

Ivana Zagorac

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, I. Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
izagorac@ffzg.hr

Fritz Jahr's Bioethical Imperative

Abstract

*It seems that the revitalisation of Fritz Jahr's thought has come just at the right time. During the course of its rapid development, bioethics managed to assume different forms, but also to become both reduced in its underlying intention and hyper-specialised in its theoretical and practical aspects. Summed up in his bioethical imperative, Fritz Jahr's thought prompts us to re-examine both its underlying intention and its field of interest. Accordingly, this paper centres on Jahr's bioethical imperative, its origins, construction and implications, aiming to scrutinise Jahr's original thought and his message within the contemporary discourse on bioethics in general and that on integrative bioethics in particular. The latter is examined only in its outlines, leaving room for a possible upgrade. Lastly, the paper looks at the Rijeka Declaration as a document that represents an attempt to both conceptually and methodologically transform contemporary bioethics within the context of Jahr's thought. **

Key words

Fritz Jahr, bios, bioethical imperative, Rijeka Declaration

Van Renssealer Potter's role in the formation of bioethics is well known. In the articles he wrote at the beginning of the 1970s he presented the term 'bioethics', which was to sum up the then scattered activities of various social movements. One cannot deny either the cohesive role that Potter's work played in the formation of today's bioethics or the fact that many authors predating Potter had also recognised that "bridges" were missing that would connect the natural sciences with the humanities and social sciences. Or the fact that the term 'bioethics' appeared before Potter. More specifically, the article entitled "Bio-Ethik. Eine Umschau über die ethischen Beziehungen des Menschen zu Tier und Pflanze" that Fritz Jahr published in 1927 – almost half a century before Potter's articles – not only introduces the term 'bioethics' first, but today also seems, with regard to its intention, much closer to the field of interest of bioethics and its aims than Potter's world famous work. From today's perspective, it would, therefore, be unfair to call Potter the "father of bioethics", even in the less exclusive variant that the "bi-location" of the emergence of this term suggests,¹ although one must acknowledge the synergic effect that Potter's work had on the formation of the field of bioethics.

* This paper was developed within the framework of the "Founding Integrative Bioethics" Project, headed by prof. Ante Čović, Department of Philosophy, University of Zagreb. The project is financed by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia.

¹ Waren Thomas Reich researched the emergence of the term 'bioethics' and ascribed it to two authors. Cf. W. Th. Reich's two articles: "The Word 'Bioethics': Its Birth and the Legacies of those Who Shaped It", *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (De-

This paper examines the concept of bioethics suggested by Fritz Jahr culminating in the construction of the 'bioethical imperative'. In doing so, the fact that he was the first to have used the term 'bioethics' is somewhat less significant, considering that Jahr's work – positioned in relation to the prevalent contemporary discussions in bioethics – comes across as a stimulating reading for the re-evaluation of the underlying intention of bioethics and the possible directions of its future development.

The origins of the bioethical imperative

Fritz Jahr (1895–1953, Halle an der Saale), a German Protestant priest, calls for extending anthropocentrically founded ethics to ethics orientated towards *bios*. His call is not the fruit of either an intuition that all life is interconnected, which inspired Albert Schweitzer at about the same time, or a deep religious conviction that all creation is interlaced, which inspired St. Francis of Assisi a few centuries ago, but rather issues from the facts of science backed by the Holy Scripture. In his "Bio-Ethik"² article from 1927, Jahr asserts that psychology has already recognised the need to be extended to consider animal psychology, and that even the contours of plant psychology are also discernible. Jahr sets out from Eisler's concept of 'bio-psychology' ('Bio-Psychik'), which, within the context of scientific research of his time, showed to be a meaningful neologism carrying a powerful synergic message. Exactly the reaches of science, the products of a progressive and active human mind, will show that the anthropocentric position has no grounds. It is a fact, Jahr continues, that we would not be where we are today had we abandoned both subordinating animals and their exploitation for the purpose of our advancement. However, it is also a fact that exactly these scientific achievements and the conclusions based on the same have undermined man's dominant position in general, have exposed it as all too fragile and self-opinionated. Philosophy, which once guided the natural sciences, today must build itself on the facts of science.³ And what they tell us is that a strict division into humans on the one hand and animals on the other is ungrounded. Jahr states that, accordingly, there is only one step from 'bio-psychology' to 'bio-ethics' entailing

"... the assumption of moral obligations not only towards humans, but towards all forms of life".⁴

However, bio-ethics is an invention of modern times perhaps only for Europe. Here, as in some other places, Jahr refers to Oriental teachings. Within the context of finding an anchor for the extension of our moral obligations towards all forms of life, Indian philosophy revealed itself to the German pastor as an attractive model of a lived ethics, an inspirational example of diverse teachings that value concern for all living beings highly, a type of concern that western thought has been familiar with only sporadically.⁵ It is in the tension between the East and the West that Jahr clearly contrasts worldviews and detects his fundamental postulate. More specifically, the nature of our "western" relationship to animal life, and even more so to plant life, is entirely utilitarian. Jahr examines the extent to which this utilitarian relationship is justified by reference to authorities he is well acquainted with. How does the commandment "Thou shalt not kill!" reflect on the relationship between man and animal?⁶ Jahr argues that both the Bible and the natural sciences instruct us to have ethical responsibility to animals. The Fifth Commandment does not pertain exclusively to the killing of people – does this mean that it should equally be applied to plants and animals? Jahr is convinced that the answer is

a most definite – yes. This can seem utopistic: in our actions we are not primarily guided by love, and there is constant tension between us and our competitors. Yet, our struggle for life, in the multitude of its everyday manifestations, actually equally defines our relationship to people as well as our relationship to animals. Jahr concludes that the command not to kill animals – or plants – is, therefore, founded on the same groundwork as the command not to kill people. This renders the Fifth Commandment “as an ideal and a point of reference for our moral strife”.⁷ In spite of sceptical doubts, this extension of our ethical duties can only have a beneficial effect for our relationship to people. Jahr seems to communicate – those who see the world around man also see the world in every man.

In addition to scientific facts, which destroy the qualitative difference between people and animals, and a deeply set religious conviction that he ascribes the power of argumentation, Jahr adds one more building block to his bioethical imperative – compassion. Jahr is convinced that this is not some mere sentimental construct, but a scientific fact which reveals itself “as an empirically given phenomenon of the human soul”.⁸ Correspondingly, for Jahr, his call to show compassion for animals is far from being utopistic, and is, at the same time, not useless for humankind. Compassion we may feel for animals can only be accompanied by compassion for people. Nevertheless, even though compassion is a positive phenomenon that bonds, it can also be deviant. Eduard von Hartmann objected that there are countless people who are full of love for animals and are at the same time cruel to other people. Jahr's reply is that such exceptions are always possible, but they do not weaken the rule. As the

ember 1994), pp. 319–335; and “The Word ‘Bioethics’: The Struggle Over Its Earliest Meanings”, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (March 1995), pp. 19–34. Both articles were written before the discovery of Fritz Jahr's work which mentions the term ‘bioethics’ earlier than either of the two authors from Reich's analysis.

2

Fritz Jahr, “Bio-Ethik. Eine Umschau über die ethischen Beziehungen des Menschen zu Tier und Pflanze”, *Kosmos. Handweiser für Naturfreunde*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1927), pp. 2–4. For our purposes, the English translation is used: Fritz Jahr, “Bio-Ethics. Reviewing the Ethical Relations of Humans towards Animals and Plants”, in: Hans-Martin Sass, Jochen Vollmann, Michael Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr: Essays in Bioethics and Ethics 1927–1947*, translated by H.-M. Sass, I. M. Miller, Zentrum für Medizinische Ethik, Bochum 2011, pp. 1–4. By having published Fritz Jahr's text (English translation by H.-M. Sass, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2010), pp. 227–231), the editors of the Croatian journal *JAHHR* also contributed significantly to both researching Jahr's thought and a greater accessibility of his work. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for the useful information they provided for the purposes of writing this paper.

3

F. Jahr, “Bio-Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 1.

4

Ibid.

5

As has been well noted by the reviewer of this paper, it must be mentioned that Jahr became familiar with Eastern philosophies exactly through the writings of western European authors. Schopenhauer's influence is particularly pronounced. The extent to which Jahr was directly conversant with Eastern philosophies remains to be seen.

6

Jahr discusses this in his article “Death and the Animals” (1928), as well as in his studies on the Fifth Commandment (1934). The latter, collected under the title “Three Studies on the Fifth Commandment” (English translation by H.-M. Sass), were also published in the Croatian journal *JAHHR*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2011), pp. 7–11.

7

F. Jahr, “Death and the Animals”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, pp. 4–6, here p. 6.

8

F. Jahr, “Animal Protection and Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, pp. 6–10, here p. 6.

fact that there are people who are cruel to other people does not undermine ethics itself, so the fact that there are cruel people who are kind to animals does not mean that animal protection is a bad idea only because cruel people also support it.⁹

The construction of the bioethical imperative

Scientific progress requires that we make adjustments, particularly those that regard our orientations while making decisions in our everyday life. Jahr believes that the “golden rule”, but also Kant’s categorical imperative, ought to be extended in accord with our latest insights. As can be read from Jahr’s texts, if I interpreted them correctly, the new imperative must adopt the following as its postulates: that there are no grounds for a strict division between people and animal, that (at the beginning of the 20th century) science confirmed what is already in the Holy Scripture – i.e. that both plants and animals are worthy of our moral concern – that the conclusion of the above is the extension of the Fifth Commandment to all living beings (which is, according to Jahr, substantiated by scientific insights), that compassion is a verified capacity of the human soul that sees no boundary between humans and other living beings, and that it is exactly compassion which broadens our narrow utilitarian perspective fully facilitating our managing to avoid causing uncalled-for suffering of other living beings. Accordingly, it is necessary to find a new guideline for our (moral) actions, a new imperative: non-anthropocentric, non-reciprocal, and not merely formal. This is the imperative according to Jahr:

“Respect every living being on principle as an end in itself and treat it, if possible, as such!”¹⁰

This imperative, fully orientated towards life (*bios*), is rightfully rendered as ‘bioethical’. Interpreting Jahr’s bioethical imperative, I shall attempt to outline the extent of its reaches. The bioethical imperative addresses man as the only living being capable of moral reasoning, and directs man at other humans, but also at other, or more specifically – all, living beings. Living beings other than humans do not have man’s capacity to reason, do not share man’s sense of responsibility, and cannot make moral choices, but Jahr’s imperative draws them in the sphere of man’s moral concern. The bioethical imperative does not care much about the reciprocity of reaction – animals and plants cannot reciprocate in equal measure, not even all humans will reciprocate, but that does not diminish either the strength of the imperative or the inclusiveness of the objects of man’s moral concern. The reciprocity of action is precluded by the unconditionality of the imperative itself. The imperative must guide our actions and must affect our sense of responsibility to all living beings. This requirement is founded in and coloured with Christian hues, and empowered by Jahr’s reference to the Holy Scripture. But, even if we do not agree with his argumentation – as the author himself explains – we cannot overlook the scientific one. The same also applies to the objects of moral concern: irrespective of those who, in spite of ample evidence, cannot accept the application of the imperative to animal and plant life, the imperative does not lose its strength, but rather obliges one to a moral duty to human society in general.

The bioethical imperative is also not weakened by yet another fact, which Jahr calls “the principle of struggle for life and its existence”.¹¹ We are in a constant state of struggle for survival, a struggle whose guise is sometimes such that it is difficult to recognise in its pure form, as is the case in politics,

work or administration. The necessity of our struggle with other people resembles the necessity of our struggle for life with other lives, but in no case shall we “lose the idea of moral obligations as a principle”.¹² The bioethical imperative appreciates this continued tension and calls for respect for each individual life. Moreover, it appears that what follows from Jahr's argumentation is that what will ultimately make us respect all life is exactly awareness of the fact that a permanent state of rivalry has been thrust upon life as such. Following Jahr, it can, therefore, be concluded that what binds us together is not a similarity between species, but the recognition that the aspirations that we yearn to achieve in our lives are essentially alike.

One cannot hope to be successful in his/her struggle for life unless it is ego-centrally motivated. Jahr claims that egoism is a natural phenomenon, just like altruism. They both represent psychological and ethical facts that cannot do without each other. Following this line we can reconstruct the link between Jahr's postulate that there is an egotistical struggle of life against life and his call to respect all life. The interplay of egoism and altruism is displayed in the correlation between individuals and communities. Jahr lists professional organisations, political parties, rural or urban communities, nations, etc., as examples of communities. Powerful cohesive elements within a community facilitate “collective egotistical” behaviour of one community in contact with another, which is beneficial for all the members of the community.¹³ However, individual gains and protection, both of which are multiplied within a community, are not the only reasons that will prevent one from violating the Fifth Commandment. According to Jahr, it also reflects the fulfilment of a moral law – love. Besides natural compassion, it seems that love is, thus, that final transition from struggle to coexistence, from egoism to respect. One's self-respect is at the very heart of one's respect for the other. Pastor Jahr is particularly concerned about corporeal corruptions: from chastity to the problem of alcoholism – weaknesses and diseases are not the problem of only one person, but the community as a whole. Respecting each living being, highlighted in the imperative, starts with self-respect.

Regardless of the fact that its name, content and intention adhere to the form of an imperative, Jahr's bioethical imperative is reserved as regards practical implementation. The instruction to ultimately respect all living beings is somewhat invalidated by its “if possible” relativisation. Where does this reluctance come from? Jahr refers to some Eastern religions that go to extremes to prevent any accidental destruction of life. However, Jahr claims that our starting position is entirely different from that of those “Indian fanatics”:¹⁴

9

Ibid., p. 7.

10

F. Jahr, “Bio-Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 4.

11

F. Jahr, “Animal Protection and Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 9.

12

Ibid., p. 10.

13

F. Jahr, “Egoism and Altruism”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, pp. 15–18, here p. 17. It appears that, within this context, there are truly no obstacles to – following Jahr's attitude – recognise in them, the way that H.-M. Sass does, an early concept of biotical communities as holistic entities. Cf.: Hans-Martin Sass, “Fritz Jahr's 1927 Concept of Bioethics”, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (December 2007), pp. 279–295, here pp. 284–285.

14

F. Jahr, “Bio-Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 3.

our animal protection is inseparable from the aspect of their utility for our purposes, irrespective of whether we look at animal farms or the legal protection of rare plant species. Abstaining from needless cruelty to animals, which to us “westerners” appears to be a major concession in favour of the non-human living world, remains within the framework of the utilitarian view. On the other hand, however – and according to Jahr’s interpretations of the worldviews in India – abstaining from all killing is fully immune to any anthropocentric motivation, and finds its stronghold in recognising *bios* as a densely interlaced network of life. Jahr does not demand that we unconditionally denounce all destruction of life like in India, but rather appeals to the raising of awareness of the existence of criteria – some of our attacks on other lives are utterly unnecessary. At the same time, the bioethical imperative comes across as ultimately ideal:

“We are on the road of progress and animal protection gets more and more support in wider circles, such as no decent human being [anständiger Mensch] will without criticism accept, that a thoughtless lout [Flegel] without any afterthoughts beholds flowers with a stick while on the hike or that children break flowers only to through them away after a few steps. Our self-education, in this regard, already has made considerable progress, but we have to go further, so that the guiding rule of our actions may be the bio-ethical demand: *Respect every living being on principle as an end in itself and treat it, if possible, as such.*”¹⁵

The bioethical imperative contains in itself the possibility of divergence in practical implementation, which, according to Jahr, lies in the domain of subjective assessment within the context of specific situations. Our sense of respecting the imperative changes through time, we are becoming increasingly sensible – this is the path of progress that must be persevered in. The bioethical imperative renounces the luxury of being merely formal, it insists on practical implementation, and understands the challenges in its wake. Correspondingly, even if we digress from ultimate respect for life, provided it is kept within the limits of necessity, we shall still remain in the field of moral actions.¹⁶

Jahr’s bioethical imperative is not some mere upgrade of the existing anthropocentrically founded and orientated moral guides. As far as his intention, impelled by the latest scientific insights, Jahr wishes to expand the existing ethical framework, but actually offers a rough outline of an entirely novel discipline. However, he himself is not convinced that this is so, or at least it seems that way since he frequently refers to the established practices of the East. His texts imply the view that the cultural-historical-worldview framework of the western world has arrived at the point of yielding to long ignored facts only once these facts were presented in the language of the western world – the language of science. The idea of bioethics, orientated towards respecting life as such, can therefore be novel only to those who are immune to all things either extra-scientific or religious. Jahr acknowledges this and makes use of exactly the scientific perspective to empower the construction of the bioethical imperative. Besides knowledge, his appeal to compassion, which he holds to be a fact of the human soul, must be highlighted once more. This fact cannot be brought into question by there being individuals who act insensitively, much like the way in which there being blind people cannot deny the fact that the ability to see is a characteristic of man. Compassion which is bioethically coloured, i.e. which extends one’s moral concern to all forms of life, is nothing new for Jahr – he detects it not only in Eastern philosophies, but also in the work of influential German authors (F. Schleiermacher,

K. Krause, A. Schopenhauer, E. von Hartmann, J.G. Herder and others),¹⁷ and in the instructions of the Holy Scripture. A sense of compassion is already sufficient as the content of “bioethical thought”, but Jahr wants to support it “by biological and biopsychological arguments, and not without success”.¹⁸ The protection of nature will gain strength by the expansion of our knowledge and our understanding nature better, which will in turn reflect positively on not only plants and animals, but humanity itself. A successful transfer to and implementation of novel insights in ethics will reflect a positive attitude that the protection of nature has in public. Within this context, Jahr devoted quite a lot of his time and attention to the need to promote (bio)ethical ideas through the media.

“And if one considers the pages in the newspaper to be a medium to establish or at least strongly influence public opinion, then from an ethical point of view, it becomes even an obligation, to take part in this type of character formation [Gesinnungsbildung] – actively and with best knowledge and conscience.”¹⁹

Fritz Jahr – the inspiration for modern bioethics

Fritz Jahr was, thus, the first to have used the concept of ‘bioethics’, to have formulated the bioethical imperative, but also the first to have sketched the framework of a field that was to evolve decades after his work. Hans-Martin Sass, most responsible for the recent rehabilitation of Jahr’s thought,²⁰ rightly

15

Ibid., p. 4.

16

Although Albert Schweitzer’s concept of “reverence for life” and Jahr’s “bioethical imperative” share striking similarities, when it comes to the more subtle implications of their concepts differences are great. This point represents one of those differences: while for Jahr application of the ‘necessity rule’ justifies our actions against the imperative and labels them as moral ones, Schweitzer strongly holds the opposite position – every action done against the “reverence for life” principle, no matter how necessary and/or unavoidable it might have been, is to be considered as un-ethical and the responsible moral agent must at least feel guilty.

17

The only possible explanation for why Albert Schweitzer is not on this list is that Jahr simply never came into contact with Schweitzer’s work, and vice versa. As mentioned earlier, the bioethical sensibility of these two authors is very similar. Amongst European authors, St. Francis of Assisi is also close to them, whose ideas and lifestyle were admired by both German authors. Cf.: A. Schweitzer, “Religion in Modern Civilization”, in: Predrag Cicovacki (ed.), *Albert Schweitzer’s Ethical Vision. A Sourcebook*, Oxford University Press, New York 2009, p. 82, and Fritz Jahr, “Bio-Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 1.

18

F. Jahr, “Animal Protection and Ethics”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (ed.), *Fritz Jahr*, p. 9.

19

F. Jahr, “Social and Sexual Ethics in the Daily Press”, in: H.-M. Sass, J. Vollmann, M. Zenz (eds.), *Fritz Jahr*, pp. 10–12, here p. 12.

20

Rolf Löther from the Humboldt University of Berlin “discovered” the forgotten article “Bio-Ethik”, and presented Fritz Jahr on a conference in 1997 as the first author to have used the term ‘bioethics’. In 2001 Eve-Marie Engels wrote about Jahr and helped spread knowledge about Jahr’s article “Bio-Ethik” in Latin America. However, Hans-Martin Sass has undoubtedly contributed most to the dissemination of Jahr’s thought. Besides Sass, research by Croatian authors Iva Rinčić and Amir Muzur has recently been significantly contributing to the reception of Jahr in Europe. It is indicative that the journal *JAHHR*, first published in 2010, was started at the Department of Social Sciences and Medical Humanities, University of Rijeka – School of Medicine, Rijeka, Croatia, that Rinčić and Muzur work at. Shortly afterwards, the “Eurobio/Nethics. Fritz Jahr and European Roots of Bioethics” project was started (<http://euro-bionethics.com/>). Cf.: José Roberto Goldim, “Revisiting the Beginning of Bioethics. The Contribution of Fritz Jahr (1927)”, *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, Vol. 52, No. 3



points to one more aspect that follows from Jahr's work. More specifically, he reminds us of the divergence of what bioethics ought to be and what bioethics today is. In his concept of 'bio-ethics', Jahr seeks to sum up the widely encompassing field of our ethical conduct towards all living beings in the light of new scientific insights. Today's reducing of bioethics to certain fields contrasts strikingly with Jahr's intention. His bioethics is all-pervasive and relational: all-pervasive with regard to the objects of moral concern, and relational since it requires well-informed and knowledgeable action. Even though only man can act and, therefore, cannot hope for an equal reciprocal reaction, the feedback of man's respect for other living beings is the personal development of the moral agent regardless of the effective passivity of the object of the agent's moral concern. Any exclusion of any individual or group from the framework of bioethics is, as far as Jahr's intention, entirely amiss. Talking about Jahr, H.-M. Sass has, therefore, rightfully reopened²¹ the contemporary discussion about both the definition and field of interest of bioethics – which are today scattered, fragmented and highly specialised.

The signees of the *Rijeka Declaration on the Future of Bioethics*²² have noted the same. The *Declaration* rests on the revitalisation of bioethics in the wake of Fritz Jahr, summed up in his bioethical imperative. It recognises both the inappropriateness of the reduction of bioethics and the resulting need to extend and to conceptually and methodologically transform bioethics for it to be able to incorporate different perspectives and integrate the same into orientative knowledge. The pluriperspectival and integrative approach rest on the underlying premise that life, as a cohesive factor in the perspectives, ought to be respected. Only an affirmative relationship to all forms of life – subject-matter-wise and methodologically set on a platform that facilitates the meeting of and open dialogue between different perspectives – can hope to provide answers to the countless ethical questions of today's world. Fritz Jahr recognised the twofold role of science. Science provides new insights that we cannot be blind to. These insights verify our intuitive assumptions about the interrelatedness of all life, and at the same time expose the worrisome reaches of human actions into the sensitive mechanism of nature. Correspondingly, ethicists should be open to the public, communicate their knowledge, and act both educationally and correctively. Jahr also recognised that the media play a major role in this, while the signees of the *Declaration* are hoping that the positive reception of this integrative model of bioethics will also legislatively come to life.

Ivana Zagorac

Bioetički imperativ Fritza Jahra

Sažetak

Revitalizacija misli Fritza Jahra čini se da dolazi u pravi trenutak. Bioetika je tijekom svoga brzoga razvoja uspjela poprimiti različite oblike, ali i postati reduciranom u svojoj osnovnoj intenciji i hiperspecijaliziranom u svojim teorijskim i praktičnim aspektima. Misao Fritza Jahra, sažeta u njegovu bioetičkome imperativu, potiče nas da nanovo sagledamo kako temeljnu intenciju bioetike tako i njeno predmetno područje. Ovaj rad će se stoga usmjeriti na Jahrov bioetički imperativ, njegova ishodišta, konstrukciju i implikacije, s dvostrukom nakanom: istražiti izvornu Jahrovu misao te pokušati sagledati njegovu poruku unutar suvremenog diskursa o bioetici, posebice onoga o integrativnoj bioetici. Ovo potonje učinjeno je samo u naznakama, ostavljajući prostor za moguću nadgradnju. Završno se tekst osvrće na Riječku deklaraciju kao dokument koji predstavlja pokušaj konceptualne i metodološke transformacije suvremene bioetike u kontekstu Jahrove misli.

Ključne riječi

Fritz Jahr, bios, bioetički imperativ, Riječka deklaracija

Ivana Zagorac

Bioethischer Imperativ Fritz Jahrs

Zusammenfassung

Die Revitalisierung des Gedankens Fritz Jahrs scheint rechtzeitig aufzutreten. Der Bioethik gelang es, im Laufe ihrer temporeichen Entwicklung diverse Formen anzunehmen, nichtsdestotrotz in ihrer Grundintention reduziert sowie in ihren theoriebezogenen und praktischen Aspekten hyperspezialisiert zutage zu treten. Die Idee Fritz Jahrs, summiert in dessen bioethischem Imperativ, gibt uns den Ansporn, sowohl die Grundintention der Bioethik als auch ihr Gegenstandsgebiet von Neuem in Augenschein zu nehmen. Mithin richtet sich diese Arbeit auf Jahrs bioethischen Imperativ, dessen Ansatzpunkte, Konstruktion und Implikationen, mit zweifachem Vorhaben: Jahrs Quellgedanken auszuforschen sowie eine Auslegung seiner Botschaft im Rahmen des zeitgenössischen Diskurses zur Bioethik – speziell zur integrativen Bioethik – zu wagen. Das Letztere wurde lediglich durch Anmerkungen ausgeführt, indem es einen Manövrierraum zum eventuellen Gedankenaufbau offenließ. Abschließend nimmt der Text einen Rückblick auf die Rijeckaer Deklaration als ein Dokument, das einen Versuch der konzeptuellen und methodologischen Transformation der gegenwärtigen Bioethik im Kontext von Jahrs Idee darlegt.

Schlüsselwörter

Fritz Jahr, bios, bioethischer Imperativ, Rijeckaer Deklaration

(Summer 2009), pp. 377–380, here p. 379. Jahr's bio-bibliography and information on the reception of his texts were presented in detail by Iva Rinčić and Amir Muzur in paper delivered at *Lošinj Days of Bioethics* conference in 2010 under the title "Fritz Jahr: Contributions to the Biography of the Founder of (European) Bioethics" (abstract published in: Hrvoje Jurić (ed.), *9th Lošinj Days of Bioethics*, Book of Abstracts, Croatian Philosophical Society, Zagreb 2010, pp. 115–116.

21

Cf.: H.-M. Sass, "Fritz Jahr's 1927 Concept of Bioethics", pp. 289–293; H.-M. Sass,

"Asian and European Roots of Bioethics: Fritz Jahr's 1927 Definition and Vision of Bioethics", *Asian Bioethics Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (September 2009), pp. 185–197, here pp. 193–196.

22

Rijeka Declaration on the Future of Bioethics, Rijeka/Opatija, signed on 12 March 2011. Published in English and Croatian in: Hrvoje Jurić (ed.), *10th Lošinj Days of Bioethics*, Book of Abstracts, Croatian Philosophical Society, Zagreb 2011, pp. 45–50.

Ivana Zagorac

L'impératif bioéthique de Fritz Jahr

Résumé

Le renouveau de la pensée de Fritz Jahr semble arriver au bon moment. Au cours de son essor rapide, la bioéthique a réussi à prendre différentes formes, mais aussi à voir sa principale intention se réduire et devenir hyperspécialisée dans ses aspects théoriques et pratiques. La pensée de Fritz Jahr, résumée dans son impératif bioéthique, nous incite à appréhender à nouveau tant l'intention fondamentale de la bioéthique que le domaine de son objet. C'est pourquoi cette étude se concentrera sur l'impératif bioéthique de Jahr, ses points de départ, sa construction et ses implications, dans un double objectif : explorer la pensée originale de Jahr, puis tenter d'appréhender son message dans le cadre du discours contemporain relatif à la bioéthique, notamment la bioéthique intégrative. Ce dernier point n'a été qu'esquissé, laissant place à un éventuel développement. Enfin, le texte revient sur la Déclaration de Rijeka, document qui représente la tentative d'une transformation conceptuelle et méthodologique de la bioéthique contemporaine dans le contexte de la pensée de Jahr.

Mots-clés

Fritz Jahr, bios, impératif bioéthique, Déclaration de Rijeka