

7. Report on the implementation of the State program of the Russian Federation "Affordable Environment" for 2011-2020 in 2015. URL: <http://rosmintrud.ru/docs/mintrud/handicapped/130> (reference date: 08.10.2017).
8. The situation of disabled people. URL: http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/population/disabilities/ (reference date: 08.10.2017).
9. Amputee Statistics You Ought to Know. URL: <http://www.advancedamputees.com/amputee-statistics-you-ought-know> (reference date: 08.10.2017).
10. Custom gadgetry for the discerning hacker. URL: <http://amal.net/> (reference date: 08.10.2017).
11. Improving the way we live. URL: <http://www.dekaresearch.com/innovations/> (reference date: 08.10.2017).
12. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network. URL: <http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov> (reference date: 01.10.2017).
13. Sedova N.N., Donika A.D. Methodology connection between bioethics & law. 23rd Annual Congress of World Association for Medical Law Book of Abstracts. 2017. C. 99.

Литература

1. «Биоинженерия. Выращивание трахеи. Паоло Маккиарини». URL: <http://lionessk.livejournal.com/159700.html> (дата обращения 08.10.2017).
2. Исагуро К. Не отпускай меня / Пер. Л. Мотылева. М.: Издательство «Э», 2017. 352 с.
3. «Киноглаз. Снимать как видеть». URL: <https://www.popmech.ru/technologies/12034-kino-glaz-snimat-kak-videt/> (дата обращения: 08.10.2017).
4. Майленова Ф.Г. Роль научной фантастики в формировании ожиданий и оценочных суждений от внедрения новейших технологий конструирования человека // Рабочие тетради по биоэтике. Вып. 13. Человек – NBIC машина: исследование метафизических оснований инновационных антропотехнических проектов / Отв. ред. П.Д. Тищенко. М.: МосГУ, 2012. С. 40–49.
5. Майленова Ф.Г. Прощение и воздаяние. Вечные вопросы в пространстве литературы и психотерапии // Биоэтика и гуманитарная экспертиза. Вып. 7 / Отв. ред. Ф.Г. Майленова. М.: ИФ РАН, 2013. С. 168–189.
6. Майленова Ф.Г. Современная российская фантастика об актуальных проблемах биоэтики // Биоэтика и гуманитарная экспертиза. Вып. 8 / Отв. ред. Ф.Г. Майленова. М.: ИФ РАН, 2014. С. 57–86.
7. Отчет о ходе реализации государственной программы Российской Федерации «Доступная среда» на 2011–2020 годы в 2015 году. URL: <http://rosmintrud.ru/docs/mintrud/handicapped/130> (дата обращения 08.10.2017).
8. Положение инвалидов. URL: http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/population/disabilities/ (дата обращения: 08.10.2017).
9. Amputee Statistics You Ought to Know. URL: <http://www.advancedamputees.com/amputee-statistics-you-ought-know> (дата обращения: 08.10.2017).
10. Custom gadgetry for the discerning hacker. URL: <http://amal.net/> (дата обращения: 08.10.2017).
11. Improving the way we live. URL: <http://www.dekaresearch.com/innovations/> (дата обращения: 08.10.2017).
12. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network. URL: <http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov> (дата обращения: 01.10.2017).
13. Sedova N.N., Donika A.D. Methodology connection between bioethics & law. В книге: 23rd Annual Congress of World Association for Medical Law Book of Abstracts. 2017. C. 99.

УДК 17.7

ABOUT CONTRADICTORY CONNECTION OF BIOETHICS AND EVENT (OF MEDICALIZATION OF SOCIETY AND SOCIALIZATION OF MEDICINE)

V.N. Prjamitsin

PhD, associate professor of the Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and Law with the Course of Medical Sociology, Volgograd State Medical University, Volgograd, pryamycin@mail.ru

K.S. Smirnov

PhD, associate professor of Department for Philosophy, Bioethics and Law with the Course of Medical Sociology, Volgograd State Medical University, Volgograd, zzzzz111@mail.ru

Reymer M. V.

PhD, Ass. of the Department of Foreign Languages with a Course of Latin, Volgograd State Medical University, Volgograd, Russia, mashaliru@yandex.ru

The article demonstrates that there is contradictory connection of bioethics and event. This principle is conditioned by the event of the medicalization of society on the one hand and socialization of medicine on the other hand. The conceptual elaboration of the problem of the connection of event and bioethics, of the definition of hermeneutics of this connection from the point of view of existentially-ontological phenomenology is supposed. The connection of bioethics and event is revealed with the aid of intuition, which is discovered phenomenologically. Their connection appears as contradictory unity of two sides. Their contradiction is existential-and-dialectical. It means, that essentially-ontological pattern of their connection is existential. Event and bioethics appear as existentials. But their existential qualities must not be generalized, for quite often the essentially-existential disintegration of the connection takes place. The event is the cause of disintegration and divergence, what supposes human participation. Bioethics and event are anthropologoessential existentials. They are connected between each other by essential connection. And here the traditional question about essence of anthropologoessential arises. The latter is guaranteed by the experience of its existential basis. This leads to the original essence of the event and bioethics. The existence manifests itself here. It is the basis for the possibility of the essential connection of bioethics and event. The essence of their connection is defined by existential essence of anthropologoessential. It is interpreted as dependent on existence of anthropologoessential, on its existential behavior. Anthropologoessential is the ontological totality of the existential acts-behavior of each human and all humankind. At the same time bioethics is the existentially-ontological phenomena intrinsic in living world of anthropologoessential. The conclusion is that contradictory and united continuum of event-bioethics exists existentially. Bioethics and event take place in each other. And their relations are asymmetrical and accompanied by tension, which initiates their interaction.

Key words: event, bioethics, existentially-ontological phenomenology, intercommunication, contradiction, principle.

О ПРОТИВОРЕЧИВОЙ СВЯЗИ БИОЭТИКИ И СОБЫТИЯ (МЕДИКАЛИЗАЦИИ СОЦИУМА И СОЦИАЛИЗАЦИИ МЕДИЦИНЫ)

В.Н. Прямыцин

Кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии, биоэтики и права с курсом социологии медицины, ФГБОУ ВО «Волгоградский государственный медицинский университет», Волгоград, pryamycin@mail.ru

К.С. Смирнов

Кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии, биоэтики и права с курсом социологии медицины, ФГБОУ ВО «Волгоградский государственный медицинский университет», Волгоград, zzzzz111@mail.ru

Реймер М. В.

Кандидат философских наук, преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков с курсом латинского языка, ФГБОУ ВО «Волгоградский государственный медицинский университет», Волгоград., mashaliru@yandex.ru

В статье показывается, что существует противоречивая связь биоэтики и события. Это положение обусловлено событием медиализации социума и социализацией медицины с одной стороны и существованием биоэтики с другой. Предлагается концептуальная разработка проблемы связи события и биоэтики, определения герменевтики этой связи с позиций экзистенциально-онтологической феноменологии. Связь биоэтики и события выявляется с помощью интуиции, которая распознается феноменологически. Их связь выступает как противоречивое единство двух сторон. Их противоречие экзистенциально-диалектично. Это означает, что сущностно-онтологический строй их связи экзистенциален. Событие и биоэтика выступают как экзистенциалы. Но их экзистенциальные качества не должны обобщаться, ибо нередко имеет место сущностно-экзистенциальная расщепленность связи. Причиной расщепленности и расхождения является событие, что предполагает человеческое участие. Биоэтика и событие являются антропологическими экзистенциалами. Они связаны между собой сущностной связью. И здесь возникает традиционный вопрос о сущности антропологического. Последняя гарантируется опытом ее экзистенциальной основы. Это приводит к первоначальной сущности связи события и биоэтики. Здесь проявляется экзистенция. Она является основанием для возможности сущностной связи биоэтики и события. Сущность их связи определяется экзистенциальной сущностью антропологического. Она понимается как зависимость от экзистенции антропологического, от экзистенциального его поведения. Антропологическое есть онтологическая совокупность экзистенциальных поступков-поведения каждого человека и всего человечества. При этом биоэтика является экзистенциально-онтологическим феноменом, присущим жизненному миру антропологического. Делается вывод о том, что противоречивый и единый континуум события-биоэтики существует экзистенциально. Биоэтика и событие участвует друг в друге. А их взаимоотношения асимметричны и сопровождаются напряжением, которое инициирует их взаимодействие.

Ключевые слова: событие, биоэтика, экзистенциально-онтологическая феноменология, взаимосвязь, противоречие, принцип.

I feel that I could not escape contradictions. Complete, well-balanced system did not come out. But if true contradictions came open and not forced, then may be it is better any making both ends meet.

D. A. Granin

There is event of "medicalization" [5] of the society and socialization of medicine. There is bioethics. Principle: there is connection of bioethics and event. There is existentially-ontological phenomenology. There is no conceptual elaboration of the problem of mutual connection of the event and bioethics. According to principle the problem is supposed: to elaborate phenomenologically conception of their intercommunication and try to define its hermeneutics in terms of existentially-ontological discourse.

The connection of bioethics and event is intuitively-grasped-by notice. Notice is intuitive, intuition notices. Intuitively-grasped-by notice connection

(correctly) reaches consciousness. Intuition, notice, consciousness are phenomenological categories.

Thus, connection can be directly contemplated-and-noticed, in a word, intelligible to intuition. How one can recognize it? Phenomenologically. The gist of the phenomenological matter of the recognition of connection: intuitively grasped, not to let it go; to hold in the field of vision of consciousness all the time; to apprehend it by all consciousness; to reflect consciously; to express reflection, as far as possible, in terms of existentially-ontological hermeneutics. At least two problems accompany phenomenology in this matter (and how many in passing arising questions, thoughts, hints, conclusions).

The first. Correlation of intuitive and discursive in definition of interconnection of event and bioethics, what is actually intuitive and what is actually discursive in phenomenological work concerning connection. It is special theme and is not subject of this article.

The second takes its source from the first. It is very hard to describe the connection. One must look at it with own eyes, listen with own ears, grasp with own intellectual intuition and notice with own mind. All this must be synthesized in the experience of phenomenological consciousness. Phenomenology must find corresponding language and form for the rendering of this experience. And the connection of bioethics and event is "vivid-essentially-existentially-mobile"[2], never stands still, flows all the time as Heraclitus's water. That is why there is no finished intuition in phenomenology, no finished idea, no finished notice, no finished consciousness, no finished form and language for the description of connection. Phenomenology does not give (since it itself is rather art than science) exclusively exact description of it, but gives something more- existentially-ontologically-essential pattern. Language of phenomenology is not exact hermeneutic discourse, but existential tissue.

The connection of bioethics and event is contradictory unity of two sides. Their contradiction is "existential-and-dialectical at the same time" [3]. This bilateral unity objectively is based on the principle of preservation of this connection as itself. The unity will be torn and existential essence of their connection as itself will be broken; essence will be broken, unity will be torn. Bioethics and event are not connected according to the

principle of homogeneity and (formal) logic, essentially-ontological pattern of their connection is existential. The law of Hume- there is no transition from being as being to ethical proper- is correct. If they would meet, being as being-in-itself and ethical proper as ethics-for-us, in life, in vital world of anthropologoessential, among-people-in-human-environment, they would have nothing to do together. They do not meet, for there is no joint course, unless in theoretical ontology and metaethics. But the courses-transitions from bioethics to event and on the contrary are possible. Of course, telling about interconnection of bioethics and event it is not allowed to generalize their qualities. Measure, proportion, harmony, equality are categories of ontology. But these main ontological characteristics between two sides of this connection-relation are not always maintained.

Event and bioethics are existentials. In spite of that one should not generalize their existential qualities. Why? Because their existential qualities can be in relation of the largest opposition and contradiction at the same time. Event can have negative "quality"; bioethics claims positive quality. The event of the "medicalization of society" [1] and of socialization of medicine of course, has got the most "quality", if it was realized in such manner that it crippled and ruined human body, soul, destiny, did harm and evil to human, animal, nature. And it happens. It means, that society was medicalized abominably and medicine was socialized abominably, that socialization as itself of the event accomplished abominably, in vain. Such "quality" contradicts and directly opposite to the positive quality of the claim of categorical imperatives of bioethics, such, for example, as principle "do not harm", principle "do good" and all its principles. But and in such case the connection of bioethics and event do is not broken off. And how many them, such cases. One can call them metaphorically: God his own, devil his own. But connection is not broken, however it can break down and very hard. In such cases connection as itself gets another existential quality: ambivalentness of the connection and as the result, ambivalentness of impression, perception, notion, senses and thoughts, intuitive and discursive produced by this. The essential-existential disintegration of the connection takes place. Disintegration passes through all connection in concrete case, of course, through all its essential-existentially-ontological pattern. Ambivalentness spreads in any sides of connection, but it as two its sides,

links up every time from new point to it as itself. But connection becomes two-faced, because sides disperse. But they are not simply different- they are opposite and contradict each other. Divergence tells on the relation of bioethics and event. However bioethics is not the cause of the divergence, on the contrary, bioethics struggles against it from own part. The cause of the divergence is event usually, more exactly, its executors, people and its execution by them.

The concept of relation-connection or, what is the same, connection-relation is not conventional figure. This is mental image, existentially-ontological eidos, if to use language of eidetical phenomenology. It is necessary for the opening of the complexity of interconnection between bioethics and event, for the opening of the dialectics of their relation, contradictory-their-unity, unity-these-oppositions. Bioethics and event are anthropologoessential existentials, existential phenomena, not always proportionate, sometimes quite disproportionate. Sometimes they contradict each other openly; sometimes they clash not so obviously; sometimes they exist one in other, exist jointly; sometimes bioethics gives rise to the event and event gives rise to bioethics. Sometimes these existentials are at daggers drawn irreconcilably; sometimes they become reconciled; sometimes they are the complement of one another existentially; sometimes their existential symmetry or, on the contrary, asymmetry are broken by anthropologoessentialhandmade but gone out of control of anthropologoessential accordingly uncontrolled by it force. It happens that it is broken by some third unforeseen, impersonal force, acting by its nonanthropologoessential laws- natural disasters. At all events people, animals suffer always.

Bioethics and event are connected by essential connection. One must define it. Definition of their essential connection leads us to the old as the world question about the essence of anthropologoessential. This leads in that direction, which guaranties us the experience of existential basis of its essence. This guaranties so, that it will lead us, first of all, to the field of the original essence of the connection of bioethics and event. The existence discovers itself here. It is the basis for the inner possibility of the essential connection of bioethics and event. It is the basis, because it ensure the essence of their connection by itself. Their connection gets its own essence from original

essence- from existential essence of anthropologoessence. Its essence is the essence-for-essence of their connection and is defined the same: essence of anthropologoessence is the essence-for-essential their connection. The essence of their connection is defined by existential essence of anthropologoessence. This one defines their essential connection.

How then even if as a preliminary one should understand the essence of the connection of bioethics and event? The essence of their connection is existentially- anthropologoessence. It is understood is dependent on the existence of anthropologoessence, on its existential behavior. But would this principle about the essence of their connection replace by something other? No. That is why given affirmation does not seem strange. Behavior and connection are mutually connected themselves, interact. Interacting, they tell on each other, influence each other. Connection- relation, relation-connection, in a word, mutual relation, interaction, they are essential. To put essence of the interaction of bioethics and event in existence of anthropologoessential- does not mean this- to give their relation in existential behavior and authority of anthropologoessential? Yes. It is. After all if people-anthropologoessential behave as like-minded persons, unanimously agree with each other in the community of interests, united by combined responsibility, connected by the unity of views and actions, coordinate their acts with established moral standards, polite, friendly, quietly, in short, their behavior is existentially-essentially united and correct, then the relations of bioethics and event are the same. But which force is able to create such human behavior and such relation of the event and bioethics? That is why, what was said is not idealization. People do everything themselves. They get according their deeds. Is it always? According to the unwritten law of life, almost always, only in other, different from once made, form. At any rate: the essence of the interaction of bioethics and event is existential-by existentiality-existentially-anthropologoessential. The connection-of-their-connection with the behavior of anthropologoessential is the same. Anthropologoessential unites bioethics and event, however and it separates them. It unites or separates even- and especially- when people does not know, what they do exactly- connecting or separation. Yes, their connection-relation essentially belongs to anthropologoessential. Yes,

they by it- interacting pair. But one can not remove their connecting/ separation from its being.

Interaction is complex, contradictory, changeable. But the living anthropologoessential origin is in it. Life is dynamic, living world of people is dynamic, interaction of bioethics and event is dynamic. What was said in another manner above, without changing essence, is re-changed here. The essence of their interaction reduces to the existentiality of anthropologoessential, to its existence. Interaction, essentially based in the existence of anthropologoessential, existentially develops instantly-together-in concert with anthropologoessential. Existentially developing together with it, it remains anthropologoessential and in behavior of anthropologoessential. Existentially-anthropologoessential character of their contradictory interaction ontologically proves existentially well-founded essence of their relation-connection. The essence of interaction of bioethics and event is well-founded by existence of anthropologoessential, existentially well-founded by its behavior. The behavior of anthropologoessential is existential. Now it's the very moment to define anthropologoessential: anthropologoessential is the ontological totality of existential acts-behavior of each human and all people in the world.

The difference of bios and ethos is phenomenologo-existentially-ontological difference of "living world" (terminology of E. Husserl) of "man-people" (terminology of M. Heidegger), man-people-anthropologoessential-living-world: from conception and birth (or non-birth) to death and funeral (burial). The difference of life and ethics- phenomenological difference of all forms of existential knowledge. The difference of living and ethical experience is ontological difference as itself of the existence of the living world of people. Whatever difference, it is one of the fundamental philosophically-worldoutlooking problems. This difference is fundamental, key problem of phenomenologo-existentially-ontological philosophy.

Bios... ethos, life...ethics, experience of life...ethical experience- this dichotomy is subject to doubt. The search of "the missing link" between them was crowned with success. Bioethics was discovered and exists. In existential plan it means hermeneutics of bioethics as: phenomenon of consciousness; "essence" of the existence of the living world of anthropologoessential; it regional

ontology; event, involved in society. The term “bioethics” can preserve dichotomy, but can be interpreted as unity. However which experience in general does make it possible to speak about “unity”? Etymology does not solve else the question about experience where “essence” of such kind and the attempt to think unity rise, where the components of dichotomy become one.

Bios...Ethos, Life...Ethics. What is between them, connects and unites in one, though contradictory, but nevertheless the whole?

The answer is “simple”:- consciousness: consciousness corresponding ontologically to the existential experience of anthropologoessential. Consciousness is ontological to the experience. The source of the problem of their connection and union in one whole- in phenomenological form, the name of which is bioethics is just in existential experience of anthropologoessential. Bioethics is problematic phenomenological form; and the starting-point of this problem ontologically is in existential experience of anthropologoessential. Point is ontological to experience. The talk is not about abstraction “bioethics”, not about bioethics in general, but about bioethics as the part of existential experience, about among-people-in-human-environment born phenomenon, that is about the phenomenon of the living world of anthropologoessential. Bioethics is existentially-ontological phenomenon, inborn to the living world of anthropologoessential.

In phenomenologo-existentially-ontological aspect the question arises: does bioethics essentially correlate with or existentially with the essence of anthropologoessential? And first, and second. The essence of anthropologoessential is existential, existence is social and bioethics, no matter how to define it, is “social phenomenon” [4]. Using language of phenomenological sociology one can say, that bioethics is existentially-essential form of social consciousness and at the same time ontologically problematic phenomenological form

Conclusions. In the living world of anthropologoessential there is existentially united, though contradictory, continuum of event-bioethics. Bioethics takes place in event, event- in bioethics: they- collaborators. Their relations are asymmetric and tense, tension between them- motive power of their interaction.

References

1. Basov A. V. Pharmaceutical companies as the social agents of medicalization: Author's abstract of master's thesis of Cand. Soc. Sc. – Volgograd, 2008. P. 15.

2. Petrov K. A. Postmetaphysical philosophy of Peter Sloterdijk: monograph.- M. Publishing house “Ruscience”, 2015. P. 86.
3. Petrov K. A. Subject, human, corporality in the philosophy of Peter Sloterdijk// Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Series 7. Philosophy. Sociology and social technologies.- 2013.- № 1(19). P. 125.
4. Sedova N.N., Sergeeva N.V. Bioethics in the space of culture: monograph.- M. Triumph, 2010. P. 23
5. Smirnov K.S. Culturological conception of anthropological disintegration: monograph- Volgograd: Publishing house VolgGMU, 2012. P. 203.
6. Sedova N.N. Methodology connection between bioethics & law.: 23rd Annual Congress of World Association for Medical Law Book of Abstracts. 2017. C. 99.

Л и т е р а т у р а

1. Басов А. В. Фармацевтические компании как социальные агенты медиализации: Автореф. дис. ... канд. социол. наук. – Волгоград, 2008. – С. 15.
2. Петров К.А. Постметафизическая философия Петера Слотердайка: монография. -М.: Издательство «Русайнс», 2015. - С. 86.
3. Петров, К.А. Субъект, человек, телесность в философии Петера Слотердайка // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 7. Философия. Социология и социальные технологии. – 2013. – № 1(19). – С. 125.
4. Седова Н.Н, Сергеева Н.В. Биоэтика в пространстве культуры: монография. М.: Триумф, 2010 - С. 23.
5. Смирнов К.С. Культурологическая концепция антропологической дезинтеграции: монография. Волгоград, Изд-во ВолГМУ, 2012.- С. 203.
6. Sedova N.N. Methodology connection between bioethics & law. В книге: 23rd Annual Congress of World Association for Medical Law Book of Abstracts. 2017. C. 99.

УДК 17+347.152

PRINCIPLE “ETHICAL EQUALS PRECISE” AS BASIS FOR ETHOS OF BIOMEDICINE

Kh. P. Tiras

PhD, Head of Chair of Humanities at Puschino State Institute of Natural Sciences, Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Biophysics, RAS, e-mail: tiras1950@yandex.ru

The principle of “ethical - means precise” suggests that only if ethically correct approaches to a living object are observed, it is possible to obtain accurate information about it. Previously, the problem of following ethical norms in biology has traditionally been examined in the context of the requirements of ethical committees on observance of certain formal rules for working with animals. In the present work, an attempt is made to justify the necessity of observing ethically adequate approaches to biological experiment as a necessary condition for obtaining accurate scientific information about a living object. Ethical approaches are considered ethical, which considers an animal in natural, natural conditions. This approach goes back to the ethics of naturalism, which means the return of remote monitoring of a living object as the basis for obtaining precise information about its structure and function.

Keywords: ethical equals precise, ethological approach, 3R principle, principle of additionality, non-invasive technologies, study of weak and superweak influences in biology