стратегии Homo sapiens. Как следствие, наблюдается дихотомия механизма эволюции на спонтанную и ра-ционалистическую составляющие (адаптивная инверсия павнозначная стианию границ между Разумным замыслом и Эволюцией, основанной на законах природы). В результате редукции антропного принципа участия к научной концепции интеграции рационалистической составляющей в глобальный эволюционный процесс делается вывод, что биоэтика трансформируется в трансдисциплинарную область знаний о механизмах интеграции и координации гуманитарно-аксиологических (этических), эволюционных и экологических научных теорий в единую систему представлений о целях и технологиях рационального управления эволюцией (эко-этно- этика).

*Ключевые слова:* антропный принцип, эко-эво-этика, эволюционная стратегия, технологии управления эволюцией.

In previous communications [4, 5], we considered the metaphysical foundations of the rationalization of the global evolution process in connection with the development of technogenic civilization. Its main postulate was the transformation of a unique evolutionary phenomenon - the three-modular stable evolutionary strategy of Homo sapiens (SESH) into the mechanism of the evolutionary dichotomy on an objective-spontaneous and subjective-axiological components. The main conclusion was the thesis of the need for the formation of a social institution of bioethics as a mechanism for preserving of human cultural and spcies self-identity. Here the main general scientific theoretical postulates of the same conception will be considered. The main methodological method of such research will be epistemological reduction - the transition from general metaphysical principles (anthropic principle of participation) to the formation of prolegomena of a specifically scientific concept

of integrating the rationalist principle into the global evolutionary process. The organization of SESH has consistently been considered from three perspectives [1]:

(1) the nature of the carrier (substrate) of adaptive information – biological, sociocultural and technorationalistic adaptive modules. This aspect turns out to be equivalent to different ways of replication of adaptive information – genetic, sociocultural and symbolic inheritance; (2) the nature of the connection between generation and adaptivity of the information the Darwin-Weismann mode and the Lamarck mode. Darwin-Weismann modus is a stochastic – is not intended to rigidly determinate information structures and/or controlled by signs, (a), unspecified – is not adequate and does not correlate with changes in the external environment (b), not projective not constructive, i.e. is not capable of directly (intentionally or not intentionally) change the adaptive landscape, in which the evolutionary process (c) and is not recursive – cannot be changed except by re-stochastic events (d); fixing the rate of new adaptations of the higher, the smaller the size of populations (e); in the dissemination of the newly generated adaptations of horizontal transfer (diffusion contamination as a result of communication) is significantly inferior to its importance to the vertical, i.e., proper inheritance from ancestors to descendants (f). Modus based on the genetic code and provides a so-called Eigen hyper-cycle [6] of nucleic acids and proteins. The adaptive significance of information fragments acquired and recorded during the stochastic selection, not directly related to the generation of functional dependency information. Lamarck Modus is teleological, i.e. – aimed at certain information structures and/or controlled by signs (a), is adequate and/or correlated with changes in the external environment (b), a projective-constructive, i.e. able to direct changes in the adaptive landscape and (cultural) ecological niche where there is an evolutionary process, moreover – to deliberate their reconstruction (c), and recursive – available correction in the course of (d); fixing the rate of new adaptations increases in parallel with the growth of the size and density of the population (e); in the dissemination of the newly generated adaptations of horizontal transfer (diffusion contamination as a result of communication) is comparable in its importance to the vertical transfer generation to generation (f); (3) the nature of communication of various adaptations, the result of which is their integration into a single stable evolutionary strategy co-evolutionary informatics and co-evolutionary semantics. This aspect turns out to be equivalent to the mechanism of repayment of evolutionary conflicts between different adaptations. We have reason to suppose that culture is based on already existing genotypes in the population forming in the simplest case a binary adaptive bundle, and, in the future, they become a substrate basis that provides replication and distribution of adaptive elements of culture. Such coevolutionary-semantic nodes are easily formed and easily destroyed. They can include elements of the biological module, very remote from the socially adaptive significance of the corresponding social innovations. Their fixation in evolution is possible only in the case of the formation of a long and powerful trend in the development of systemic sociocultural adaptations. So, the stable adaptive strategy of Homo sapiens is a superposition of three different adaptive information arrays (modules): biological, sociocultural and technological, based on three autonomous processes of generation, replication and implementation of adaptive information – genetic, sociocultural and symbolic. In this case, the third component of SESH is directed equally to the adaptive transformation of the habitat and the carrier itself (hominins). This aspect of the SESH implementation can thus be called an informational.

Another aspect of implementing SESH functions (co-evolutionary semantics) is a time-varying code of correspondence between members of pairwise coevolutionary connectives. (“semiotic co-optation” [7]). So, there must exist an operator specifying the rules of pair matching of information arrays of three modules, and this is done either by a system of objectified interests (praxeologically oriented knowledge) or by a system of subjective values (psychological predispositions). Replication of interests is carried out within the rational-technological module on the basis of mechanisms of symbolic inheritance, and replication of value priorities is carried out within the framework of the socio-cultural module and, accordingly, socio-cultural inheritance (cultural tradition). If the main «purpose» of

interests is the material survival of SESH carriers, then the content of a similar parameter (evolutionary correctness) of values is determined by their ability to ensure the preservation of self-identity. Influence of culture on the structure and composition of Homo sapiens populations and the pool of technological schemes of the High Hume class is divided into two separate types: the change in the frequencies of individual genes and the prevalence of specific technologies and their applications (information coevolution) an increase in the level of genetic and technological polymorphism (semantic coevolution).

The system of prevailing in society value priorities has a structure including several levels: personal (unconditional) interests, group (conventionalist) standards, abstract and theoretical (universal) values [8], and group standards most susceptible to evolutionary transformation. However, the effect of perturbations group ratios diffuses through evolutionarily semantic gear to a biological module and destroying, in turn, semantic matching rules of the module with the two remaining modules. The elements of the biological module of the SESH are extended to a system of objective «interests», and then to the remaining levels of the socio-cultural module of SESH. There is a fixation of a certain set of group norms and thereupon revision of universal values as the latter are a reflection of the projective group norms and individual interests. Therefore, a certain part of biological adaptations in the new socio-cultural context becomes elements of the genetic load, and, on the contrary, part of the selectively harmful or neutral components of the genome acquire adaptive meaning. With regard to technological innovation, in their totality, they are clearly aimed at fragmentation of biological adaptive complex and separation of its constituent interlocking adaptations (such as sexual and reproductive functions) on independent cultivated patterns.

A fundamentally important feature of the phenomenon of bioethics is the clearly expressed trend of transdisciplinarity, the incorporation into its sphere of competence of new and new concepts and areas of social life – the trend of social and epistemological evolution, noted recently not only by authors but also by many experts [2]. Another statement, also supported by some experts, though rather as a statement of a concrete empirical fact, is the transformation of bioethics into a factor of at least socioecological [9], probably - biological, and, as a long-term trend - global evolution.

Indeed, the bioethics with a trail of associated conceptual fields (biology, bioeconomics, biohistory, etc.) turned out to be not just the only rationalized regulator of the process of biological and socio-cultural evolution. It became part of the methodology and theoretical foundation of theoretical natural science, forming an original inseparable amalgam of the concepts of humanitarian and scientific discourse (post-nonclassical or post-academic science). In fact, the nature of this phenomenon cannot be reduced to either ethics or science (biology), it is a social practice and a social institution designed to control the magnitude of the evolutionary and social risk of modern biotechnology. This is one of the main theses argued during this study.

In the modern disciplinary matrix of the theory of evolution and systemic ecology (the «theory of designing an ecological niche») a single conceptual framework is formed, consisting of three independent theoretical constructs – eco-evo-ethics [3, p. 45, next].

In the formal logical aspect, the two original members of this triad belongs to the descriptive (scientific) discourse, and the latter (ethics) belongs to its sociohumanistic and therefore value antagonist. As a result, of the hybrid nature of this construct between the three autonomous modules and (due to the proliferation of the terminological apparatus into the interior of the module that does not belong to it) and within each module logical contradictions are inevitable.

In the content aspect, the members of the complex described above refer to

- the influence of modern technologies of controlled evolution on the system of ecological links between man and his environment (i.e., the medical and hygienic aspect of self-construction of man and human dimensional eco-systems (biotas),

- preserving the self-identity of a reasonable human in the course of any technological manipulation with its genetic code (i.e. evolutionary survival of the biological species *Homo sapiens* and the preservation of the socio-cultural identity of human civilization (i.e., the basic « universal » value norms during the implementation of new technological schemes and their indirect or direct influence on the continuity of the socio-cultural tradition).

In any case, such a transdisciplinary concept assumes, first, a projective-axiological intent. The initial component of the theory and practice of controlled evolution technologies is the ideal image of the future cultural and ecological niche and the «human» (the mind carrier with its inherent system of value priorities as its system-forming component), which we call the humanitarian paradigm nucleus. The descriptive paradigm nucleus acts as a diagnostic tool for discrepancies between the ideal future and reality. Applied genetic and socio-engineering developments are a means of eliminating these.

In an objectified, freed from metaphor form, the conclusion from the investigation is reduced to the statement that one of the basic predispositions of the mentality of technogenic civilization (its Western variant) is the trend towards the liberation of the social role and social status of the individual from the conditioning of his biological substrate (genome) as the criterion of social (and evolutionary) progress. Bioethics in this interpretation turns out to be an eco-ethno-ethics – transdisciplinary field of knowledge on the mechanisms of integration and coordination of humanitarian-axiological (ethics), evolutionary and ecological scientific theories into a single system of ideas about the goals and technologies of rational evolution management.

#### REFERENCES

1. **Чешко, В.Ф., Иваницкая Л.В., Глазко В. И.** Антропоцен. Философия биотехнологии . Москва: Курс, 2018. 400 с.
2. **Agazzi E.** The polyhedron of bioethics. *Bioethics UPdate* – 2017. No 3, p. 1-3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bioet.2017.01.003>
3. **Bergandi D.**(ed.) *The Structural Links between Ecology, Evolution and Ethics. The Virtuous Epistemic Circle Series: Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science*, 296, Dordrecht: Springer, 2013, XV, 179 p.
4. **Cheshko V., Kosova Y.** Bioethics as the reincarnation and rehabilitation of natural philosophy // *Sakharov readings 2017: environmental problems of the XXI century* . Minsk, 2017. P. 266-267.
5. **Cheshko V., Kosova Y.** Ontology and bioethics as transdisciplinary paradigm syntetic biology and biotech // *Strategia supraviețuirii din perspectiva bioeticii, filosofiei și medicinei.. / Sub red. T.N.Țirdea. – 2017, Vol. 23, P. 58-62*
6. **Eigen M., Winkler R.** *Laws of the game: how the principles of nature govern chance.* – Princeton: University Press, 1993. 347 p.
7. **Maran T.,Kleisner K.** Towards an Evolutionary Biosemiotics: Semiotic Selection and Semiotic Co-option // [Biosemiotics](#).2010, Vol.3, No 2.P 189-200.
8. **Prehn K.** Neural Correlates of Post-Conventional Moral Reasoning: A Voxel-Based Morphometry Study / K. Prehn, M.Korczykowski, H.Rao, et al. // [PLoS One](#). 2015. Vol. 3, No 10(6). Publ.e0122914. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0122914. eCollection 2015.
9. **Valles S. A.** Bioethics and the Framing of Climate Change's Health Risks *Bioethics.* – 2015. – Vol. 29. – No 5. – P 334-341