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Bioethics as a phenomenon of intellectual culture represents a natural philosophical core of modern post-academic (human-dimensional) science, in which the ethical neutrality of scientific theory principle is inapplicable, and elements of public-axiological and scientific-descriptive discourses are integrated into a single logic construction.
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What is the phenomenon of bioethics? The question, in our opinion is by no means trivial, and rhetorical. According to the English version of Wikipedia, «Bioethics is the study of the typically controversial ethical issues emerging from new situations and possibilities brought about by advances in biology and medicine. It is also moral discernment as it relates to medical policy and practice. Bioethicists are concerned with the ethical questions that arise in the relationships among life sciences, biotechnology, medicine, politics, law, and philosophy. It also includes the study of the more commonplace questions of values («ethics of the ordinary») which arise in primary care and other branches of medicine» (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bioethics). According to the Russian version of the same website «Bioethics - the doctrine of the moral side of human activities in medicine and biology» [1].

And finally on one of the educational portals bioethics is characterized as «interdisciplinary studies of ethical, philosophical and anthropological problems arising from the progress of biomedical science and the introduction of new technologies in healthcare practice» [2].

So, in the modern mentality the content and the meaning of «bioethics» as a category imply its «hybridity», a synthesis or, at least, a comparison of cognitive-epistemological (bio – as a symbol of rational methods of manipulation with living objects), and communicative-ethical (ethics – as a symbol of good or malicious outcome of such manipulation for human).

Thus, bioethics as a scientific discipline in any case goes beyond the actual ethics - in the sphere of social practice and in the sphere of natural philosophical comprehension of its potential and actual results.

In accordance with the basic principle of modern post academic science with human dimension, a classic example of which are biotechnology and bioethics: scientific theory of complex self-organizing systems, including the carriers of creative intelligence, the theory and algorithm of its construction is necessarily a synthesis of evolutionary epistemology and philosophical anthropology with a specifically scientific empirical base.

The system of socio-cultural balances that provide self-identity of Homo sapiens, has been very stable, but only until the birth of technologies of directed evolution when ontological antinomy Evolution versus Intelligent Design was finally overcome. As a result, the restrictions arising from the limitedness of technological means of transformation of reality, were overcome at least in potentio. The only stabilizer of the flow of the global evolutionary process, integrated into the evolutionary strategy of our species is the semantic code of humanization/dehumanization, which itself admits considerable stochastic fluctuations, besides it is open to technological interventions, and therefore requires continuous monitoring.

The paradox of use of technologies of directed evolution for the improvement of the psycho-emotional, mental and moral spheres of humanity is in their (technologies) trans module character. Technological fixation or strengthening of the attributes of humanity turns them into species, rather than socio-cultural characteristics, i.e., transfers them from social and cultural to the biological module of SASH. In the terms of social psychology the transfer of the attributes of humanity into the attributes of human nature takes place.
This paradox was defined by Ingmar Persson and Julian Savulescu, who formulated it from transhumanist position, i.e., used it to justify the admissibility of a moral bio improving of human by contradiction [3]. However, since its logical core represents philosophical antinomy (1) genetically predetermined HUMAN NATURE versus HUMANITY formed by culture [5] and (2) a biologically reduced NEEDS versus DESIRES reduced by culture [7], as well as (3) biological SEX versus socio-cultural GENDER etc., actually, this paradox is not solvable in a logic way.

With the birth of biomedical and genetic technologies the «change of the dominant purpose» of adaptive technogenesis from spontaneous transformation of «construction of ecological niche» to «environmental engineering» has occurred [6]. The latter term refers to already rationalistic (purposeful) transformation of reality on the basis of the initial knowledge and the a prediction of the future. Such methodological intention is closer to the traditional paradigm of socio-humanitarian sciences than to the natural ones. Beyond the opposition spontaneous/rational [7], or, if you like – antinomy natural process/intelligent design, the difference between these two classes of evolutionary phenomena (population and social communities) has no content Hermeneutics of nature from a purely philosophical methodology returns to the natural science of the era of directed evolution in which categories Truth and Misconception are equal to the opposition of Good and Evil.

In other words, natural philosophy is regaining the status of the backbone of the theory of evolution - in an explicit form, in contrast to the classical attempts of the evolutionary synthesis of XIX-XX centuries (classical and neodarwinists paradigm). It means that bioethics is exactly a modern version of natural philosophy, in which the elements of public and axiological (social-humanitarian) and descriptive-informative discourses merge into the inseparable amalgam not without internal logical contradictions.

THE LITERATURE

1. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%91%D0%B8%D0%BE%D1%8D%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0
2. https://iles.school-collection.edu.ru/dlrstore/fbdcf9cb-83b4-b2e5-38ad-97f7d6590ab/1010365A.htm

БИОЭТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО УГОЛОВНОГО ПРАВА: СОСТОЯНИЕ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ

BIOETHICAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL LAW: CONDITION AND SETTLEMENT PROSPECTS

Я. Тринева, В. Куз
Ya. Trynova, V. Kuts

Европейский университет, Национальная академия прокуратуры Украины, г. Киев, Украина
Trynovayana80@gmail.com
European University, National Academy of Prosecutors of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

Theses present contemporary issues of bioethics, which require the settlement of both the means of international criminal law and the means of national criminal law. Presented their current legal status and perspectives for their legal support. Global bioethical problems that require their international legal support include: conducting experiments on the human genome, including reproductive cloning of humans, creation of chimeras; Large-scale use of nanotechnology. Presented the comparability of such international crimes as genocide and ecocide, from the point of view of bioethics.

Современные актуальные проблемы биоэтики требуют регулирования средствами как международного, так и внутреннего уголовного права. В тезисах представлены настоящее правовое состояние биоэтических