

Luka Perušić*

Fritz Jahr as Methodological Paradigm in Bioethical Education

SUMMARY

The paper examines Fritz Jahr as a possible role-model in bioethical education. It consists of two parts. The first part builds upon the acknowledged data and theories about how Fritz Jahr proposed the bioethical imperative and changed his way of thinking. It provides arguments for and against known claims and expands the knowledge background with the focus on reconstructing the thought process and some presumptions that led to the formulation of bioethical imperative. The second part uses these results to infer five features to show how we can extract and define methodological features from Jahr's personality and activity, which confirm and enhance integrative projects. An attempt has been made to understand that something such as "Jahrian methodology", might be sensible enough to provide scientific knowledge and cultural orientation without simplifying the *bios*, but that it is pointless without integration with educational models, and to emphasise this I conclusively consider the role of bioethicists in the 21st century.

Keywords: Fritz Jahr, bioethics, science, worldview, education, sensibility, synthesis, openness, innovativity, autocriticality.

Introduction

Most research papers on Jahr's bio-ethical demand focus on the implied scope of the formulation he postulated, and the theoretical and practical repercussions we ought to consider once the imperative sets into motion¹. Appropriately, these studies relate Jahr's vision of (necessary) moral broadening in the approach to

* *Correspondence Address:* Luka Perušić, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3, 10000, Zagreb. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5339-781X>. E-mail: lperusic@yahoo.com.

1 For example, such studies were done by Engels (2011), Eterović (2011), Goldim (2009), Jurić (2015), Kalokairinou (2016/2017), Kos (2014), Lima (2009), Lolas (2017), Łuków (2014), Rinčić, Muzur (2011), Sass (2007), Steger (2015), Zagorac (2011), Ziętek (2014), etc.

living beings with the contemporary conceptual advancement in the framework of bioethical projects such as integrative bioethics and European bioethics, altogether suggesting that the underlying logic of bio-ethical imperative justifies (and predates) contemporary expansion of bioethical discourse (global bioethics, land ethics, future ethics, sustainable bioethics, world ethos project, and so on), and its complementing practice.² Many authors mention and explore researchers and artists that Jahr was reading and who influenced his thought. The efforts suggest that Jahr transformed these influences into thrusters for a shift from ethical to bio-ethical understanding of the supreme principle of morality by integrating scientific and extra-scientific perspectives, and thus the interpreters emphasise the relevancy of his synthetic conclusion. Nevertheless, bioethics has developed to an immense level of complexity without anyone knowing about Jahr's work. The question is: why should anyone care?

Unlike Presocratics, Plato and Aristotle, the fathers of philosophy, or De Saussure, the father of linguistics, or Galilei as the father of modern science, or even in that sense Van Rensselaer Potter as the (American) father of bioethics, Jahr did not directly influence the initial development of "his discipline". Before discovering Jahr, the entirety of Jahr's suggestions, principles, and remarks were already discussed in abundance across the world, in various argumentative forms, within and outside bioethics. Certainly, his writings provide historical proof for the value of European integrative and holistic tendencies in culture and science in general (both good and bad), and it is certainly important to learn *bioethics* as a term has a meaning alternative to American *bioethics*. But it seems that from this point on, establishing a different bioethical paradigm on the grounds of historically prior and different coining of the term does not seem meaningful because the bioethical enterprise was already highly operational. In that sense, I disagree with Azariah when he writes that Jahr was a path-maker, "the one who brings about, for the very first time, a paradigm shift in an ideology" (Azariah 2012: 295). Jahr did not do so. He might have done something revolutionary, had the history played out differently, for example, had he had the opportunities that Marx had, as Rita Kielstein speculated (2014: 44).

Be that as it may, we are the ones who retroactively find importance in his work. Why do we do it? I want to emphasise that there are roughly two groups of bioethicist: those who nurture the American meaning of the word *bioethics*, and those who do not. To rely on Jahr as the founding father, even in this quite unusual sense of identifying several principles and notions from few short texts, strangely imbues many bioethical efforts of the latter group with a deeper meaning. Blatantly

2 For example, (Engels, 2011: 476–477), (Goldim 2009: 379), (Jurić, 2015: 38, 41–42), (Kos, 2014: 230, 232–233), (Sass, 2007: 292), (Steger, 2015: 216), (Zagorac, 2011: 148–149), etc.

speaking, they stop being a “deviant tide” in the mainstream bioethics because there exist footholds to their authentic nature. As Jahr already showed in his papers, the entire history of human thought contains specific bioethical reasoning endorsed by “Jahrian” bioethicists, faithfully aligned with the initial philosophical culture nurtured for thousands of years, now surfacing with every new study conducted within the bioethical framework. However, this argument is not enough to properly acknowledge Jahrian studies. Defining things, experimenting with ideas, proposing imperatives, and testing possibilities are neither new nor rare. Giacomo Leopardi, Søren Kierkegaard and Mikhail Epstein, to address but three very different thinking styles and periods, proposed and experimented with a vast amount of ideas, and most good interdisciplinary studies on morality will look into Kant, Plato and Aristotle because, in some way, they already reasoned many crucial problems. Again, we ought to wonder why should we pay any attention to Jahr's thoughts.

As a topic of study, Jahr is a hub of various bioethical projects across the world, and I claim that all of them share qualities that Jahr as a person had, which I found intriguing. I reason that what makes Jahr important for bioethical studies and can make him important for the broader scientific culture is (a) how he came to propose the bioethical imperative and (b) who he was at the time. The initial observation is that the knowledge on the two given points might provide resources for advancing science, and in that sense bioethics, towards a better serving enterprise. There is some interesting “common sense” clarity present in Jahr's papers, almost methodological, and how these qualities are easily recognisable makes Jahr's work useful for demonstrations. However, ultimately, this paper handles behaviour and intentionality of bioethicists. At the surface of the public role of bioethicists in the current context of its institutionalised power, the following applies:

“Because bioethics constitutes a resource for the formation of public policy which impacts upon the social world, how bioethics filters into policy channels itself becomes a public issue.” (Priaux, 2013: 8; cf. 15)

The results are, however, only an outcome of what kind of scientists and persons we are, since we, as living beings, are what truly constitutes bioethics and society in which we act. Thus, examining him as a possible role model in bioethical education might provide some use to us. I wanted to explore the possibility that this “humble teacher” (Rinčić, Muzur, 2011: 550) might serve as an *idea*, as a role model for future bioethicists and their research.

The report is organised into two parts. In the following part, I build upon the acknowledged data and theories about how Fritz Jahr came to propose the bioethical imperative and what it is. I provide arguments for and against known claims and expand the knowledge background with the focus on reconstructing the thought

process and some presumptions that led to the formulation, to establish platform for the second part in which I use these results to show how from Jahr's personality and activity we can extract and define a bioethical methodology which confirms and enhances the methodology of integrative bioethics and similar projects towards overcoming many problems we encounter in contemporary scientific culture and transdisciplinary projects. I conclusively consider the role of bioethicists in the 21st century.«

I. The Who of Bioethical Imperative

In his crucial paper “Bio-Ethics. Reviewing the Ethical Relations of Humans Towards Animals and Plants”³, Jahr peculiarly opens his line of arguments by claiming that (i) the objective study of nature is what we as a civilisation should be praised for, and that (ii) philosophy cannot prescribe scientific ideals anymore (Jahr, 2010: 227).⁴ There is no research paper on Jahr that addresses this glaring attack on philosophy's role in the culture, which is strange because many Jahrian bioethicists are philosophers. I find that this should be addressed because Jahr's claim appears to be in direct conflict with the broader critique of sciences as introduced through the project of European bioethics.⁵ However, at the same time, it seems to me that it somehow has to be reasoned that after his initial claims (i, ii), Jahr looked for the arguments in various traditions of thought and different philosophical analyses. Furthermore, even though he may not have liked the practices, (iii) Jahr's justification of animal

3 For the analysis of the texts, I used the original writings in German (Sass 2011) and conferred with Croatian (Muzur & Rinčić 2012), and English (Muzur & Sass 2010/2012) translations.

4 This makes Jahr and Potter somewhat similar in their initial commentary before introducing the notion of bioethics, especially when we consider the fact that both emphasised the importance of biology. Contreras Islas wrote the following: “One of the central tasks of bioethics consists in interpreting scientific knowledge produced by social and biological sciences (about nature in general, and human nature in particular) to obtain normative statements, i.e. moral norms and values, in order to provide orientation for scientific (but also political) decision-making. The idea behind this process was already presented in Jahr's paper, but is better expressed by the American biochemist Van R. Potter in 1971, when he writes that in order to face the future challenges of our species – ethical values cannot be separated from biological facts.” (Contreras Islas, 2018:29) I would like to emphasise, however, that this commentary, although mostly true, is misleading. Initially, Potter articulates bioethics so that humanity can survive proper, but Jahr articulates bioethics so that every living being is treated appropriately.

5 The social problems that brought bioethics to life and hastened its development, which was pragmatically identified as the three stages of historical growth of bioethics: “new medical ethics”, “global bioethics”, and “integrative bioethics” (Čović, 2012: 194–196), were exclusively a result of the exploitation of the “neutrality” of specialised empirical sciences and unmonitored techno-scientific growth, whose proponents did not endorse holistic, unifying or integrative approaches to scientific culture, and were neglecting the wholeness of reality (cf. Potter, 1971: 2). To counter this, European and/or integrat(iv)e bioethicists emphasise the need to base the research process on philosophy. American bioethicists also began to realise that. Cf. now famous paper by Savulescu (2015). Also, instructive for this topic is to compare the entries between the latest edition of *Encyclopaedia of Bioethics* (Jennings 2014) and the prior editions. The most obvious update is the inclusion of many abstracts and philosophical notions.

(ab)use for the higher goals of science⁶ appears to make Jahr a more sensible follower of modern anthropocentric science. If we take into account claims by some authors that Jahr endorsed a Darwinian struggle for life between species (cf. Hurst 2017: 63–64)⁷, then Jahr does not fit the type of bioethicist that may have rediscovered, for example, a new ground for biocentrism⁸. However, Jahr also proposed that precisely this anthropocentric, Cartesian view on the world led us to a change in thinking,⁹ to a “revolution” [*Umwälzung*, perhaps “overturning”] (Jahr, 2010: 227 / 2011: 1), which can be thought in the sense of different advanced perspectives as particulars gathering into an overturning worldview. Thus, based on (i), (ii) and (iii), there seems to be some (a) discrepancy between integrat(iv)e bioethics and Jahr, as well as (b) inconsistency in Jahr's core thinking.

My attempt to understand this began with trying to identify a broader “key” phenomenon with which Jahr was occupied regardless of any special focus he had in any of his papers. Rinčić and Muzur concluded that Jahr showed the most interest in the problems of Fifth commandment, sexual ethics, pedagogy, and non-human ethics (Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 59). I think that we can find a governing phenomenon. Various fragments in his work led me to believe that the key phenomenon his discussions initiated from is the problem of formation and endorsement of (world) views/beliefs (*Weltanschauung* and *Gedankentwelt*, *Gesinnung* and *Einstellung*). In Jahr's paper, these variances intertwine in various forms and often relate to roughly the same spectre of phenomena.¹⁰

6 It is an idea which we can trace back to Descartes: “...and all animals easily communicate to us their natural impulses of anger, fear, hunger, etc., doing this by sounds and movements. However, it has never been observed that any brute animal has attained the perfection of using real speech, i.e. of indicating by sound or gesture something relating solely to thought and not to natural impulse. (...) For brevity's sake I omit the other reasons for denying thought to animals. Please note that I'm speaking of thought, and not of life or sensation. I don't deny life to animals, since I regard life as consisting simply in the heat of the heart; and I don't deny sensation, in so far as that depends on a part of the body. Thus my opinion is not as hard on animals as it is kind to human beings—at least to those who aren't given to the superstitions of Pythagoras—because it clears them from even a suspicion of crime when they eat or kill animals...” (Descartes, 2015: 216) Cf. Hatfield, 2008: 420–422, for a brief look into a somewhat different tradition of Cartesian thought, in which Descartes “granted” feelings to animals, though it seems that it was not relevant.

7 Although there was no direct confrontation between authors, it can be shown that what many authors claim is against some of Hurst's conclusions. I am fairly convinced that some Hurst's claims have no substantial arguments, but it seems to me that when Hurst comments on Jahr's acceptance of “Darwinian struggle”, he is on to something regarding Jahr's disposition, in my opinion, much closer to Engels' despite her inspiring paper on Jahr and Darwin.

8 Commonly claimed in Jahrian studies. For example, (Engels, 2011: 500; 2014: 94), (Jurić, 2015: 37), Ziętek (2014:202–203), and (Steger, 2015: 215–216).

9 Or, what Assisi symbolised.

10 In translated texts (English, Croatian, Spanish, etc.), they most often appear under the same words, such as *worldview* and *disposition*, sometimes meaning the same thing, sometimes not. The words that are used in translation to one language are often, however, complementary to versions from other languages, in various degrees.

If we take into the account the context of the use of this phrase in all occurrences in Jahr's text, although he was reading Kant's work, or at least heard about some aspects of Kant's philosophy (cf. Jahr, 2012: 10), it seems that he did not speak of *Weltanschauung* in the original Kantian sense of supersensible power of human mind (see KU 5: 351/ KU 5: 255, cf. Zagorac 2017: 131–132), but in the sense developed by German thinkers after their own reading of Kant, a sense that grew into what we today commonly understand as having a *worldview*. In reference to Kant, *Gesinnung* is used in Kant's most important papers in the form roughly the same as Jahr's.¹¹ The difference is easiest to understand in reference to Karl Jaspers, who argued:

“What is world-view [Weltanschauung]? In any case it is something naturally whole and something universal. (...) not individual expertise, rather knowledge as wholeness, as cosmos. But *Weltanschauung* is not only knowledge, but it also reveals itself in the valuation, in the order of values. (...) When we talk about *Weltanschauung*, we mean powers or ideas, the complete totality of [hu]man, both subjectively as experience, strength, and attitude [*Gesinnung*], and objectively as the concretely shaped world.” (Jaspers, 1912: 1)

With Jaspers, the case is that he used both notions to address the individual sphere, but the difference is clear. This difference seems more significant in Jahr's application. Jahr uses *Weltanschauung* and *Gedankenwelt/Gedankenheit* when discussing group worldviews, and when discussing personal dispositions, he uses *Gesinnung* and *Einstellung*.¹² In most of the papers, Jahr deals with the problem of worldviews either in the first or the second sense, and all the central papers in some way discuss these phenomena.¹³

That being said, let us examine the framework in which Jahr introduces the bioethical imperative, concerning the two issues I previously stated. The first step is to articulate the application of *Weltanschauung*, and the second step is to clarify the three comments Jahr made, which I previously cited. The result clears away some possible misunderstandings when thinking about Fritz Jahr as a founding father and a possible role model.

11 For example, KRV A748/B776; KU 5: 263–264.

12 “Gesinnungsdiktatur oder Gedankenfreiheit?” is a good example. In the first three paragraphs, Jahr uses *Gesinnung*, and in the final part of the fourth paragraph, where he addresses the German state, he shifts to *Gedankenheit* (cf. Jahr 2011: 23–24).

13 In his first paper, “Weltsprache und Weltsprachen”, Jahr discusses the problem of applying *one world language* to many cultures, in “Wissenschaft vom Leben Und Sittenlehre”, in which he formulates the imperative, his concluding comments related to teaching *Gesinnung* in class – the purpose of the paper is to show how we ought to change the system of creating worldviews (Jahr, 1926: 605). In “Gesinnungsdiktatur oder Gedankenfreiheit?”, Jahr dedicates his entire discussion to the problem of worldviews in teaching, in “Soziale und sexuelle Ethik in der Tageszeitung”, he discusses the creation and dissemination of public opinion, in “Zwei ethische Grundprobleme in ihrem Gegensatz und in ihrer Vereinigung im sozialen Leben”, he analyses two fundamental human dispositions/ attitudes [*Einstellung*] to contribute to *social ethics*. And so forth.

I. I. *Weltanschauung*

In “Bio-Ethik”, Jahr begins his line of argument by dispelling Europe’s attempt to unite as one under one *Weltanschauung*:

“The heart of the European human being up to the French Revolution was fighting towards the unity of religious, philosophical, and scientific knowledge; but such unity had to be abandoned under the pressure of more information.” (Jahr, 2010: 227);

“When the unity of the European weltanschauung broke down at the end of the Baroque period, European intellectual life for the first time was ready for the influence of foreign weltanschauungs [Gedankenwelten] without prejudice.” (Jahr, 2010: 228)¹⁴

With these two comments, Jahr roughly outlined global cultural events unfolding throughout three centuries before Jahr. The origins can be traced to the 25th session of the Council of Trent, where rules and goals regarding the creation of images were established to incite piety, teaching faith, and eliminating idolatry, for which they were criticised by the Protestants (Council of Trent, 1848). Baroque became a signature style of the Roman Catholic Church attempting to keep their believers and retain its power through the expression of the magnificence of the dogma it controlled in spite of the flourishing of the opposition—the Protestant Reformation which based its alienation in the critique of precisely the power the Catholic Church nurtured. The broader conflict eventually led to the infamous Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648) that grew towards the reinvention of the old political conflict of the House of Habsburg and the Kingdom of France. The devastation of Central Europe led to an intellectual outrage that gave birth to the Enlightenment in a broader sense, which in turn built a platform for the advancement of science in general.

Furthermore, the 17th century was the century of colonial expansion, initiated by the same nations that played a major geopolitical role for the Roman Catholic Church, more precisely France and Spain (cf. Bleiberg, 2004: xix–xxxii). However, it was in France, a latter major side in geopolitical conflicts, where the Ancien Régime in the 18th century brought misery to its nation by supporting a grotesquely opulent class of aristocrats and clergy that exploited its people (cf. de Tocqueville 2011: 80–101). The Enlightenment movement was further fuelled by the discovery of the plurality of cultures via colonial expansion, and in return it seeded among the working class new understanding of equality and freedom that eventually led to the fall of the Ancien Régime in France, that is, to the French Revolution a century after, once the terrible financial management took its toll (cf. Berman 2019: 51–57). Elsewhere, changes

¹⁴ Engels touched upon these two crucial statements, but didn’t explore the implications of their background. See (Engels, 2011: 476–477).

in mentality already began with Luther's initiative—the final outcome of both the conflict of two faiths and the Thirty Year's War was the establishment of individuality, both in the form of personal orientation (cf. Barzun 2000: 3–20) and in the form of independent cities and national states. This course of events prepared the European consciousness for a twofold change: for other cultures to influence Europe, which is how the Indian philosophy made its way into the minds of Western humanists, and for artists and intellectuals to rebel against the Age of Reason, which imposed rational unity. Thus, various “intuitions of the world” at the same time conflicted and influenced one another in a mental breakthrough. This, I believe, is what Jahr meant with the two quotes cited above: that our specific intuition of the world drove us to the point of turnover, of overflow from enforced singularity to natural plurality, and that this was justified by the results obtained from the cultural experience and scientific investigation. To know that Jahr was well aware of the epochal situation can lead us towards conviction that his proposal of the bioethical imperative emerged in a mental framework conscious of great historical changes that occurred before Jahr's operative period. The conclusion is that Jahr does not merely adjust his beliefs and applies knowledge on the level of incidental research, but that he does so concerning the broader whole, by having a sense of the historical course.

In that sense, the question is how the three initial claims I previously cited constitute his disposition.

I. II. Objective science, philosophy and animal abuse

Jahr's first claim, a claim about the importance of objective science, reflects the fact that such intellectual progress majorly contributed to the overcoming of various misleads born from subjective misinterpretations, such as the false truth of Cartesian interpretation of animals or the false interpretation of cosmological model by the Church. Amidst the historical events I previously described, modern science was marked by a conflict between Galileo Galilei and the Church in its inception.¹⁵ Objective and experimental science had to make a breakthrough within the rigid religious and political framework existing in Europe, and philosophical ideas that grounded themselves in empirical knowledge continued to provoke.¹⁶

¹⁵ The conflict was initiated by cardinal Robert Bellarmino, who was previously a member of the inquisition during trials against Giordano Bruno, and later by a Dominican Vincenzo Maculano. Unlike Bruno, Galileo had enough important followers and friends within the Church to keep him from suffering a similar fate (cf. Odifreddi 2009). In 1992, Pope John Paul II confirmed that Galileo was mistreated and issued an apology (Finocchiaro 1989: 308).

¹⁶ A good example we can find precisely in Jahr's case when he refers to Adolf Wagner's book *Die Vernunft der Pflanze*. The book did not just motivate Jahr, it suggested ideas that stirred many researchers (cf. Rothe 1925).

Naturally, this makes us wonder about Jahr's second claim, a claim that "philosophy can no longer prescribe leading ideals for natural sciences". As far as I can conclude, the case is that Jahr probably viewed philosophy either as a manifestation of *weltanschauung* or as a tool for formulating a *weltanschauung*, which was quite normal during the first half of 20th century, and was spread through the Europe by two strong currents, on the one hand, by (neo)positivists who rigorously rejected metaphysical and theistic discourse (Lolas emphasises this at one occasion, cf. 2012: 121), and on the other hand, by romanticism, Schelling, Schopenhauer and their intellectual followers, who advanced the concept of philosophy as a worldview-building endeavour (cf. Zagorac 2017: 132–133). More specifically, Jahr probably challenged the ideas of philosophical world-building because a worldview is fundamentally related to morality, and morality is the core subject matter of ethics. I find it possible to conclude that, for Jahr, philosophy had an orientational value Jürgen Mittelstraß wrote about (Kos, 2014: 233–234), and it was perhaps considered to have the performative power to posit normativity. Jahr's disposition might have also been fuelled by the strong Protestant tradition in Halle, since, as Ziętek explained, the Protestant ethics is subjectivist and relies on personal interpretation of the Bible (Ziętek 2014: 208). We can follow this line of argument in his paper "Gesinnungsdiktatur oder Gedankenfreiheit?" (1930). It begins with Jahr's argument that a worldview [*Gesinnung*] can be traced to moral values, which is something that science does not have. Afterwards, Jahr argued in favour of changing the way we educate the young, which implies that morality can be taught and worldviews altered. Then, Jahr's reaction against philosophy perhaps occurred because he felt that rigid philosophy lacking objective data might cause a misleading understanding of the purpose of morality. Thus, because it was a philosophical argument that separated humans and gods from other living beings, he somehow had to connect empirically-based sciences with morality, and philosophy (as a *weltanschauung*) was in the way.

However, it then seems that Jahr is inconsistent because he draws the majority of arguments from philosophers. The solution lies in the realisation that Jahr seems to have differentiated between subjective and objective philosophy. We can find these clues in his other papers, for example, in his paper "Zwei ethische Grundprobleme in ihrem Gegensatz und in ihrer Vereinigung im sozialen Leben" (1928), in which he uses the phrase "philosophischen und theologischen wissenschaftlichen Ethik". From his commentary on science as a possible source of worldview in "Gesinnungsdiktatur oder Gedankenfreiheit?", it is clear that he fundamentally does not have a problem with worldviews as such, but with subjective, uncritically examined worldviews absorbed by cultural inertia, but also, he is cautious regarding science, which we can read from his paper "Unsere Zweifel an Gott" (1933). Thus, Jahr is neither

for philosophy or science nor against either. Ultimately, he is against unreflected subjectivity treated as critical objectivity.

Jahr's third claim, a claim by which he approved the use of animals for experiment and continuation of such practice, I again find to be connected to what he identified as the European *weltanschauung*. We can see this in the way in which he reports on various habits without encoding it morally towards "Occident" or "Orient". Simply put, it was our habitual way of handling the truth of life. It was the method of living and thinking we nurtured for centuries. Jahr acknowledged this. In a sense, it, too, is the truth of this world. Moreover, for better or for worse, it helped us to understand what we were doing, and it helped us indisputably understand what animals are¹⁷. The important thing is that even though we are not to forget the danger of our practices, we should not hold a grudge against humankind. Instead, we are to open a new page in history and change our ways to the best of our abilities, until it "takes a hold in us" (Jahr, 2010: 229)¹⁸. In other words:

"Our self-education, in this regard, already has made essential progress, but we have to go further, so that the guiding rule for our actions may be the bio-ethical demand." (Jahr, 2010: 230)

However, as soon as it may seem that he somehow supported the Western idea of animal and plant treatment, Jahr wrote the following:

"Unfortunately, legal regulations against prevention or punishment of those tortures are not strongly enough introduced in all civilized countries [Kulturlaendern]. But, we are on the road of progress and animal protection get more and more support in wider circles, (...) no cultivated human being (...) without criticism accepts that a thug [Flegel] without any afterthought beheads flowers with a stick while on the walk or that children break flowers only to throw them away after a few steps." (Jahr, 2010: 230)

What Jahr did acknowledge was the specific tradition of the most prevailing European *understanding* of animals and plants and the people's habits that culturally developed with time. He did not propose radical changes, rather, he pointed at the fact that our sense of bioethical imperative is lower than it perhaps should be, but that there truly is such a sense, albeit misguided, and that a good way to raise awareness of the bioethical imperative is not to impose practices that, to a degree, resemble

17 Or, rather, what animals certainly are not: thoughtless, emotionless machines with heteronomous purpose.

18 That is, until we "internalise it".

absurdity¹⁹. Instead, it is to work our way towards bioethical imperative through understanding the relation between established practices and ever-newly discovered knowledge²⁰. It is the practice of “working with what you got”, but it has much to do with how human beings are fundamentally positioned in their tradition. Here Jahr and, for example, Edgar Morin as an example of integrative bioethicists growing from cultural anthropology, overlap in the sense of awareness of culturally imprinted historical roots (Cf. Morin 2007: 131). Our understanding of our situation, derived from our biological and cultural context, at the same time, reveals and constitutes a tangible horizon of thought and action through and by which we engage with others with and within our situatedness:

“Just as our prejudices are themselves brought into question in the process of understanding, so, in the encounter with another, is the horizon of our understanding susceptible to change.” (Malpas, 2016)²¹

Based on scientific evidence and historical experience of European expansion, Jahr questioned his probable prejudices. He examined implications that opened to him once he let his beliefs be questioned. He built upon that a new horizon without losing anything for himself but giving much to the potentiality of achieving the better of all living beings. Without narcissistic tendencies, Jahr monitored an interaction

19 During the 2016 bioethical summer school in Tutzing, Germany, titled “Bioethik als wissenschaftliches und gesellschaftliches Projekt: Die Idee einer integrativen Bioethik”, there was an intense workgroup discussion on the question of probable Jahr’s prejudices in these fragments. Eventually, I concluded that Jahr wasn’t prejudicial and that by the text alone we cannot possibly argue that he spoke of these habits either in positive or negative way, including the use of the word ‘fanatics’ for a group of Indians because of their way of avoiding hurting anything that lives: “Thus, we start from a totally different point of view than the Indian fanatics, who do not want to hurt any living entity.” (Jahr, 2010: 229). I am uncertain about was that meant merely as a neutral reference to their devotion and uncritical zeal or was it meant as an insult, but grounding my observation in the fact that the rest of Jahr’s paper is respectful, and how he uses Buddha’s disposition on these zealous practices to support his opinion, it seems to me that he used it as a neutral term with an emphasis on the negative tendency of human beings to go too far with their ideas. I would argue that to Jahr, it did not seem plausible to hurt the authenticity of your own life, and Jahr’s inclusion of Darwinian mechanisms justifies the position.

20 For example, this is Jahr’s approach in trying to understand our burden of bioethical imperative in (2010b: 11–12), where he is attempting to avoid making a reader feel as if he has to do something absurd and showing the probable scope of our moral obligations towards non-human living beings.

21 In Gadamer’s research, which Malpas is discussing, prejudice has no positive or negative connotations (see Gadamer, 2013: 283–289 for an account of the use of the phrase, followed by Gadamer’s critique of the established use), and this is good because it seems to me that such approach was Jahr’s approach to understanding differences between “Western” and “Eastern” culture. Though I am aware that some readers may feel as if Jahr was endorsing this or that element of either culture, I could not find a distinct statement that supports such intuitive suggestions. What is visible from the text is that he supported the acknowledgement of conventions and the acknowledgement of the possibility of changing them. Gadamer’s argumentation in the context of text analysis provides a solid foundation for a broader understanding of how Jahr did so: “Rather, a person trying to understand a text [read: any phenomena] is prepared for it to tell him something. That is why a hermeneutically trained consciousness must be, from the start, sensitive to the text’s alterity. But this kind of sensitivity involves neither ‘neutrality’ with respect to content nor the extinction of one’s self, but the foregrounding and appropriation of one’s fore-meanings and prejudices. The important thing is to be aware of one’s own bias so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one’s own fore-meanings.” (Gadamer, 2013: 282)

between cultural and scientific perspectives of his time, and through a pluriperspective approach to intertwined phenomenal data, he noticed a *transgressive* moment of altering horizon. From it, Jahr re-invented a paradigm that seemed obvious and unavoidable: bio-ethical imperative; which in turn became a *transperspective* because it instantly revealed the multitude of perspectives and how to overcome their barriers in the consciousness of European human being.

Since Jahr's papers are commentaries and essays, not systematically developed papers, there may be confusions about, but I believe that offered reconstruction through comparison of Jahr's fragments does show enough consistency in thought to safely arrive at the reasoning that Jahr had a clear vision of the epoch and that he did not want to grant primacy to any approach to the world. The core conclusion is that he was substantially worried only about the negative effects of worldview as a phenomenon. If this interpretation is correct, then the mental framework in which Jahr introduces the bioethical imperative perfectly aligns with the core nature of European bioethics (including integrative bioethics). The reaction to principlist bioethics and techno-scientific progress produced sensibility precisely for the problem of worldviews. Nevertheless, I think that Jahr's methodological approach is not enough to classify him as a good role model in bioethical education because the methodology can be carried out for research without any true connection to the object of research. But that was not the case with Jahr. Jahr was not a trained researcher who rationally examined the advantages of various methodologies. His papers have different motivology behind them; they are passionate and bear the experience of life. In the following part, I briefly examine these factors.

I. III. Suffering

From our personal experience, from many records of lives changed by events, from research in neuroplasticity of our brain, and from studies in psychoanalysis, analytic psychology and psychotherapy, we learn that experiencing events can change us. In the first chapter of his sixth volume of *Method* (2007), Morin devised a useful map of forces and factors taking a role in defining our life and moral action. He discussed human egocentric and allocentric force in living beings in the same fashion Jahr discussed egoism and altruism, and he explained the two factors—genes and cultural imprint—playing fundamental roles in shaping our individualities. In between, experiences counter our being, and choices we make alter ourselves and others, but also how we see ourselves and how others see us. In that sense, I find the case of Fritz Jahr very intriguing because he did not have a pleasant life, and three aspects of his

experience might have contributed to the constitution of his understanding of the world.

Firstly, many papers have been written about Jahr's personal life, among them several cover most of what might be relevant for understanding how Jahr came to propose the bioethical imperative. Muzur, Rinčić (2012), Steger (2014), and Kielstein (2014) provide enough evidence to understand Fritz Jahr as a person who was humble and did not try to go over his abilities, who was not boastful and was not a criminal. Steger showed that Jahr was living poorly, that he was in poor health, that he could barely manage the finances of his family and that he could not find a decent, long-lasting job (Steger 2014: 18–20, Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 28–30). Jahr often borrowed money and barely ever managed to receive regular salary. He did not have a stable job, and political or personal differences forced him to quit his job at least once (Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 25). Similarly, Kielstein showed that Jahr's job applications were continuously rejected and that he may have grown to feel useless and underappreciated (Kielstein 2014: 41–42), that his life was quite poor and burdened by his illness, the illness of his father, and the disability of his wife, as well as by the death of his mother (Kielstein 2014: 43; Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 29). Miller (2012) showed that as time went on, Jahr was more desperate and more direct in his pleas to the higher authority. From Jahr's biography, we learned that he lived 58 years, which was below average life expectancy at the time. It is worth noting that Jahr's life was not much different from many other Germans at the time: by 1918, adult Germans lived on 1000 calories per day, on average, and in that year, over 500,000 Germans died of influenza (Brooman 1985: 4). Just as one catastrophic war ended, internal "revolution" followed, and the Weimar Republic was established. In Weimar, the political and financial situation was utterly terrible, with hundreds of political assassinations by 1923 and a financial breakdown that culminated in 1923 with the hyperinflation that faced millions of people with starvation, and then another collapse happened between 1929 and 1933 (cf. Brooman 1985: 15–17, Lee 1998: 49–60, 99–105). Afterwards, World War II pretty much ruined Germany again, and Jahr was there to see it.

Secondly, in 200 years prior to Jahr, Halle was a city of great religious shifts. Beginning with major changes under Lutheran orthodoxy, in 18th century Halle, as the largest city in Duchy of Magdeburg, played an important historical role for Phillip Jacob Spener, who refreshed and launched Protestant religion into a new direction as the father of pietism. The central intellectual place of pietistic influence was The University of Halle (founded in 1664 by Frederick III, Elector of Brandenburg, who appointed Spener), which later became clergyman August Hermann Francke's (appointed by Spener) social experiment in his attempt to create the City of God. The University of Halle and the broader pietist network joined forces to greatly influence entire Germany, including plans to draw Jews closer to the teaching by founding the

Judaic institute in Halle in 1728. However, pietism declined after 1730–1740, and the University was shifted towards rationalism with which it entered into the 19th century (cf. Clarke, 2007, ch. 5). It met with new challenges during the Weimar Republic because the Republic had no state religion and has declared freedom of religious thought, equalling Protestants, Catholics, and Atheists. From Church documents we learn that Jahr was Christened, but raised in a Protestant family and has entered Church service as a Protestant (Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 25), and we learn that he was schooled in the institutions that, in spite of decline, were directly connected to pietism while, as it is seen from Jahr's papers (cf. Rinčić, Muzur 2012: 69–70), he had many objections to such teaching. Thus, it is quite possible that Jahr's struggle extended from his physique and financial status to religious and political tension in his workplaces, which in turn might have contributed to the continuous decline of his physical and psychic health.

Thirdly, there is another interesting element that might have influenced Jahr's thinking about the role of bioethical imperative in society, especially considering his sometimes passionate commentary on treating other living beings. As we learned from Steger (2014: 17) and Muzur, Rinčić (2011: 388), Fritz Jahr volunteered to participate in World War I, serving as a gunner in Mansfelder Feld-Artillerie-Regiment Nr. 75, an official artillery regiment in Magdeburg since 1899. I am unsure what to think about it, but Jahr was not sent to the battlefield, instead, as a member of the fourth reserve for artillery divisions, he was stationary in Halle (cf. Kraus, Busche 2007) and most likely never hurt anybody in the few months he served (Miller 2012: 159, 162), which I think is good (and elsewhere, we learn from his letter that he did not join NSDAP; cf. Miller 2012: 166). However, he may have witnessed something relevant. Halle had an important Institute for Animal Breeding and Dairy at the University of Halle, in effect to this day. Its facilities were funded for expansion and advancement between 1914 and 1920 for agricultural growth, better food provision, and the increase of independence from international trade (Saraiva 2018, 106–107). In 1915, an event known as *Der Schweinemord* took place in Germany. In a short time, approximately five million pigs were slaughtered to reduce food sharing between humans and pigs, being a highly present and important domesticated animal at the time. It is near impossible that the slaughter also did not take place in Halle (at the time ~170,000 citizens)²², and that there was no focus on it afterwards because *Der Schweinemord* did not yield expected results. Many actions had to be taken to recover from the cumulative loss of healthy crops and meat, including new programs and initiatives of the Institute of Animal Breeding and Dairy (cf. Chickering 2005: 57–58; Saraiva 2018: 107–109). Although this event was “recognised” retroactively,

²² Data available at: <https://statistik.sachsen-anhalt.de> (13 August 2019).

this kind of mass activity could not have gone unnoticed, and a very poor situation in Bavaria generally, which we can read from Jahr's own financial and social struggling, must have left some mark. Taking into account the first, second, and third element of Jahr's life, it seems to me that we can fairly plausibly conclude that Jahr experienced a lot of suffering, predominantly without him being the cause.

Thus, we have a person who continuously suffered in his life and had adverse social experience, who considered the everyday life to be superficial and could not find himself in it, who had a good sense of historical epoch he lived in, and who was against imposing worldviews, that is, against unreflected subjectivity treated as critical objectivity. This complex relation of psychosocial phenomena must have turned the tides in somebody who did want to share his thoughts with the world, who, in other words, worried about the world. Interestingly, although adverse experiences, especially in children and young people, cause permanent damage to intrapersonal and extra-personal communication²³, recent studies provide evidence, on the one hand, that the increase in adversity stimulates tendency to behave compassionately (cf. Lim & DeSteno 2016), and that the "cold attitude" towards strangers is related to stress caused merely by the unknown (cf. Martin et al. 2015; Tomova et al. 2014). Considering that Jahr was by his nature quite a fair person, we can safely assume that Jahr might not have come to the bio-ethical imperative or his general change in behaviour, was it not for the specific combination of worrying about the world, personal suffering, and fair personality.

We have to, however, read this case in reverse: engaged critical thinking makes a person open to advances in knowledge, interacting with suffering increases the possibility of growth in empathy and compassion, and managing personalities may increase the possibility of subduing destructive aspects. All three aspects can be applied in the curricula regarding the bioethical approach to the subject matter. The proposal would build on the ideas related to Jahr, which Nada Gosić presented in 2011, which is itself a continuation of her very useful book on bioethical education, on Ivana Zagorac's paper on bioethical worldview (2017), and, naturally, on the vast literature regarding mostly medical and law ethics education internationally, while within Croatia, it would have to additionally rely on Sonja Kalauz's book *Nursery Profession in the Light of Bioethical Pluriperspectivism*, and Ivana Zagorac's *Bioethical Sensibility*. In this paper, however, the main objective was to show good reasons for using Fritz Jahr as a role model, and in the final chapter I will merely outline the starting point of such a methodological implementation.

23 For an important paper on adverse experience in childhood, visit <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/acestudy/journal.html>, and see Stumbo et al. (2015) for a detailed examination of the presence of adverse experience in (seriously) mentally ill persons.

II. Fritz Jahr and integrative methodology

In the context of methodology that we ought to consider when carrying out, firstly, integrative research, and secondly, an integrative project, Fritz Jahr should be understood as a role model bioethicist based on these five phenomena:

1. *Sensibility*; the property of being able to appreciate and appropriately respond to complex organic states, to act prudently following the inner order of things (from understanding “the Other”, to adjusting depending on their knowledge cores and situations);
2. *Synthesis*; the mechanism of combining elements to form a structured whole (from gathering perspectives to understanding their incommensurability and revealing the truth of the whole, to becoming a mediation of conflict in oneself);
3. *Openness*; the quality of being able to comprehend, consider and possibly accept new or different methods, changes, personalities, views, ideas, behaviours, and perspectives while being honest (from understanding differentiations to approaching everybody equally);
4. *Innovativity*; the quality of being able to think outside the box, create systems from scratch, to see further beyond the current matter of things and make something of it, to broaden horizons by featuring a new approach to the matter at hand, to nurture the faculty of forming ideas yet to be attainable;
5. *Autocriticality*; the quality of being able to continuously examine oneself, to understand from where your fears, desires, and aims are coming from, comprehend personal actions, work on personal flaws and nurture personal virtues, and have a clear vision of goals and consequences of possible actions.

This set of features I would call Jahrian methodological principles. However, it is interesting that sensibility, synthesis, openness, innovativity, and autocriticality are roughly five primary characteristics of integrative bioethics as a project in general, regardless of Fritz Jahr.

Sensibility of the project can be observed on the grounds of taking care of (and about) all aspects of living beings as living beings, including animals and plants²⁴, by which the carriers develop “an ear” for troubles and problems related to various lifeforms, as well by participating in all aspects of factual life, from scientific analysis of concepts, phenomena and cases, over educational programs to political involvement; from

²⁴ We may say that integrative bioethics, or European bioethics for that matter, are yet to fully comprehend the totality of archaea, eubacteria and eukaryote domains of life, but in comparison to other bioethical narratives, especially in the context of “American bioethics”, we can claim with reasonable certainty that it prestigiously aims towards the absolute comprehension of life.

nurturing productive ideas, over bridging academic and everyday life, to caring about the working class and those less fortunate, or simply different. In Jahr, we find this property in his concern for negating freedom and causing harm – it is this that we achieve if we apply sensibility in our projects.

Synthesis and *openness* manifest themselves through extreme emphasis on interdisciplinary gathering and the inclusion of all possible knowledge cores that might somehow affect the understanding of any phenomenon for the better, which finds its factual support in the multitude of various multi-expert collaborations, including transdisciplinary projects through which science and public institutions directly communicate for the advancement of the quality of life. Fritz Jahr did precisely that in his attempt to understand the proper approach to life and especially to individual life, he aimed to understand the common ground of different interpretations and used all possible type of knowledge cores to clear up the problem to avoid silencing and reductionism – it is this that we achieve if we apply synthesis and openness in our endeavours, and the final result will be an effective solution for complex problems. This will draw out the need for *innovation* because every new interaction of different knowledge cores creates new dynamics in appearing contexts, and the underlying achievement is not just finding a way out of any particular problem or a situation, it is the creation of new transperspectives that turn into orientation for future encounters.

Finally, from the history of philosophical science, great researchers and projects inherit self-criticism or *autocriticality*. It is the power of reinventing through learning and discovering, it humbles us, and it is aimed at reducing mistakes in judgment and action. This is inherent in the mereological examination that living contexts impose, and from Jahr's papers and letters, we can see that he spent a great deal in inner reflection regarding himself and the world. When dealing with bioethical problems, we should be aware of the fact that our discoveries, comments, and results enter the public sphere. What we say can alter people's opinion, change legal documents, affect behaviour towards specific groups, and affect social movement, and that means that we can also *hurt* people and other living beings, especially if we are recommending subjection. Because we are philosophers and scientists, we are also obliged to seek and report what we discover to be the probable truth of things, but the truth, especially in matters of life, is just as sensitive as the life itself. Thus, I think that words bioethicists spell out and note down can carry a great burden, and we should refrain ourselves from rash investigations and production lacking repeated cycles of autoreflexion.

However, as I mentioned at the beginning of this analysis, all this may have less than no value in context of the fundamental meaning for society without nurturing scientists as persons who share the same qualities that their projects have, who

will strive to “walk the talk” and integrate themselves into society via their public involvement regardless of whether we are discussing, e.g. a parliamentary involvement of any bioethicist or we are discussing a transdisciplinary project with the purpose of reconceptualising, e.g. public traffic. In other words, bioethics as a phenomenon can reshape and reintroduce *intellectuals* to society in an all-encompassing way that was, if it ever did exist in the first place, buried dead before it had the chance to shine. A scientist that exchanges words with and cares for the most troubled of members of global civilisation, the weak, ill, and the poor at the bottom of a hierarchy of corporative capitalism bred with opportunistic partocracy, is the kind of person who can be shaped only through integrative thinking embodied in practical projects via bioethical imperative. The newly established platform of integrative bioethics is the kind of platform that can shift the, mostly correct, view of “intellectuals” from “academic pointy-heads who live in ivory towers, musing over seemingly irrelevant issues and esoteric topics” (Parsi, Geraghty, 2004: 17) and salonists to socially engaged individuals able to understand each particular form of life and its place in contingency of the shaking world. Naturally, not everyone is for everything – but no matter the role, we can still teach and nurture world-shaping qualities. Parsi and Geraghty are right when they state that being in various committees does not constitute a public intellectual (Parsi, Geraghty, 2004: 21). Being a member of the former 43rd U. S. President Bush’s bioethics council did not appear to have any relation to public intellectualism, and from the results we can see that whatever was presupposed before the formation of the council, the council eventually confirmed²⁵. Another case is that of Ketan Desai, of financial corruption and the presidential elections for the World Medical Association in 2009. In 2012, Chattopadhyay, Gillon and De Vries wailed: “Is biomedical ethics just casual talk? Is it merely medical etiquette, philosophical window dressing, full of empty rituals and little substance? Do doctors take ethics seriously? (...) Hired by the for-profit pharmaceutical corporations, bioethicists have engaged in a number of activities – with serious conflicts of interest – including, for example, acting as ‘key opinion leaders’ in marketing strategies, sitting on for-profit institutional review boards (IRBs), justifying research with vulnerable populations including the use of homeless people in phase one trials, and writing industry-funded research articles. There is a sad and painful irony here: bioethicists love to talk about ‘justice,’ but have been part of the injustices of the healthcare industry. Apparently corporate money influences not only medical science but also the nature and scope of bioethics. (...) Only a few brave souls or organizations like Transparency International have been willing to tackle corruption in healthcare. For the most part, the bioethics community has remained silent. Why? Have bioethicists lost the passion to make the

25 See Blackburn, Rowley (2004) for an account on the use and abuse of the mentioned council.

world a better place by playing a strong and credible ‘watchdog’ role in medicine? Do philosophers and bioethicists find it more important and/or intellectually satisfying to solve esoteric puzzles – like, for example, the moral status of a part-human-part-animal embryo – rather than taking on ‘dull’ issues like poverty, health inequality or medical corruption?” (Chattopadhyay, Gillon, De Vries 2012: 143–145)

Chattopadhyay, Gillon, and De Vries were right to protest, and in 10 years, not much has changed. Even in Croatia, where many activities were undertaken in the early phase of bioethics, the bravery silenced. Regardless, it still holds that “bioethicists should carve out a space for public intellectualism and define appropriate roles for public intellectuals in the field” (Parsi, Geraghty, 2004: 21). By the sheer logic of integrative movement, a formation of such a role is inevitable if integrative projects are to be practically confirmed, which is why, here, still at the beginning of a new epoch, one may need a suggestion for an educational role model.

In his most important book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, Thomas Kuhn explained how a new class emerged within the scientists – professional scientists. We now have professional bioethicists. They can advance their studies by applying the five listed properties. I provided many examples in one of my other papers (2019), and most certainly, these five properties need to be examined in the light of interdisciplinary work as I proposed it. But there ought to be a difference in ideological attitude between two groups, between those bioethicists who can carry out professional studies without involving with the world and community, without walking the talk, and those who are professional not by their workplace, but by their intentions within the social agency. The humanity of the 21st century, a landmark century for all future matters, does not need bioethicists who train the youth for money and make them understand peculiarities of social, medical, and legal procedures in conflicting topics, who aim for their careers and define their path following impact factors. The world needs bioethicists who will attempt to teach a new generation to think better about phenomena and act with more caution. This is, to what Schaefer-Rolffs points towards in his analysis of the concept of integrative bioethics (cf. Schaefer-Rolffs 2012: 110, 112, 113–115), a chance to finally formulate a platform able to resolve current situation of the world while being methodologically powerful enough to integrate even where it is not wanted. Those who then decide to actively integrate themselves with the world via scientific research, cultural engagement, social movement, or political activism altogether then might need a solid example of conceptual purity, a look into the proto-approach to the relevant issues. In that sense, future bioethicists will need role models, to understand what is the point of it all, much like political parties have influential politicians, religions have saints, and children have parents and teachers. In Jahr, it is the *simplicity of his saneness* that

allows for a potentially potent bioethicist to become the pillar of a radically different unity of the worlds of the living.

Thus, I suggest to consider integrating Fritz Jahr into bioethical education in the form of a methodological paradigm.

Acknowledgement

This work has been created within the research program of the Scientific Centre of Excellence for Integrative Bioethics (proclaimed on November 10, 2014 by the decision of the Minister of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia), which is being implemented at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb, as an institution hosting the Centre.

Literature

- Azariah, J. (2012). "Path-Maker in Bioethics – Rev. Fritz Jahr". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H.-M. (ed.). *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, pp. 295–310.
- Berman, S. (2019). *Democracy and Dictatorship in Europe. From the Ancien Régime to the Present Day*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blackburn, E.; Rowley, J. (2004). "Reason as Our Guide". In: *PLoS Biol* Vol. 2, No. 4, p. e116. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0020116>.
- Brooman, J. (1985). *Weimar Germany. Germany 1918–1933*. New York: Longman.
- Chattopadhyay, S.; Gillon, J. J.; De Vries, R. (2012). "Where are all the bioethicists when you need them?". In: *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 105 (4), pp. 143–145. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.2012.110284>.
- Chickering, R. (2005). *Das Deutsche Reich und der Erste Weltkrieg*. München: Beck.
- Contreras Islas, David C. (2018). "An Analogical Hermeneutic Approach to Bioethics". In: *Open Journal of Philosophy* 8 (2018), pp. 28–44. Available at: http://www.scirp.org/pdf/OJPP_2018022615155850.pdf (accessed on 18 August 2019).
- Council of Trent (1848). *The canons and decrees of the sacred and ecumenical Council of Trent: Celebrated under the sovereign pontiffs Paul III, Julius III and Pius IV*. Edited and translated by James Waterworth. London: C. Dolman.
- Čović, A. (2012). "The Europeanization of Bioethics". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H. (eds.). *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics. The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Berlin – Münster – Wien – Zürich – London: LIT, pp. 193–196.
- Čović, A. (2007). "Integrativna bioetika i pluriperspektivizam" ["Integrative Bioethics and Pluriperspectivism"]. In: Valjan, V. (ed.). *Integrativna bioetika i izazovi suvremene civilizacije [Integrative Bioethics and the Challenges of Contemporary Civilisation]*. Sarajevo: Bioetičko društvo u Bosni i Hercegovini, pp. 65–75.
- Descartes, R. (2015). "To More. 5.ii.1649". In: *Early Modern Texts (Early Modern Philosophy. René Descartes, 1596–1650. Selected Correspondence. Letters written in 1645–1650)*. Available at: <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/authors/descartes> (accessed on 18 August 2019), pp. 212–216.

- Engels, E. (2011). "The importance of Charles Darwin's theory for Fritz Jahr's conception of bioethics". In: *JAHHR* Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 475–504.
- Eterović, I. (2011). "Kant's categorical imperative and Jahr's bioethical imperative". In: *JAHHR* Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 457–474.
- Finocchiaro, M. A. (1989). *The Galileo Affair*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hatfield, G. (2008). "Animals". In: Carriero, J.; Broughton, J. (eds.). *Companion to Descartes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hurst, S. (2017). "Upcycling Fritz Jahr's aging clothes with new knowledge". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H.-M. (eds.). *1926–2016 Fritz Jahr's Bioethics. A Global Discourse*. Zürich: LIT Verlag, pp. 63–71.
- Gadamer, H. (2013). *Truth and Method*. London – New Delhi – New York – Sidney: Bloomsbury.
- Goldim, J. R. (2009). "Revisiting the Beginning of Bioethics: The Contribution of Fritz Jahr (1927)". In: *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 377–380. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.0.0094>.
- Gosić, N. (2011). "The actuality of thoughts of Fritz Jahr in bioethics education or why Fritz Jahr advocates character education". In: *JAHHR* Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 407–414.
- Jahr, F. (2010). "Bio-Ethics. Reviewing the ethical relations of humans towards animals and plants". In: *JAHHR* Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 227–231. [Translation and Postscript by Hans-Martin Sass]
- Jahr, F. (2011). *Aufsätze zur Bioethik 1927 – 1947. Fritz Jahr*. Bochum: Zentrum für Medizinische Ethik.
- Jahr, F. (1926). "Wissenschaft vom Leben und Sittenlehre". In: *Die Mittelschule. Zeitschrift für das gesamte mittlere Schulwesen* 40 (1926), pp. 604–605.
- Jahr (2012). "Animal Protection and Ethics". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H. (eds.). *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics. The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Berlin – Münster – Wien – Zürich – London: LIT, pp. 9–12.
- Jennings, B. (ed. 2014), *Bioethics*. Mexico: Gale – Cengage Learning.
- Jurić, H. (2007). "Stützpunkte für eine integrative Bioethik im Werk Van Rensselaer Potters". In: Čović, A.; Hoffmann, T. S. (eds.), *Integrative Bioethik / Integrative Bioethics*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, pp. 68–92.
- Jurić, H. (2015). "From the Notion of Life to an Ethics of Life". In: *Synthesis philosophica* Vol. 59, No. 1 (2015), pp. 33–46.
- Kalauz, Sonja (2011). *Sestrinska profesija u svjetlu bioetičkog pluriperspektivizma [Nursery Profession in the Light of Bioethical Pluriperspectivism]*. Zagreb: Pergamena – Hrvatska komora medicinskih sestara.
- Kant, I. (2000). *Kant's gesammelte Schriften, Herausgegeben von der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band V. Erste Abteilung: Werke, Fünfter Band: Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, Kritik der Urtheilskraft*. Berlin: Georg Reimer; *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [KU 5]
- Kant, Immanuel (1956). *Kritik der Reinein Vernunft*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner. [KRV]
- Kalokairinou, Eleni M. (2017 [2016]). "Fritz Jahr's Bioethical Imperative". In: Muzur, A; Sass, H.-M. (eds.), *1926–2016 Fritz Jahr's Bioethics. A Global Discourse*. Zürich: LIT Verlag, pp. 83–91.
- Kielstein, R. (2014). "Arbeitskraft und Gesundheit – biographische Anmerkungen zu Fritz Jahr". In: Steger, F.; Joerden, J. C.; Schochow M. (eds.). *1926 Die Geburt der Bioethik in Halle (Saale) durch den protestantischen Theologen Fritz Jahr (1895–1953)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (Kindle Edition), pp. 37–44.
- Kos, M. (2014). "Od Fritza Jahra do integrativne bioetike. Prikaz razvoja jedne ideje" ["From Fritz Jahr to Integrative Bioethics: Presentation of the Growth of an Idea"]. In: *Filozofska istraživanja* Vol. 34, No. 1–2, pp. 229–240.
- Kraus, J.; Busche, H. (2007). *Handbuch der Verbände und Truppen des deutschen Heeres 1914 bis 1918 – Teil IX, Band 1–2*. Wien: Militaria-Verlag.
- Lee, S. J. (1998). *The Weimar Republic*. London – New York: Routledge.

- Lim, D.; DeSteno, D. (2016): "Suffering and Compassion: The Links Among Adverse Life Experiences, Empathy, Compassion, and Prosocial Behavior". In: *Emotion* Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 175–182. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000144>.
- Lima, N. S. (2009). "Fritz Jahr y el *Zeitgeist* de la bioética". In: *Aesthetika* 5 (2009) 1, pp. 4–11.
- Lolas, F. (2012): "Viktor von Weizsäcker and Fritz Jahr. A Challenge for Cultural Analysis". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H.-M. (eds.), *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, pp. 121–310.
- Lolas, F. (2017). "Fritz Jahr's bioethical imperative: an anticipation of ethology and bioethics". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H.-M. (eds.), *1926–2016 Fritz Jahr's Bioethics. A Global Discourse*. Zürich: LIT Verlag, pp. 109–116.
- Luków, P. (2014). "Respect for Living Creatures and the Conflictual Nature of Fritz Jahr's Bioethics". In: Steger, F.; Joerden, J. C.; Schochow, M. (eds.), *1926 Die Geburt der Bioethik in Halle (Saale) durch den protestantischen Theologen Fritz Jahr (1895–1953)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (Kindle Edition), pp. 125–136.
- Martin, L. J. et al. (2015). "Reducing Social Stress Elicits Emotional Contagion of Pain in Mouse and Human Strangers". In: *Current Biology*, 2015; DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2014.11.028
- Malpass, J. (2016). "Hans-Georg Gadamer". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/gadamer/#HapTra> (accessed on 14 January 2017).
- Miller, I. M. (2012). "Ahead of His Time. Reflecting on Fritz Jahr's Late Recognition". In: Muzur, A.; Sass, H.-M. (eds.), *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, pp. 121–310.
- Morin, E. (2007). *El Método VI. Ética*. Madrid: Catedra.
- Muzur, A.; Rinčić, I. (2011): "Fritz Jahr (1895-1953): a life story of the 'inventor' of bioethics and a tentative reconstruction of the chronology of the discovery of his work". In: *JAHR* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 385–394.
- Odifreddi, P. (2009). *Hai vinto, Galileo!: La vita, il pensiero, il dibattito su scienza e fede*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Parsi, K. P.; Geraghty, K. E. (2004). "The Bioethicist as Public Intellectual". In: *The American Journal of Bioethics* 4:1, pp. 17–23. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1162/152651604773067514>.
- Perušić, L. (2019). "Narav i metoda integrativne bioetike. Rasprava ["Nature and Method of Integrative Bioethics. A Treatise"]". In: Čović, A.; Jurić, H. (eds.), *Integrativno mišljenje i nova paradigma znanja [Integrative Thinking and the New Paradigm of Knowledge]*. Zagreb: Pergamena – Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo – Znanstveni centar izvrsnosti za integrativnu bioetiku, pp. 323–412.
- Potter, V. R. (1971). *Bioethics. Bridge to the Future*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Priault, N. (2013). "The Troubled Identity of the Bioethicist". In: *Health Care Anal* Vol. 21, pp. 6–19. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-012-0229-9>.
- Rinčić, I.; Muzur, A. (2011). "Fritz Jahr: The Invention of Bioethics and Beyond". In: *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 550–556. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.2011.0045>.
- Rinčić, I.; Muzur, A. (2012). *Fritz Jahr i rađanje europske bioetike [Fritz Jahr and the Birth of European Bioethics]*. Zagreb: Pergamena 2012. [including Jahr's papers translated in Croatian].
- Rothe, F. (1925). "Die Vernunft der Pflanze". In: *Arch Pharm* Vol. 263, No. 21–25, pp. 397–398.
- Saraiva, T. (2018). *Fascist Pigs: Technoscientific Organisms and the History of Fascism*. Cambridge – London: The MIT Press.
- Sass, H. (2007). "Fritz Jahr's 1927 Concept of Bioethics". In: *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 279–295. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ken.2008.0006>.
- Savulescu, J. (2015). "Bioethics: Why Philosophy is Essential for Progress". In: *Journal of Medical Ethics* 41 (1), pp. 28–33. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2014-102284>.
- Schaefer-Rolffs, J. (2012). "Integrative Bioethics as a Chance. An Ideal Example for Ethical Discussion?". In: *Synthesis philosophica* Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 107–122.

- Steger, F. (2015). "Fritz Jahr's (1895-1953) European concept of bioethics and its application potential". In: *JHR* Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 215–222.
- Steger, F. (2014). "Fritz Jahr (1895–1953). Eine biographische Skizze". In: Steger, F.; Joerden, J. C.; Schochow, M. (eds.), *1926 Die Geburt der Bioethik in Halle (Saale) durch den protestantischen Theologen Fritz Jahr (1895–1953)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (Kindle Edition), pp. 7–36.
- Stumbo, S. P. et al. (2015). "The Impact of Adverse Child and Adult Experiences on Recovery from Serious Mental Illness". In: *Psychiatr Rehabil J*. Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 320–327. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000141>.
- de Tocqueville (2011). *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomova, L. et al (2014). "Is stress affecting our ability to tune into others? Evidence for gender differences in the effects of stress on self-other distinction". In: *Psychoneuroendocrinology* Vol. 43, No. 95. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2014.02.006>.
- Zagorac, I. (2018). *Bioetički sensibilitet [Bioethical Sensibility]*. Zagreb: Pergamena.
- Zagorac, I. (2017). "Bioethical Worldview". In: Byk, C.; Sass, H.-M. (eds.), *Fritz Jahr (1895–1953): From the Origin of Bioethics to Integrative Bioethics*. Paris: MA Editions, pp. 131–143.
- Zagorac, I. (2011). "Fritz Jahr's Bioethical Imperative". In: *Synthesis philosophica* Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 141–150.
- Ziętek, M. (2014). "Katholische und protestantische Ethik im Dialog. Der bioethische Imperativ von Fritz Jahr aus Sicht von Tadeusz Ślipko". In: Steger, F.; Joerden, J. C.; Schochow, M. (eds.), *1926 Die Geburt der Bioethik in Halle (Saale) durch den protestantischen Theologen Fritz Jahr (1895–1953)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (Kindle Edition), pp. 195–213.

Fritz Jahr kao metodološka paradigma u bioetičkom obrazovanju

SAŽETAK

Rad ispituje Fritza Jahra kao mogući uzor u bioetičkom obrazovanju. Sastoji se od dva dijela. U prvom dijelu oslanja se i nadograđuje na prethodne podatke i teorije o tome kako se dogodilo da Fritz Jahr predlaže bioetički imperativ i mijenja svoje razmišljanje. Nudi argumente za i protiv znanih tvrdnji i proširuje pozadinsko znanje, usmjeren na rekonstruiranje misaonog procesa i nekih pretpostavki koje su dovele do oblikovanja bioetičkog imperativa. U drugom dijelu koriste se dobiveni rezultati da bi se izvelo pet obilježja i pokazalo kako se iz Jahrove osobnosti i aktivnosti mogu izlučiti i utvrditi metodološka obilježja kojima se potvrđuju i osnažuju integrativni projekti. Radi se o pokušaju razumijevanja da nešto poput »jahrovske metodologije« može biti dovoljno senzibilno za pružanje znanstvenog znanja i kulturne orijentacije bez pojednostavljivanja *biosa*, ali da je ono besmisleno bez integracije s obrazovnim modelima. Da bi se to naglasilo, zaključno se razmatra uloga bioetičara u 21. stoljeću.

Ključne riječi: Fritz Jahr, bioetika, znanost, svjetonazor, obrazovanje, senzibilnost, sinteza, otvorenost, inovativnost, autokritičnost