



# *Journal of Arts & Humanities*

## Evolutionary Theology and Bioethics<sup>1</sup>

Alexander G. Yushchenko<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The essential theses of Evolutional Theology are set forth here from the standpoint of science-religion synthesis suggested by T. de Chardin and A. Men. The theses assume biological evolution to be either a technology of the Creator or His own evolution towards understanding His own intentions and attributes. The key point of the study consists in theoretic justification of practical recommendations as to solution to some controversial problems of modern bioethics. For this, we suggest to use Christian evolutionary interpretation of Neo-Darwinism with additions made by the author. The paradigm of evolutional Christianity is reviewed along with the position and the role of humans in the psychophysical megasynthesis of the Universe. Biological evolution is interpreted as an ascending row of divine embodiments in biological organisms culminated in the most cephalized living forms: human being (terrestrial form) and higher dolphins (water form). The establishment of communication between these living forms is considered a necessary stage of integration of Noospheric consciousness. It is suggested to use the ethics of the Creator's attitude to human beings, as a basis of bio-ethical attitude of humans to animals, especially to higher ones possessing advanced intellect and soul. In conclusion, we provide key points of "Bioethical Manifesto of Evolutionary Christianity "with practical recommendations as to its legislative implementations in the societies of the modern civilization centered on science and technology.

**Keywords:** Evolutionary Christianity, bioethics, noosphere, human-dolphin cooperation, Neo-Darwinism, militant atheistic.

**JEL Classification Code:** A13, I18, L66, Q01, Z12.

**Available Online:** 28th March, 2016.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some theses of this paper were discussed at "Theology and Science in Conversation in the Changing Contexts of Central and Eastern Europe" Conference, Comenius University, Bratislava, 31 January -2 February, 2003 and presented at "Darwin Conference 150 Years after Origin of Species: Biological, Historical, and Philosophical Perspectives", University of Toronto, Victoria College, November 21-24, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Professor, National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Email: AGYu@kpi.kharkov.ua.

## 1.0 Introduction

One can distinguish two meanings of the term “evolutional theology”: a theology that accepts evolution theory and a theology that admits its own evolution on the way to God-knowledge. The most consistent theology basing on both evolutional principles is evolutional Christianity. Its paradigm has been enunciated in the doctrine of Jesuit Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, (1955) and was further developed in the works of orthodox priest Alexander Men (1991). This direction of human thought can be characterized as a synthesis of “science and religion” that is carried out despite their historic opposition resulted from a number of objective reasons (Yushchenko, 2003).

Now we know that neurobiological properties of the left and right hemispheres of an average man consist in different methods of information processing: logical and analytic – in the left hemisphere, parallel and synthetic – in the right one. We may say that scientific achievements of civilization reside mainly in the left hemisphere while the right one hosts the achievements of religion and arts. So the objective equality the two cognitive styles – and hence of the two cognitive methods: scientific and religious – follows from the very nature of human thinking.

Most of religiously biased contemporary people understand the creation of world and life literally as it is stated in the Bible while those with scientific world outlook see it as a lucky realization of nonzero probability of an accidental event which has given rise to spontaneous biologic evolution. Neo-Darwinism is perceived as an ideological banner of science, opposing so called “religious ignorance”. Unfortunately, very few people now know that Charles Darwin concluded its distinguished book “On the Origin of Species” with the following words: “There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and ... from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved.” (Darwin, 1860, pp. 490). The essence of the above-mentioned views was ideally formulated by Charles’ grandfather, Erasmus Darwin who wrote that much more might and creative power must be possessed to establish the laws which form the world than for creating every single object.

For the explanation of divine technology for creating the Universe, Chardin introduced concepts of two forms of the energy in the “fabric of the Universe”: tangential form, which manifests itself in physicochemical interactions of matter, and radial one apparent in psyche of animals and especially humans. In the latter it reaches such greatness that at the moment of biologic death it gets away. “All around us, one by one, ... 'souls' break away, carrying their incommunicable load of consciousness.” They escape “from entropy by turning back to Omega” (Chardin P.T, 1975, pp.271-272). The very point of Omega where personalities are not devoured but associated is an attribute of the Creator. In his pioneering work, T. de Chardin paid great attention to an interpretation of noogenesis as a different stage of material and spiritual evolutionary cosmic genesis toward the synthesis of the Spirit of the Earth streaming itself ultimately to Omega Point. In the works of A. Men, Holy Writ is reconciled with the evolutionary paradigm by T. de Chardin. However, in either case, bioethics - the aspects regarding the value of animals for Creator (and for a spiritual human as well) – was not sufficiently developed. These aspects are studied in the current research on methodological ground of Christian evolutionary interpretation of Neo-Darwinism.

### 1.01 Anthropic principle and the origins of faith

We can imagine the countless multitudes of the psychophysical cycles of birth, evolutions and deaths of universes between Alpha and Omega points. We don’t know whether limited human intellect will ever apprehend the Divine Design to a sufficient degree, but we can assume, what universal psychophysical cycle allows the Creator to apprehend himself and improve his own laws. It wouldn’t contradict the scientific world outlook to assume that life emerged accidentally in one of the chaotic cycles and then it

developed up to such forms of potency that it became able to affect the laws of subsequent cycles in order to improve and reproduce itself; this has something in common with the “anthropic principle” of B. Carter as it was interpreted by Barrow J.D. and Tipler F.J. (1986, p.23). “Intelligent information-processing must come into existence in the Universe, and, once it comes into existence, it will never die out” The great Ukrainian-Russian scientist and encyclopedist Vernadsky V. (1989) thought that the Redi principle *omne vivum e vivo* is correct and universal hence space is unconceivable without life so as without matter and energy. It remains only to add that the Maker is certainly “a living substance”.

Atheistically minded apologists of so called “pure” scientific world outlook would object that all that seems too “miraculous” a state of things. We can reply that, in the first place, science itself has done pretty much “miraculous” discoveries among the properties of the “fabric of the Universe”, for example, transmitting information signals to the satellites with the help of electromagnetic fields does not surprise children nowadays, whilst venerable scientists already easily accept wave-particle duality of electron, etc. In the second place, our life itself - from birth up to biologic death as well as living Earth and the endless Universe, which open themselves to our intellect, are such “miracles” that it is hard even to imagine something more “miraculous”... We are limited in fresh comprehension of the world and ourselves by the dullness of our everyday life in urbanized jungles of modern cities and mechanized villages where we reflex, like animals in nature, without enjoying the world of God, overlooking the cause-and-effect relations among events in our lives and the lives of our progenies (so called karma). Subtle religious feeling in many people originates from their souls’ admiring response to the world’s beauty and harmony, which constitute the structurizing principle of megasynthesis of the Universe. At the basis of this feeling we can discover intellectual and aesthetic intuition of spiritually developed person. A man of rational intellectual type can come to faith through objective study of a number of phenomena, lacking explanations in the realm of contemporary science: Turin Shroud with miraculous imprint of crucified Christ’s body; the testimonies from millions of people having experienced clinical death about wordless dialog with some Supreme Being; the effects produced by prays, etc.

The author developed a creative process theory based on the proof of homology of creativity in consciousness and in Nature. Among other corollaries, the theory gives scientific support to some key theses of Holy Writ (Yushchenko, 2003, 2001), such as that man is “created in the image and likeness” of God [Gen 1:26], or “the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you” [Luke 17:21]. An important consequence of the theory is the thesis that homology of the processes taking place in different levels of organization of living matter (biologic and psychical levels) is a particular manifestation of more fundamental property of pan-homology of the Universe, which in regard to the subject of our analysis means that the only properties which develop in human being are those that existed *a priori* in the Universe but in another media and in some other level of structural organization...

Today (Moore, 2011), as in the past (Burleigh, 2007), one of the arguments “militant atheists” adduce against faith consists in diversity of religions. This by the way was the reason Darwin leaned toward agnosticism (Barlow, 1958). However we can easily overcome this intellectual difficulty if we accept the conception of evolutionary Christianity which views theology as evolution of human spirit on the way of comprehending the attributes of the personality of the Creator (Men, 1991). Thus we discover harmonic elements of divine afflatus and God-knowledge in different ancient or modern religions. It is important to note that Christianity itself demonstrates the logic, inherent to living organisms – it grows out of Old Covenant in the direction of New Covenant and gets enriched then by penetration in the sacrament of the Holy Trinity. “Militant atheists” should have understood that their atheism is also a kind of religion since there is no proof for the absence of the Creator either.

## 2.0 Problems of evolutionary Christian bioethics

### 2.01 “Natural Selection” of Human souls and Analysis Methodology

Before proceeding to the analysis of bioethical problems, let us mention the most important aspects of human ethics according to our paradigm.

From the stance of evolutionary Christianity it seems that consciousness of a just person resurrecting in God tells the Celestial Father about physical mode of being, personal experience of sufferings and joys of the soul that managed to resist the Evil forces. Evil as opposite to Good is denial of the Creator's ethics and even loathing for Him and His creatures; it is also personified in the spiritual world. Seduced with lust, money-making, power, pride, envy or other filth, divine nature of sinful soul dies in embrace of satanic forces increasing moral dirt and physical suffering for everybody it encounters in the course of its life. It can be said that the same principle of "natural selection", which is so familiar to us from the evolutionary analysis of Nature, holds on this final stage of universal transformation as well, but now – on the level of Spirit (Yushchenko, 2003). Evidently, the Maker possesses free will and if human has got a chance to be "in the image and after the likeness of him" in this life, they must have freedom of will too. The presence of Evil spiritual pole provides an alternative for human choice ensuring the evolution of either material or psychic life forms. Christian's ethics is grounded on the theses of the Holy Writ: first of all on the Dispensations received by Moses in divine revelation and on the new Dispensation of Love thought by Jesus.

Christian bioethics can be considered to begin from the Last Supper, when Jesus vegetariansly replaced meat and blood of a sacrificial animal with bread and wine, which are used in Christian Eucharistic sacrament either by Western or Eastern Church up to modern times. However contemporary state of planetary expansion of *Homo sapiens* as a species armed by modern technologies, ranging from traditional agricultural ones to ultra-modern genetic engineering, demands that we seek for key bioethical doctrine to serve as moral imperative for taking many practical decisions regarding other forms of life and, in the first place, regarding our nearest congeners – in the sense of evolution – the higher animals endowed with developed soul. According to historic tradition, our species regards animals from position anthropochauvinism or "speciesism" according to Richard Ryder (1971, 2000) more or less, depending on culture or religion. The former can be seen as human kind of the latter perceived potentially as a cosmic scale phenomenon. However as in the process of economic development and evolution of human spirit, we observe significant historic dynamics of societies on the way to democratization and recognition of person's key rights, which goes beyond the bounds of tradition, so evolving human spirit needs revision of its behavior concerning other life forms as well. Here the historic tradition cannot supply us a foundation for developing new bioethical norms (a Noosphere ethics, Yushchenko, 2000). Instead we shall try to use general framework of psychophysical megasynthesis along with the ethics of biological evolution (a Gene ethics, Yushchenko, 2000). And evolutionary Christianity, being a synthetic combination of two cognitive methodologies for two different strata of reality (theology – for spiritual stratum and science – for material one), will serve as a theoretic ground for our analysis.

### 3.0 Christian evolutionary interpretation of Neo-Darwinism

Thus, we see the megasynthesis as universal spiritual matter that evolves according to anthropic principle and synchronously prepare a) huge energy sources – stars surrounded with planetary "eggs" comprising initial organic bouillon as well as b) germs of life – proto-DNAs (or RNAs), an elementary replicators, in which – according to the cosmology principle – the replication property of the Universe is informationally reproduced in current psycho-physical cycle. Richard Dawkins described a possible scheme of mutations in the replicator leading to invention of different proteinaceous surviving machines, i.e. the whole diversity of biologic species (Dawkins, 1993). Evidently, the conditions leading to development of new species occurs when intra-species competition overgrows inter-species one. That all resembles an archive file self-extracting to some media for which the archive can even adapt. The chemical basis of life on Earth (namely, gene replication and gene-guided synthesis of protein "suits", i.e. organisms) – as has been already noticed long ago – is in its essence a system of complex programs (Shklovsky, 1987). In spite of random character of mutation, crossover and inversion – the

genetic operators creating new information structures of DNA and hence the protein structures synthesized by the latter, the pronounced regular nature of evolution is ensured by natural selection granting survival to the “most fit” individuals. The most adapted biological form turns to be the most cephalized one, i.e. *Homo sapiens* along with some higher *Cetaceans* (Lilly, 1965, Yushchenko 2000, 2001). This means that intelligence is the most perfect mechanism for survival since it accelerates the search for favorable “informational mutations” in psychic reality. This was an outline of the mechanism of God’s technology for creating a living being “in the image and likeness of” the Creator, endowed with soul, intelligence and creative abilities, i.e. capacity to change the world. All these features, being developed to perfection, ensure realization of anthropic principle.

#### 4.0 Evolutionary Christian Bioethics

But what is the role of other species in this megasynthesis? Are they a kind of “biologic slag” or do they possess independent value in the eye of God? Do they exist “to the Glory of God” as some Christian theologians think (e.g. Andrew Linsey) along with the most of Moslems, Buddhists, Hindus and Jains (Pavlova, 1997)? Computer modeling of evolution starting with *Protochordata* and up to something like *Australopithecus* proved that living matter would evolve even in constant environment (Mednikov, 1982). In the first place, this supports informational interpretation of life as a self-extracting archive, in the second place, it points out that all life forms take parts in the process of creation, and pithecoïd life form has to compete with them improving its own cephalization. In other words, the emergence of our species is impossible without participation of other species occupying their own niches in the “economics of Nature”, which is by itself a single planet-size living organism that we sprout from, where we obtain either organic or inorganic substances for our homeostasis, and the organic ones are actually the parts of life spectrum including some animals which we simply eat. At the same time we are integrated in circulation of planetary matter performed by the whole life spectrum but our technological influence generates additional toxic pressure that intoxicates us and other species. That stimulates ecological movement just out of human instinct of self-preservation. Regarding ourselves as a source of values, we could sort other species according to their utility for supporting our life and discriminate the others as Aristotle did: less intelligent ones must serve more intelligent ones (Pavlova, 1997). Meanwhile molecular biology studies of genomes confirmed the hypothesis of biochemical cognation of all life forms on Earth.

In Nature as well as in the history of human civilization, we see that cooperation or simply tolerance among individuals is based on informational identity; the only difference is that it is genetic identity for animals and rather cultural identity – for humans. This can be a basis for us to formulate anthropocentric value-of-similar-one bioethical principle. We value ourselves and we are friendly to the people that share our values (cf. different military and political unions and blocs in geopolitics). At best we are tolerant to those ones that don’t share them. In military conflicts people don’t eat their conquered enemies any more as they did in great antiquity because it is tacitly implied that all civilized people have but many common values and some common attributes like abstract thinking. It follows from such logics that all other species can be killed, used as a food or utilized for some other purposes e.g. for medical experiments, like it usually is in our civilization (Graham, 2000). According to such bioethical approach, as professor Ryder wittily said, technologically more developed aliens with other biochemistry can without a twinge of conscience make delicatessen out of us. Such a situation we are reluctant to imagine. We tacitly hope that this will not happen because we would have semantic identity with the aliens since we all are intelligent beings. Here again we face contradiction: the aliens may occur to be too different in their level of intelligence so we may fail to prove our value logically. Besides there would be aggravating circumstances: we also eat farm animals or utilize them in some other manner while they are in close cognation to us, possess elementary intelligence and rather developed emotions. Overcoming this deadlock can be achieved through search for other fundamental bioethics principles. Why not consider the problem of value of other species from the same standpoint we apply to ourselves?

Universal value of a human person becomes apparent in approaching the archetype, i.e. according to the degree of perfection with which she\he resembles the Creator. The following attributes of the Creator should be considered: Love and hence emotions, feelings, intelligence, creativity, and all these in the superlative: an “infinite sum of infinite perfections” as Ramon Llull put it. Can we find these features in animals? Certainly! As it was shown by Charles Darwin, animals do exhibit all these features more or less and not only higher animals – even birds possess them to sufficient degree. Darwin wrote: “As man possesses the same senses as the lower animals, his fundamental intuitions must be the same. Man has also some few instincts in common, as that of self-preservation, sexual love, the love of the mother for her new-born offspring... the lower animals are excited by the same emotions as ourselves” (Darwin, 1890, p.66,69). And more than that “man and the higher animals, especially the Primates, have some few instincts in common. All have the same senses, intuitions, and sensations, - similar passions, affections, and emotions, even the more complex ones, such as jealousy, suspicion, emulation, gratitude, and magnanimity; they practise deceit and are revengeful; they are sometimes susceptible to ridicule, and even have a sense of humour; they feel wonder and curiosity; they possess the same faculties of imitation, attention, deliberation, choice, memory, imagination, the association of ideas, and reason, though in very different degrees” (Darwin, 1882, p.79). Darwin also points out communicative abilities of animals and variety of means for expression of emotions (Darwin, 1890) that indicate the richness of their inner selves. Some of them even have feelings close in their origin to religion, e.g. “a dog looks at its owner like at God”. Such inherently human feelings like morality and conscience, which – in their elementary form – were of fundamental importance even at stage of formation of primitive human communities, can be viewed as evolutionary development of “social instinct” of higher social animals. Our modern knowledge allows us to suppose that higher dolphins communicate in remarkably complex language, that they also possess self-consciousness and - at least Orcas – language dialects and culture. Due to the work of the Gardners – the American researcher couple – we managed to establish meaningful communication with our closest cognate – Chimpanzee (Linden, 1975). The author of these lines has developed a conception, according to which the formation of intelligence in higher Cetaceans through informational interaction of young individuals with humans corresponds to the objective tendency of integration of Noospheric consciousness in inter-species level among the most cephalized life forms (Yushchenko, 2000, 2001).

Moreover, an important corollary of the creative process theory consists in substantiation of understanding planetary evolution of living matter as intuitive thinking of Geo-Solaris acquiring its consciousness in these cephalized forms (Yushchenko, 2001). To summarize this short review: animals do possess soul and intelligence depending on their position in evolutionary hierarchy; even plants have psyche in embryo, which is in consent with key Chardin’s thesis concerning the presence of spiritual constituent everywhere in the fabric of the Universe. Having briefly characterized other living species of our planet, we have to admit that to certain degree they also embody the attributes of the Maker and, first of all, the attribute that we call ‘soul’. We believe in potential immortality of our soul and its ability to energetically reemanate at the moment of a human’s biological death taking our spirit away to the Creator or probably informationally rewrite itself to the subtle substance of His Personality – but in any case – to continue the life of spiritual constituent of our personality in other forms of incarnation. But why should we a priori rule out such possibility for all animals?

Alexander Men, an authoritative apologist of evolutionary Christianity said: “that is no way a trifling matter” and “I believe that there is actually something immortal in animals” (Men, 1999)! Theologist Keith Ward also presupposes the existence of “eternal life” for “all feeling creatures” (Pavlova, 1997). This may imply that certain divine embodiment is present at least in higher animals and here we see manifestation of regular increase of the degree of embodiment of the Creator along the ascending row of evolving life forms. Such degree can differ among human individuals too and even more dramatically than it does among animals of the same species. Among human persons we encounter a broad range – from real “image and likeness” depending on the development degree of soul and intellect to an antipode driven by Satanic spirit of anti-harmony and anti-beauty, destroying all divine things on its way. The main distinctions between human and animals are creative spirit and free will of the former but they can be either his advantages when he morally rise up to his Archetype and – on the contrary –

his deficiency (patrimonial sin) when he denies his divine nature and direct his logos to anti-creativity bringing destruction, suffering and death to the world. Animal ethics is based mainly on instincts; some elements of culture are acquired only in social groups or in communication with humans. Human ethics on the contrary is insignificantly based on instincts while in most part it comes from family upbringing, social culture and creative self-development of person. So considering planetary living matter from this stance, we note ascending row of elements of divine embodiment in animals and eventually its completion in moral human being. Now, being enarmed with millennia of mystic experience in God-knowledge and revelation of the Person embodying according to Ramon Llull “infinite sum of infinite perfections” directed to us, so imperfect, who nevertheless shows Eternal Love, immense mercy and total indulgence to us, shouldn’t we follow this rule in developing our ethics concerning dumb animals for which we are more God-embodying creatures? There are no strong reasons to think that the Creator is indifferent to the destiny of His creatures, on the contrary mystic experience tells us that embodied Divine Spirit senses the world via living soul. Fr. Alexander Men wrote: “being rejected and betrayed by people, the Lord suffers. This was an inconceivable mystery revealed to prophet Hosea. This suffering is the pain of unshared love. It testifies of intimate bonds between the Creator and the creature and the cause of the divine suffering is our imperfection” (Men, 1991). On discovering divine suffering in a soul of a suffering man, we should accept its presence in a soul of a suffering animal – “the whole creation has been groaning together” [Rom. 8:22] – this is the truth revealed to Apostle Paul. And our revelation to Nature should consist in Love and Schweitzer’s awe of Life invoked to materialize the Spirit of the Maker via human creative activity! It seems that this universal principle should be extended to cover all life forms including extra-terrestrial ones, i.e. regarding not their chemism but their embodiment of God.

## 5.0 Conclusions and Practical Recommendations

### 5.01 Conclusions

We have to admit that other life forms especially higher animals also have their substantive value for the Creator. They possess immortal soul and/or intelligence, which are included in universal psychophysical cycle. That requires revision of all human outlook and human civilization practice as to technological utilization of the rest of the Nature.

In this paper we just have sketched the conceptual approaches of evolutionary Christian bioethics; the analysis of particular bioethics problems requires special studies. But as we have seen, the study performed so far supplies us with new arguments supporting New-Testament-inspired biocentric trend in Christianity opposed to historically formed Old-Testament anthropocentrism.

Generally it seems that taking into account real danger of forthcoming total toxication of modern civilization with its own excrement (Zubakov, 2000, Yushchenko, 2000), we have urgently curtail our egoistic planetary expansion and start up to restore living space for the species we have anthropochauvinistically discriminated but which are more perfect and beautiful than some Satan-ridden *Homo sapiens*. Voluntary and moral limitation in the number of children in human families down to two persons would be a great step in this direction. For now we still reap the fruits of disastrous technological violence to the Nature: climate anomalies, which become more and more frequent, epidemic and chronic diseases of either animals or humans.

One could reasonably object that there is much suffering in Nature even without human participation. But we would reply: so far humans have only infinitely increased total suffering while they have quite opposite mission. Certain degree of cruelty in biocenoses is inevitable charge for the progress of living matter but there works a basic rule of biological stabilization: exploiter species somehow compensate the “expenses” of the exploited ones (Yushchenko, 2000). Unfortunately this is not the case with “civilized” humans. And finally there is a need for more strict legislation concerning guarantees of

animal rights for life devoid of suffering (Graham, 2000), which we should regard as our evolutionary mission and moral duty to the Creator.

Basing on these key inferences as well as on the theses provided in other cited works by the author, we can formulate “Bioethical Manifesto of Evolutionary Christianity” (Yushchenko, 2013) in the most general terms and suggest it for legislative implementation in human societies

## 5.02 Bioethical Manifesto of Evolutionary Christianity

### In theory:

1. Every biological form of life is spiritual in nature and therefore is “sacred”. It is entitled to live fully without suffering.
2. Biological evolution is the process of embodiment of Creator’s attributes (such as Love, Creativity, and Free Will) in biological forms of growing complexity that are valuable in themselves.
3. Dolphins are the supreme form of evolution in water as humans are on land. Dolphins embody Love as their dominant trait as humans do Creativity.
4. Earth is an intuitive brain, called Geo-Solaris. It possesses “gene ethics” that co-evolutionary stabilizes biocenoses through mutually beneficial co-existence of different species.
5. The role of the humans in nature is to generate a new layer of consciences, a psychological reality that is complementing the intuitive planetary cognitive process, taking place in the information medium of proteins and nucleic acids.
6. The ethics of Creator toward human should be a basis for the ethics of human toward animals as life forms embodying Creator to less degree.
7. Animals are sin-free in nature since their freedom is limited by their instincts.
8. The problem of survival of modern humans is caused by human rudimentary aggressive genetics and increasing technological knowledge that lacks bioethical basis.
9. To solve the survival problem, we have to make our education system more humane, with priority of cultivating “good” in the minds of spiritual personalities.

### In practice

1. Euthanasia is a manifestation of free will of a conscious human, a form of liberty of conscience, like religion.
2. Abortion is killing of a forming conscious being. Government should confidentially provide a pregnant woman with adequate support and take responsibility for raising a child in case if both parents refuse to do so.
3. Animals that are exploited by humans should be given an opportunity to live their lives fully and enjoy physical and emotional development according to the level specific to their species. The level of exploitation should decline up to complete liberation as any other kind of discrimination (racial and gender inequality) that has been rejected by modern civilization.

## Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Ms. Sheelagh D. Graham, Advisory Director of WSPA and Mr. Andrei I. Kursin, head of Machine Translation Laboratory at National Technical University “Kharkov Polytechnic Institute” for the helpful advice and kind aid concerning of preparation of this paper English version.

## References

Barlow, Nora ed. (1958). The autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882. With the original omissions restored. *Edited and with appendix and notes by his grand-daughter Nora Barlow.* London: Collins.



- Barrow J., Tipler, F. (1986). *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford.
- Burleigh, Michael. (2007). *Sacred causes: the clash of religion and politics from the Great War to the War on Terror*. 1st ed. New York: HarperCollins, 557 p.
- Chardin, P. (1975). *The Phenomenon of Man*, N.Y. Harper & Row.
- Darwin, C. (1860). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*. London: John Murray. 2nd edition, second issue.
- Darwin, C. (1882). *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. London: John Murray. 2nd edition.
- Darwin, C. (1890). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. London: John Murray. 2nd edition.
- Dawkins, R. (1993). *The Selfish Gene* 1976, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, S. (2000). Procrustean bed: the Fate of Animals We Eat. In: *Bioethics on the Verge of 3-d Millenium*. Proc. Int. Simp., Kharkov pp.7-11. (in Russian).
- Lilly, J. (1965). *Man and Dolphin*. London: Gollancz.
- Linden, E. (1975). *Apes, Men, and Language*. Dutton: Saturday Review Press.
- Mednikov, B. (1982). Macro- and microevolution. *The UNESCO Courier*, pp.33-35.
- Men, A. (1999). *Alexander Men Answers the Questions of Audience*. Moscow (in Russian)
- Men, A. (1991). *History of Religion: In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*, vol. 1-7., 2nd edition Moscow.
- Moore, C. (2011). *Militant atheists: too clever for their own good*. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved on 10 March 2011.
- Pavlova, T. (1997). *Bioethics in Higher School*. Moscow: MSAVM&B. (in Russian).
- Ryder, R. (1971). *Experiments on animals*. In: Godlovitch, S., Godlovitch, R. & Harris, J. (eds.). *Animals, Men and Morals. An Enquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-Humans*.
- Ryder, R. (2000). *The History of Animal Protection in the West*. In: *Bioethics on the Verge of 3-d Millenium*. Proc. Int. Simp. Kharkov, pp.32-34.
- Shklovsky, I. (1987). *The Universe, Life and Mind*. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian).
- Vernadsky, V. (1989). *Beginning and Eternity of Life*. Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossia (in Russian).
- Yushchenko, A. (2003). *Science and religion: the synthesis instead of a confrontation, "And The Trust Will Make You Free" – Theology And Science in Conversation in the Changing Contexts of Central and Eastern Europe*, 31 January – 2 February 2003, *The Evangelical Theological Faculty, Comenius University, Bratislava*, pp. 184-188, doi: 10.13140/2.1.4480.4160
- Yushchenko, A. (2001). *Synthesis of Science and Religion: Human as being "in the image and likeness" of God form the Standpoints of Creative Process Theory, «Erdeni» Congress Eupatoria, Sept. 2001*, pp. 100-03. (in Russian).
- Yushchenko, A. (2000). *Logics and Ethics of Evolution – Scientific Basis of Human Ethics*, *Biologicheskyy Vestnik*, 1-2, vol. 4, pp. 122-126. (in Russian).
- Yushchenko, A. (2000). *Logics of Evolutionary Megasyntesis and Conditionality of Global Catastrophe, In Emergencies*, Proc. Int. Conf. of BSEC. Kharkov. (in Russian).
- Yushchenko, A. (2001). *The Prospects of Intellectuals Integration of Man's and Dolphin's. ; International Institute of Informatics and Systemics. World Multiconference on Systemics, Volume: v.17: Concepts and Applications pt.2*, doi: 10.13140/2.1.2371.1689
- Yushchenko, A. (2001). *The Earth as a Reflexively Thinking Brain (Geo-Solaris), «Erdeni» Congress Eupatoria, Sept. 2001*, pp. 99-100. (in Russian).
- Yushchenko A. (2013). *Bioethical manifesto of Evolutionary Christianity, Proceedings of the Fifth National Congress on Bioethics. Kyiv, Ukraine, September 2013*, p.59. (in Russian).
- Zubakov, V. (2000). *The Home of Earth: Outlines of Ecogeosopic World Outlook*, St. Pb. (in Russian).