

Rev. Marian Machinek MSF

## **Biblical anthropocentrism?**

### **About (over)using the Biblical arguments in the contemporary bioethical discussion**

Referring to the authority of the Bible does not constitute anything new in the discourse on philosophical and theological issues. The bioethical discussion, which is currently being carried on, makes that the Biblical texts are sometimes cited in rather surprising contexts and appear to take the new meanings. Bioethics [1] is a science situated "at the junction of the great human realities, such as: the individual, family, social justice, environment protection" [2] and as such it has to take into account the research results of many sciences, both natural and humanistic ones. One of the issues of the debate being currently conducted is the question about the limits of the human interference in the nature with reference both to the surrounding environment and human nature. Is the man really the centre and crowning achievement of the creation? Can one draw a conclusion that the human rule over the world is unlimited? Should the man subject his unstoppable urge to invent and his creative skills for shaping the environment to ethical principles? And if so, what principles should they be?

The Biblical text, which very often appears in the context of the bioethical discussion, is the description of the creation, placed on the first pages of Genesis (Chapter 1-2). The accounts of creating the man,

which are contained there, seem to indicate the significant frames of the human nature. Actually, the Bible presents the man as the most perfect being, created in the image and after likeness of the Creator and equipped with the extraordinary mandate: he is to make the earth subdue to him and rule over its all living creatures. Are these texts the proclamation of anthropocentrism? Their interpretation affects the answer to the question about the human powers to interfere in the nature and the limits of this interference. This study wishes to analyse the way of referring to the Biblical arguments in the selected argumentative models.

#### **1. The Bible as the source of "the ecological sin"?**

The aforementioned text of Genesis is sometimes cited as the key witness or peculiar *corpus delicti* to confirm the thesis of the Judaeo-Christian culture, which was inspired by the text, being the source of the present ecological crisis. This thesis was propagated as early as in the 60s' by Lynn White [3] and he has been followed by some contemporary authors. [4] The Biblical description appears to grant the man the status of the absolute lord of the world, whereas the world itself, deprived of its own value, is allegedly given to the man merely as the

material for free moulding and the means for self-expansion. According to the aforementioned author, making the man superior, which is reflected in the Biblical anthropocentrism, means making all other living creatures inferior, depriving them of their own inbred values and reducing them to the role of "a raw material." Being equipped with such prerogatives, the man began to subdue the earth, which followed by his development, resulted in the damage of the environment. Thus, the Biblical anthropocentrism is meant to be in some measure "the historical cataract," which allegedly has justified the untamed exploitation of the earth up to now. [5]

Is such interpretation of the Biblical texts substantiated? In order to answer this question it is necessary to take a closer look at the texts, taking into consideration the function they performed in the theological thought of the Biblical authors.

The aforementioned fragment, concerning the description of the creation of the man, belongs to so-called Hexaemeron, that is the first (in sense of chronology) out of the two Biblical descriptions of the creation of the world (Chapter 1, 1 – 2, 4a). According to the contemporary exegesis, the well known to us, final version of this description comes from the period of captivity, i.e. from about the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. The structure of the text allows formulating a few significant observations. The intention of the author was actually to emphasise the extraordinary status of the man. He is created as the last, the most perfect creation of God. "The process" of his creation is accompanied by in some measure peculiar God's activity, emphasised by the triple use (in one line!) of the verb *bārā* (he created), triple emphasis of the man's likeness to the Creator, as well as peculiar dialogue of God with himself in which he appears to ponder upon his intention ("Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" – Chapter 1, 26) [7]. Also, the func-

tion of the man is stressed twice: he is to dominate over the world and its all living creatures.

Beside these literary observations concerning the text, the key factor to understand it properly is the context of its origination. Taking into account the circumstances of the text origination, one can notice its religious-critical and social-critical functions. The situation of captivity forced the nation of Israel to face the Babylonian religion together with its cult of the celestial bodies, forces of nature and living creatures, as well as people (lords and kings). The description of the creation constitutes a peculiar answer to this challenge. While proclaiming and emphasising the existence of one solitary God, this text simultaneously performs demythologisation of the world. If God is a creator of the celestial bodies, all animals and people, they cannot be gods, but only creations. [8] On the other hand, granting each man the status of "the image and likeness" of God and raising him to the role of the God's partner in the domination over the world contains a great potential for democratising social relationships. This approach extremely differs from the views of other great Oriental cultures, which labelled as gods only rulers and kings. [9]

It cannot be denied that in the first description of the creation we actually deal with the anthropocentric attitude. It is not the absolute anthropocentrism, though. The man presented in the priestly description of the creation is not a sovereign owner of the environment entrusted with him. He is meant to participate in the God's rule but also in His wisdom and handling the world. Although describing the human mandate towards the creation the Bible uses such phrases as "to subdue" and "to dominate" [10], their meaning in the Biblical context is similar to the way a shepherd is a master of his flock. Being such a master includes not only the consent to use the flock,

but also the responsibility to look after it and provide it with the space to live. While describing the God's attitude to the creation, the Bible frequently uses the image of a shepherd.

Caring tasks of the man towards the surrounding nature are strongly emphasised in the second description of the creation of the world and man (cf. Chapter 2, 4b – 25), which is much older than the aforementioned one (it belongs to so-called Yahwist Tradition and dates back to about 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C.). The author of this description uses a mythological language, in which the creative action of God is strongly anthropomorphised. Thus, the Creator is presented as a potter on whose wheel the man is modelled from “the dust of the ground.” He is located in the garden planted by the Creator. Similarly to the first description, the man is also invited to cooperate with the Creator in order to manage the earth and in some measure “complete” the act of creation: he is entrusted with a task of tending and growing the garden, whose owner however maintains God. The symbol of the tree of knowledge of good and evil and the prohibition concerning eating its fruit indicates restricting the human power over the creation and necessity of respecting the God's sovereign rule. [11]

Both texts were juxtaposed at the beginning of the Pentateuch. The editors of the Pentateuch did not feel a need to make any retouch in order to harmonise both texts. Therefore, both these texts together with the ideas contained in them concerning the man, shaped the awareness both of the nation of Israel, and then the world of Christianity. The analysis of the texts themselves does not allow confirming the accusation of the anthropocentrism complicity in the ecological disaster of the contemporary world, which does not imply that their misunderstanding could not have been used for substantiating the man's unlimited power over the earth. However, such misinterpretations

occurred with reference to many other Biblical texts, especially when they were interpreted in the aspect of various philosophical ideas. Sometimes, the interpretation of the Biblical texts was nothing else but “reading out” the content, which had been previously fitted in the text. It was not until combining the presented texts of Genesis with philosophical trends that they could be interpreted as the permission for unlimited exploitation of the world. This context indicates both the Cartesian division of the spirit and matter, which resulted in placing the man in the opposition to the surrounding nature, and the research programme of Francis Bacon, who saw the instrument to subdue the nature in learning its rights. [12]

Is the concept of “anthropocentrism” at all adequate to express the anthropological content of Genesis? This term is not the Biblical one. It was not until the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that it took on as a description of some outlook in the scientific discussion, i.e. the model of understanding the world and the place of the man in it (similarly to the terms of “geocentrism” or “heliocentrism”). [13] Although this concept conveys strong ethical connotations, its content and range depends on the context in which it is used. Even if one accepted this concept with reference to the Bible, the Biblical anthropocentrism, followed by the Christian, is always placed in the context of theocentric religion. Thus, it will be “theocentric anthropocentrism” indicating the core orientation of each human being towards the Creator and the transcendental dimension of their existence. Such a form of anthropocentrism will significantly differ from “the anthropocentrisms” developed in the context of other outlook systems. A different meaning will be attributed to the anthropocentrism understood as the opposite to theocentrism, which does not only acknowledges the relationship between the man and God, but brings up a radical alternative: God or man. Another meaning will

be ascribed to the concept of anthropocentrism compared to cosmocentrism or contrasted with the atomic and mechanistic concepts. [14]

Undoubtedly, the differences in understanding this concept affect the ethical consequences resulting from them. While the extreme anthropocentrism (e.g. of the atheistic origin) makes the man the measure of all things, attributes far-reaching autonomy of action to him, the anthropocentrism understood in the theistic context, as well as the Biblical anthropocentrism, will emphasise the responsibility of the man to God and obligation to obey the God's commandments. At this point, the Biblical vision of the man extremely differs from the status of "the lord and owner of the nature" ascribed to the man by Cartesius (*"maître et possesseur de la nature"*). [15] A specific dignity of the man will consist in the likeness to God, expressed by the power of reason and ability to love whereas his freedom will be reflected in his voluntary turn towards the Supreme Good.

The accusation of the complicity of Christianity in ecological devastation of the earth seems to base on the concept of anthropocentrism, which does not stem from the Bible but is the result of "liberating" the man, which took place at the turning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. While de-mythologisation, whose witness is the aforementioned text from Genesis, deprived the world and man himself of the God-related attributes, at the same time maintaining the exceptional position of the latter one as the God's trustee, the breakthrough of the Enlightenment excluded the man from any dependence on God and as the only rational being he became the measure of all things. This radical anthropocentrism, combined with the Enlightenment cult of progress must have led to the absolutisation of human activity. No wonder that the Enlightenment authors and those of later periods, with the same deter-

mination as some people nowadays put forward the declarations perceiving in the Biblical description of the creation the roots of the ecological crisis, noticed in the succeeding Christian anthropology emphasising the man's dependence on God, the enemy of progress, obstacle for developing the genius of the mind and acknowledging the man the rightful place in the world. [16]

This is a fact that the Biblical tales of the man contain a strong impulse, which demythologizes all the created beings. These texts de-sacralise the world. The celestial bodies, plants and animals are deprived of the status of deity and become the components of the reality, which can be used and modelled by the man. The line between "sacrum" and "prophanum" is extremely moved in the manner leaving in this first space only the Creator. He is extremely transcendent towards all other beings and the whole world. Unlike the religious ideas of the peoples surrounding Israel, Jehovah is not perceived as some power, energy (or the sum of energies) supporting the world's existence, but he is the Creator of all the powers and nature forces. Consequently, the nature cannot be understood as the emanation of deity. Israel emphasised the difference and transcendence of God in a radical way. [17] However, did that "de-sacralisation" of the world automatically mean its "profanation," that is an absolute freedom to use and exploit it? The Biblical descriptions of the man's creation do not substantiate a positive answer to this question.

## 2. Ecologically-oriented anthropocentrism

The role and scope of human freedom undoubtedly maintain the key issue in the contemporary ecological discussion. In the context of the debate being conducted on the issues of catastrophic consequences of the man's activity, one could ask a question whether the anthropocentric paradigm can still constitute an adequate instrument for modelling a responsible attitude of the man

towards the world. Actually, there appear a lot of proposals to resign from that anthropocentric paradigm and replace it with a new one, which appreciates other living creatures. This new paradigm would be constituted by biocentrism, attributing the same dignity and moral value both to the entire animate nature and the man or physiocentrism (holism), proclaiming a direct ethical duty of the man towards everything that exists. Proclaiming the holiness of all beings would constitute a step towards "creating cosmic democracy" [18] and "respectful empathy" [19] towards everything that is alive. Thus, the man would have to hold a less favourable position in the world. These proposals often include a strong outlook element as they assume the opposite attitude resulting from the process to that performed by the Biblical texts. The point is "remithologisation" of the world. The aforementioned proposals assume that "Heaven, God and spirituality are the parts of the great universe surrounding us, which is tantamount to the pantheistic perception of the world." [20]

However, such views must face the accusation of leading to the insoluble aporia. On the one hand, assuming the postulate for the radical right equality of each living being (or in case of holism – everything that exists), it is unlikely to escape from the issue of the conflict between the man's interest and interests of other beings. On the other hand, the fact of formulating the postulate for the reorientation of ethics and submitting this postulate as an appeal towards the man, indicates his exceptional place among living creatures. The man's standing in the evolutionary chain is simply distinguished by his – and only his – simultaneous presence in the nature, and through its conscious shaping, above it. However, the extra-human nature lacks one essential quality: ability to moral activity, bearing responsibility. There is a radical asymmetry between the man and surrounding world in this field. Noticing the

disastrous effects of his activity and willingness to undo his own mistakes, the man can only turn to himself: it is only him that can be a subject of morality and addressee of moral imperatives. It is only with himself that the man can make a treaty for respecting all living creatures. He cannot delegate his responsibility, as he is the only being who can bear responsibility for the surrounding environment.

Although the surrounding nature cannot be the addressee of moral imperatives, it can and should become their content. [21] And this statement is crucial: it is not only other human beings that are "duty-bearing objects" for the man, but also everything that is alive and exists, of course, within a reasonable range.

Thus, it seems to be unlikely to escape from the properly understood anthropocentrism. It does not need and cannot mean excluding "sympathy" (*compassion*) to all creations. The alternative presenting the vision of the man either ontically closely related to the whole nature and being only a part of it or a tyrant, ruthlessly and arrogantly exploiting the earth, seems to be wrong. At that point, there might appear a surprising question: does the imperfectness of the human rule over the world have to stay invariable? It might be only temporary and human abilities will be shortly enhanced, as the man will take the evolution of his own species in his own hands.

### 3. Autocreator?

At first sight, it seems that is it anthropocentrism, emphasising the man's responsibility for the world, that leads to formulating the postulate stating that at this stage of development the man should take his fate in his own hands and consciously direct the evolution including the evolution of his own species. Paradoxically, in order to justify this historic mission, there are sometimes made references to the Biblical anthropocentric

concept. God, having created the man equipped with freedom, in some measure "liberated" him from any tutelage so that he could create and give moral norms by himself. According to the President of the Max Planck German Scientific Society, Prof. Hubert Markl, human dignity makes the man exceed all the limits. He should not only disrespect any "Rubicons," but also find or wilfully mark newer and newer passages. Although Markl in his comment does not refer to Genesis, he states that he would not be able to accept the image of God, who grants the man the right to liberate from any genetically determined limitations of the nature. [22]

Dealing with the human interference in the nature, one should pay attention to the crucial term distinction. Where the term "nature" hides the meaning of the world of animate and inanimate beings surrounding the man, it would be difficult to forbid him any interference in it. Since the very beginning of his hominisation the man has not been doing anything else but interfering in the nature. This concept of "nature" is opposite to the term of "culture," as its creation belongs to the fundamental characteristics of human beings. [23] Today, no one of course is going to state that this concept of "nature", which covers everything that the man finds, constitutes just "a raw material" without any self-contained value or that the human interference in it is morally indifferent. Within the range of his knowledge, the man should follow the principle of responsibility, but his right to interfere in such understood nature is unquestionable. [24]

However, does this concept of "nature" also cover the man himself? Does the fact that he is not allowed to interfere *in the surrounding nature* imply his being able to improve his *own nature* as well? At first sight, one can notice that we deal with two different concepts of nature in one sentence. Unlike the first, quantitative term, the latter one

refers to quality. The term of "human nature" refers here to the internal structure of the man, the first and fundamental principle of his existence. It is "the human nature" that differentiates the man from the world, which surrounds him.

As a result of the qualitative difference between both concepts, we have the difference in the ethical judgement of both interferences. Since the human nature is endowed with the characteristics, which make it distinguishable among other living creatures, it also has an exceptional dignity. The voice of this belief is constituted by the man's rights, as well as the recognition of the unreducible value of each individual entity. Any form of their objectification, i.e. use as the means to achieve other aims, constitutes the violation of this dignity.

Rejecting this difference, which is acknowledged that the man is exactly the same biological structure as all other animate beings (according to genetics, *homo sapiens* could be defined as the third species of a chimpanzee; the difference within the genome is not bigger than 0.5%!), would certainly have to lead to admitting legitimacy of any interferences in the human nature including eugenic strengthening of the species or making the evolution steer towards breaking the human race into several subspecies, inhabiting different ecological niches. However, if one recognises the inviolable dignity of each human entity, it will constitute a crucial measure of interference in the human nature.

Today, the possibilities of this interference are more viable than ever. One of them is a germ-line therapy. This form of a gene therapy, whose effects, distinct from a somatic therapy, are inherited by offspring or directly related to human embryos at early stages of their development, asks a straightforward question about the ethical limitations of interference in the human nature. Although the man does not create a human

life as such, and his interference in it, even at the genetic level, constitutes only emulating and using the natural processes, he is able to significantly predetermine its final form. Like many other contexts of contemporary biotechnology, this area is also opened out to the chances of eliminating diseases and pathologies and that is not at the level of the effects but genetics, i.e. the causes. Apart from the question of safety and efficiency of this kind of manipulation, there appears a more fundamental question. This interference in the human nature, whether at the individual or species level, is based on one important assumption: predetermining the characteristics of an individual person or human race, we assume that the mankind (or particular scientists) have the optimum, best vision of the man and humanity. The result of this vision will attribute more value to human characteristics than to any others; it also assumes a specific concept of a successful human life.

Predetermination makes that the man owes his characteristics not to "the genetic roulette," as it has been thought so far, but to the planned activity of other people. Thus, the only alternative to this natural process of the human being creation is the external manipulation. It means a radical heteronomy of the human entity consisting in defining by other people "the field of activity," which is constituted by a genetic structure of the individual. Thus, there is carried out a conscious selection of the vital potential of particular individuals. Of course, the justification of these activities can be noble, which does not change the fact that the man becomes an object of manipulation and is forced to realize the vision of humanity of his creators. [25]

If a desire of interfering in the human nature is justified by the need of optimising the human race, there occurs another significant change: a single human entity is no longer a value on his own, whereas the spe-

cies of homo sapiens is personified taking almost personal qualities. Such reasoning slightly reminds the logic of ant-hill, where particular individuals are subordinate to the interest of the whole. The ultimate consequence of these activities might be a kind of "the rule of the dead over the alive", which is the rule of the present generation over the future ones, whose genetic equipment will be predetermined.

While mentioning once again the description of the creation of the man, it can be stated that he constitutes the starting point to treat each single individual as a self-contained value regardless of anyone's acceptance. The man does not need to justify the fact of his existence and present condition before any human tribunal, as the simple fact of his existence proves the God's approval. A desire to mould the human nature puts the mankind nearly in the role of a demiurge repeating after the Creator "Let us make man after our likeness" (cf. Chapter 1, 26). The man might not possess the knowledge, which would aspire to the role of the final explanation of the human being; such cognition is and will stay partial in spite of the entire technological progress. The deistic image of the Creator as the Heavenly Watchmaker, who having created the world abandoned it to its fate, not only allowing but simply forcing the man to take the evolution of his own species in his hands, is not substantiated in the Bible.

Another description of the creation of the man, presented hereabove, includes the tale, which warns the man not to succumb to this kind of omnipotence. It is the tale of a temptation and sin (cf. Chapter 3). According to this tale, the sin of the Paradisiacal Couple originated from the loss of confidence in the sense of the limitations established by the Creator. They were no longer perceived as the guarantees of the human freedom and seemed to be simply the opposite: a nonsensical prohibition imposed on the man by

the Creator envious of his position. The core of the temptation is the promise of the Biblical tempter, who unfolds the vision of receiving the God's prerogatives and being "as gods" (Chapter 3, 5). The intention ends catastrophically not only for the man, but also "the garden," which had been entrusted with him.

Once more, the tale of the sin emphasises and presents, from the negative side, one of the main thoughts of both descriptions of the creation. Although the man's domination over the earth, including a wise interference in its form, is fully legitimate, it is not unrestricted. The wisdom and greatness of the man consists not only in the better and better learning the world, which extends the range of his possibilities of interference in the surrounding nature, but also in recognizing and respecting the limits of this interference. And all that for the God's trustee not to become the cause of the annihilation of the garden entrusted with him or himself. And here it is a complete content of the Biblical anthropocentrism. It contains the delight of the man's greatness although at the same time it does not turn a blind eye to his fundamental weakness and sinfulness.

The awareness of his own exceptionality brings the man the extremely antagonistic attitudes. While looking at the results of his actions and destructive potential of the interference in the nature, the man proclaims the readiness to self-limitations and moves as far as divesting himself of his position in the surrounding world. At the same time, the stupefaction with the enormous potential of new technologies and possibilities arouses a desire to seize the absolute power over the creation. In this context the Biblical point of view appears as a relatively balanced concept, which admits the man a relative autonomy to shape the surrounding world, simultaneously indicating its limitations.

Referring to the manner of using the Biblical texts during the conducted bioethical discussion, it is worth giving a critical notice to the fact that if isolated of a wider context and deprived of theological meanings, the key concepts of the Biblical anthropology, such as "the image and likeness after God", "the order of creation" but also "subduing the earth", might take a completely different meaning. These endeavours are beyond any reproach until the new meanings, different from the original ones, wish to participate in the authority of the Bible itself and are used as the warrant of the unrestricted and wilful interference of the man in the environment and his own nature or the key witness of the reprehensible degradation of the nature and kind of "a bogey" concerning any man's interference in his environment. [26]

## Summary

The analysis of the Biblical description of the creation, with reference to both the negative (responsibility for the ecological catastrophe), and the positive (permission for the man's interference in the surrounding and his own nature) connotations, shows that while the Bible demythologises the world surrounding the man, it does not give the unlimited prerogatives to him. In spite of his power, which is the element of his "likeness" to God, he stays the God's trustee, responsible to God for the undertaken interferences. This relative anthropocentrism requires a great deliberation in the use of new possibilities, which are given to the man by the contemporary biotechnology and summons the man to a voluntary acceptance of the limits of his power over the creation. The painful experiences of the mankind and perspectives of the global threat, connected with the advances of technology, constitute a challenge at least as serious as still undiscovered secrets of nature.■



## References

- [1] The author knowingly omits here the question concerning the reasonableness to use this term. Some authors rather want to talk about "so-called bioethics", expressing at the same time their distance to this term. Cf. B. Wolniewicz, O tzw. bioetyce, "Medycyna Wieku Rozwojowego" 5 (2001) supplement I to no. 1, p. 155: "Today's fashionable "bioethics" is mainly the sophistry aimed at obscuring the fact that a human embryo is a human being."
- [2] John Paul II, On Guard of Human Life. A speech to the participants of the International Congress devoted to bioethics (17. 02. 1996.), "L' Osservatore Romano" (Pl) 6 (1996), p. 27
- [3] Cf. L. White, The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis, in: D. Spring / E. Spring (edit.), Ecology and Religion in History, New York 1974, p. 15-31.
- [4] There could be mentioned C. Amery (Das Ende der Vorsehung. Die gnadenlosen Folgen des Christentums, Rein bei Hamburg 1974) or E. Drewermann (Der tödliche Fortschritt. Von der Zerstörung der Erde und des Menschen im Erbe des Christentums, Regensburg 1986).
- [5] H. Skolimowski, Nowe oblicze Boga w dobie ekologicznej, in: J. Dębowski (edit.), Religia a ruchy ekofilozoficzne, Olsztyn 1996, p. 17.
- [6] Cf. M. Peter, Prehistoria biblijna, Poznań 1994, p. 13 n.
- [7] The use of the plural form remains a puzzle for the exegesis. One of the theories considers the form to be a kind of the God's self-reflection (pluralis deliberativus). Cf. M. Peter, Prehistoria biblijna, citat., p. 17; G. von Rad, Das erste Buch Mose (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, vol. 2/4), Göttingen 1967, p. 44 n.
- [8] Cf. L. Scheffczyk, Die Welt als Schöpfung Gottes, Aschaffenburg 1968, p. 14-15.
- [9] Cf. J. Scharbert, Genesis 1-11 (Die Neue Echter Bibel), Würzburg 21985, 44-45.
- [10] It refers to the verbs kabash and raddah in Chapter 1,28.
- [11] Ibidem, p. 50-51.
- [12] Cf. G. Löhr, Ist das Christentum für die gegenwärtige ökologische Krise verantwortlich?, "Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift" 14 (1997) i. 1, p. 113.
- [13] See P. Feldhaus, Anthropozentrik, in: W. Korff, L. Beck, P. Mikat (edit.), Lexikon der Bioethik, vol. 1, Gütersloh 2000, p. 177.
- [14] Ibidem.
- [15] R. Descartes, Discours de la méthode, Mainz 1948, p. 148 (the study was published for the first time in Paris in 1637).
- [16] Por. F. Gruber, Im Haus des Lebens. Eine Theologie der Schöpfung, Regensburg 2001, s. 17-19. Także A. Papuzinski, Kryzys ekologiczny a chrześcijańska doktryna religijna, w: J. Dembowski (red.), Religia a ruchy ekofilozoficzne, citat., s. 60-63.
- [17] Cf. E. Schockenhoff, Ethik des Lebens. Ein theologischer Grundriß, Mainz 1993, p. 107 n.
- [18] Cf. H. Skolimowski, Nowe oblicze Boga, citat., p. 19.
- [19] Ibidem, p. 24.
- [20] Ibidem, p. 20.
- [21] Cf. W. Korff, Umweltethik, in: M. Junkernheinrich, P. Klemmer, G. R. Wagner (edit.), Handbuch zur Umweltökonomie, Berlin 1995, p. 280.
- [22] Cf. H. Markl, Von Caesar lernen heißt forschen lernen, "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" i. 25. 06. 2001, p. 52.
- [23] The Biblical description of the creation even seems to suggest some "flaw" in the man's attitude towards the surrounding nature. The man will never find an ultimate fulfilment in it, therefore his complete return to the nature, his joining the nature just as a part of it, is not possible. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, Schöpfung durch das Wort im Alten Testament. Ein Weg von Gen 2 zu Gen 1, in: W. Strolz (edit.), Schöpfung und Sprache, Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1979, p. 35-36.
- [24] Cf. H. Jonas, Zasada odpowiedzialności. Etyka dla cywilizacji technologicznej (translated by M. Klimowicz), Kraków 1996.
- [25] Cf. E. Schockenhoff, Ethik des Lebens, citat., p. 264-267.
- [26] Cf. E. Schockenhoff, Die Würde ist immer die Würde des anderen, "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" of 23.01.2002, p. 44.

*Rev. Prof. Marian Machinek MSF  
 University of Warmia and Mazury  
 Faculty of Theology  
 ul. Hozjusza 15, 11-041 Olsztyn, Poland*