ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of the article was to determine the relationship between the concepts of "jus naturale" and "global bioethics", as well as to clarify their significance for rule-making activity.

Theoretical framework: The introduction of the concept of "neo jus naturale" into the scientific circulation is justified, which is understood as a new stage of the evolution of jus naturale and the basis for the formation of a renewed type of legal understanding - bioethical. Neo jus naturale is considered as the foundation of modern law-making.

Method: The methodology of the research is: firstly, the unification of the concept of legal-positivist and natural-law types of legal understanding in the phenomenon of "bioethics" with the dominance of the natural-legal type of legal understanding in this synthesis; secondly, a change in worldview positions from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism. From research methods, both traditional, for example, historical, and non-traditional methods, for example, Gestalt approach, were used.

Results and conclusion: The articles illustrate the relationship between the concepts of "jus naturale" and "global bioethics" and their significance for rule-making. The definitions of natural law and bioethics are analysed and their meaningful analysis is carried out.

Implications of the research: The research provides valuable insights into the relationship between "jus naturale" and "global bioethics" and their significance for rule-making. It contributes to the ongoing discussion on the evolution of legal understanding and the integration of ethical principles in a globalized world.

Originality/value: It was found that global bioethics reflects the synthesis of two main concepts of legal understanding (natural and positivist), which can be recognized as the next step in the culture of development and knowledge of the phenomenon of law.
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A BIOÉTICA COMO GATILHO DA EVOLUÇÃO DA LEI NATURAL

RESUMO

Objetivo: o objetivo do artigo foi determinar a relação entre os conceitos de "jus naturale" e "bioética global", bem como esclarecer seu significado para a atividade normativa.

Referencial teórico: Justifica-se a introdução do conceito de "neo jus naturale" na circulação científica, entendido como uma nova etapa da evolução do jus naturale e base para a formação de um tipo renovado de entendimento jurídico - a bioética. O neo jus naturale é considerado o fundamento do direito moderno.

Método: A metodologia da pesquisa é: em primeiro lugar, a unificação do conceito de entendimento jurídico jurídico-positivista e jurisprudencial no fenômeno da "bioética" com o predominio do entendimento jurídico natural-jurídico nesta síntese; em segundo lugar, uma mudança nas posições de visão de mundo do antropocentrismo para o ecocentrismo. Dos métodos de pesquisa, foram utilizados métodos tradicionais, por exemplo, históricos, e não tradicionais, por exemplo, abordagem Gestalt.

Resultados e conclusão: Os artigos ilustram a relação entre os conceitos de "jus naturale" e "bioética global" e sua importância para a elaboração de normas. As definições de direito natural e bioética são analisadas e sua análise significativa é realizada.

Implicações da pesquisa: A pesquisa fornece percepções valiosas sobre a relação entre o "jus naturale" e a "bioética global" e sua importância para a elaboração de normas. Ela contribui para a discussão em andamento sobre a evolução do entendimento jurídico e a integração de princípios éticos em um mundo globalizado.

Originalidade/valor: Constatou-se que a bioética global reflete a síntese de dois conceitos principais do entendimento jurídico (natural e positivista), que podem ser reconhecidos como o próximo passo na cultura de desenvolvimento e conhecimento do fenômeno do direito.

Palavras-chave: Direito Natural, Jus Naturale, Bioética, Direito, Direito Penal, Normatização.
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1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a notable resurgence in scholarly interest regarding the concept of natural law, as researchers seek to justify its precedence over positive law. The aim of these endeavors is to provide a comprehensive and precise definition of natural law, distinguishing it from positive law and highlighting its significance in contemporary legal systems and the process of lawmaking.

Concurrently, the term "bioethics" has increasingly gained recognition within the scientific community, encompassing a wide range of interpretations and applications. Some scholars have also attempted to integrate bioethics into the field of jurisprudence, particularly in the context of jus naturale or natural law. However, due to the inherent complexity and ambiguity of the bioethics concept, its exact boundaries and limitations in relation to legal frameworks remain elusive. This lack of conceptual clarity has resulted in terminological confusion, the substitution of related terms, and an overwhelming abundance of information in the field.

Therefore, there is a pressing need to address the relationship between global bioethics and jus naturale, shedding light on their interconnections and distinctiveness. Surprisingly, despite the growing body of literature on bioethics, there appears to be a dearth of publications.
specifically investigating the precise subject matter presented in our research. Consequently, the primary objective of this article is to examine and establish the correlation between the concepts of "jus naturale" and "global bioethics," and to clarify their respective roles and significance in the realm of rule-making activities and legal discourse.

By delving into the intricate relationship between these two concepts, this research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of the fundamental principles that underpin the field of bioethics, particularly within the framework of natural law. Through this exploration, we aim to provide insights into how natural law and bioethics can inform and shape the development of legal systems, ensuring a more coherent and ethically grounded approach to contemporary lawmakers challenges.

2 METHODS

The conceptual foundations of the research are: first, the unification of the concept of juridical-positivist and natural-legal types of legal understanding in the phenomenon of "bioethics" with the dominance of the natural-legal type of legal understanding in this synthesis; secondly, a change in worldview positions from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism. The use of such a method is productive if the researcher defends the worldview positions of ecocentrism as an idea against the background of today's dominant anthropocentrism. Knowledge of the bioethics phenomenon, determination of its relationship with other phenomena, in particular law, criminal law, morality, was carried out using the historical method and the Gestalt approach as the newest means of knowing reality. The expediency of changing the concept of worldview is justified by the clear negative consequences of following the anthropocentric paradigm of reflecting reality and the dominance of positivism. Being guided and cultivating a consumerist attitude towards the environment, humanity has put itself on the verge of self-destruction. This was confirmed by the appearance of the so-called "dangerous knowledge" - knowledge that is significantly ahead of existing human knowledge, tested by practice, which causes a destructive socio-legal imbalance. Such knowledge creates bioethical problems.

In order to understand the very concept of "bioethics", its origin, they resorted to hermeneutic techniques and presented the author's concept of bioethics. When learning the essence of bioethics, both dialectical and formal logic were applied, which made it possible to reproduce, so to speak, a three-dimensional model of this term concept?

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 General Ideas About Natural Law

It is known that the ideas of jus naturale were laid by the Greek Stoic philosophers. The latter were convinced that jus naturale arises from the nature of man as a rational, social and natural being; precisely such norms should regulate human behavior in general. Being the simplest and most rational, jus naturale norms had universal application. Thus, according to the teachings of the Roman jurist Ulpian, natural law is a law that applies to all animals and is not limited exclusively to human beings (Asmus, 1976). Law according to Ulpian is the art of good and just.
However, in addition to such human qualities as rationalism, sociality, and naturalness, the formation of jus naturale was also influenced by ethics, which reflected a person's religiosity and morality.

The famous Renaissance philosopher Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) defined law through the category of justice. In his opinion, everything legal is fair, and the basis of law lies in ethical concepts expressed in legal terms. In the well-known treatise "Three Books on the Law of War and Peace" ("De jure belli ac libri tres") H. Grotius noted that natural law preserves a moral basis, but is not a set of laws, but a certain legal order established by God, ordering existence of the world with permanent connections. At the same time, the criteria for finding these connections according to H. Grotius are the dictates of common sense, by which this or that action, depending on its conformity or contradiction to reasonable nature, is recognized as necessary; and therefore such an act is either prohibited or prescribed by God himself, the creator of nature (Zheldukov, 1994).

According to R. Tuck, one of the most famous researchers of the work of H. Grotius, natural law in the work of the latter is based on the general human desire (primary instinct - Y.T.) of self-preservation and consists of a fairly small set of rights and obligations connections (Tuck, 1999). In continuation of R. Tak's opinion, it can be noted that the essence of natural law is preservation. However, not only self-preservation of a person. Today, taking care of the ecosystem, of which a person is a part, is gaining more and more relevance. Therefore, by making efforts to preserve the ecosystem, a person automatically protects himself from destruction.

Modern philosophers and theorists of law define jus naturale as a set of universal norms and principles that are at the basis of all legal systems of world civilization (Lutsky, 2013). Probably, this interpretation of this concept stems from the teachings of H. Grotius, his definition of the essence of jus naturale.

Legal philosopher V. Bachynin provides his criteria for defining jus naturale. Here are some of them: 1) it is derived from the natural order, that is, from the universe and the nature of man, which is an integral part of the universe; 2) arose together with the first steps of human civilization in the form of customary law; 3) in accordance with jus naturale, such human rights as the right to life, freedom, property, and personal dignity are unconditional, that is, they cannot be limited by the will of the state; 4) jus naturale is not identical to the current legislation and provides for religious-metaphysical and moral-ethical principles that connect it with most values of human culture, expand and deepen its legal meaning; 5) the normative-value limit of its goals is the highest justice, which is understood as a universal ideal that corresponds to the original foundation of the universe; 6) jus naturale is inseparable from world culture; 7) natural-law worldview, thinking is a property of the philosophical mind and metaphysical intuition (Bachynyn, 2006).

Continuing the opinion laid down in the last of the above criteria for the definition of natural law by V. Bachinin, let us turn to the characteristics of the natural-legal consciousness or thinking of a person, a subject of law, which will demonstrate additional features of jus naturale.

Thus, A. Polyakov, comparing natural legal and positivist approaches to understanding law, notes that they (approaches) point to different sides of legal reality, while believing that their approach is the only correct one. With regard to jus naturale, this is an indication of the connection of law with the value world of the subject, the need for his "included" participation in the life of law due to its high significance for everyone and everyone. In this case, the law finds itself in the sphere of "significance", fundamentally related to the entire value universe and therefore blurred and uncertain, unclear, not proven by formal and logical means (Polyakov, 2008).
That is why, when familiarizing with international legal acts, it is sometimes too difficult to understand their provisions (Nihal, 2023; Nordin, 2023). Their text is designed for different approaches to legal understanding, including different legal systems. However, when interpreting and applying them, it is important to feel their essence (the spirit of the law), which is the right - jus naturale. This spirit of the law should be reflected in national legislation in traditional forms for them, and not verbatim, as is often done in Ukraine, which leads to a misunderstanding of relevant international legal provisions by domestic law enforcers. Characteristic examples of the latter are the norms transferred verbatim from international conventions to the Criminal Code of Ukraine in the field of combating human trafficking, legalization of criminally acquired property, corruption, etc. (Kuts, 2001).

Similar opinions are expressed by representatives of other branches of Ukrainian jurisprudence. Thus, N. Onishchenko, reflecting on the essence of jus naturale, notes that it is rational and fair, not limited by the borders of certain states, and extends to all times and peoples. It is eternal and unchanging, just as human nature and mind are eternal and unchanging (Onyshchenko, 2013). This opinion is supported by V. Bachynin, who characterizes jus naturale as a stronghold of stability and immutability, which is not amenable to revaluations and devaluations (Bachynin, 2000).

It turns out that a person, as a potential subject of law, must learn to feel the spirit of jus naturale. Only after developing such an ability can we talk about human production of legal laws.

Summarizing the given definitions of jus naturale, let's turn to L. Fuller, who noted that the general natural law paradigm is based on the fact that there is an ideal system of law established by God, human nature and nature in general. This ideal system is the same for all societies and all stages of history. Its norms can be discovered with the help of reason and reflection. Legislated laws that contradict this ideal are invalid and therefore have no moral basis to claim to be enforced (Fuller, 1999).

3.2 Natural Law in Law Enforcement

Each subject of law (be it an average citizen or a professional lawyer) must reflect on what is the highest justice in the context of the existence of human society and . Try to identify the general patterns of social, orderly existence of different societies in different historical eras. These regularities can be traced in various religious texts, customs, historical monuments, legal texts, etc. A sign of regularity is their repetition (in different interpretations) in different sources, while preserving their single essence. Such a refrain can be a form of manifestation of jus naturale.

A vivid example of the "inclusion" of the subject of law in the life of law is the Anglo-Saxon legal system. Unlike the continental one, in which the court is strictly limited to the framework of the article of the law when making a decision, even if this article is higher than a person, the court in the Anglo-Saxon legal system directly affects the law-making process (through precedents).

Of course, in order to follow the Anglo-Saxon example of the administration of justice, it is necessary to change one's consciousness and approach to the understanding of law, to start educating a new generation of lawyers based on other principles. These principles are the principles of natural law. The natural-law type of legal consciousness involves a thinking lawyer who is not limited in his mind by the letter of the law, but one who observes in law enforcement activities the highest justice established by nature, the dictates of common sense and the conformity of this or that action (both his own and that of other persons) to reasonable nature, and therefore assesses the need to commit a certain act, while not forgetting the existence of the ancient instinct of human self-preservation through the preservation of the ecosystem.
The question of how to understand the principles and dictates of natural law and how to apply them in law enforcement activities is quite logical.

In our opinion, the answer to this question can be provided by bioethics. The latter began to form almost with the beginning of writing in human civilization through customary law. Of course, this term was not used at that time. Individual bioethical principles can be found in various religious texts in the form of spiritual instructions (in Christianity, these are the commandments of God, in Ayurveda, the vedas, etc.) - all of them are aimed at a harmonious, orderly, reasonable human existence within the Earth’s ecosystem.

3.3 Origins of Bioethics and its Definition

For the philosophical thought of the beginning of the 19th century during the Russian Empire (which included various modern independent legal systems) and in the 20th century, the direction of the so-called ethics of life or life ethics, which actually reflects the essence of bioethics in its modern understanding according to international documents, was relevant. Representatives of this direction were: P. Badmaev, S. Bulgakov, V. Vernadsky, M. Fedorov, F. Dostoevsky, P. Kropotkin, M. Roerich, K. Tsiolkovsky, M. Umov and others.

Having analyzed the relevant works of these philosophers, we came to the opinion that the ethical concepts developed in the religious philosophy of that time did not fully reflect the understanding of bioethics in comparison with its modern definition. However, they already followed some of the provisions of the latter - the need for ethical control of new knowledge, calls for the protection of the environment, the biosphere and biodiversity, the protection of future generations, the spiritual enrichment of man, etc.

Let us briefly state the main thoughts of some of the mentioned philosophers.

The most famous representative of the ethics of life was M. Roerich (1874-1947) - the creator of the so-called "Living Ethics" (Roerich, 1999). The very names of M. Roerich's ethical articles are "Common cause", "Living wisdom", "World for all living things", "Freedom of knowledge", "Fighting ignorance", "Justice", "Sensitivity", "Help", "Resisting evil" – demonstrate that it was an ethic of mutual solidarity, mercy and justice, based on the religious and philosophical values of Buddhism. Formulating his rules for the life of living beings in "Living Ethics", M. Roerich emphasizes precisely the spiritual component of these living beings. This interpretation by the author of the rules of human life (existence) essentially overlaps with the concepts of jus naturale, which were given above.

The leading principle of K. Tsiolkovsky's ethics is the demand that "all living things prosper", because "life is continuous, there is no death" (Tsiolkovsky, 1986). This, essentially Buddhist, opinion is expressed by him in his early work "Ethics, or the natural foundations of morality" and in the later "Scientific Ethics" written in 1930. In fact, K. Tsiolkovsky considers ethics as an opportunity to obtain some superknowledge, currently undefined, with the help of which a person can know immortality (provided he changes his form) - and in this he sees humanity's path to happiness.

The most famous representative of this trend at the beginning of the 20th century, was M. Umov (1846-1915) physicist, whose philosophical works, including ethical ones, are unfortunately little known.

In his articles "Misunderstanding in the understanding of nature", "Tasks of technology in connection with the depletion of energy reserves on Earth", "Cultural role of physical sciences", M. Umov develops a complex of ideas that justify the ethics of life. He proceeds from the fact that life is specific in its organization, and concepts and methods from physics are

---

7 The definition of bioethics, given in particular in the "General Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights" from 2005
not enough to understand it. The specificity of life lies in its antientropy, in the fact that it is always connected with the struggle against what M. Umov calls an "unstable state". This term is essentially identical to what is called chaos, disorganization, and disorder in modern physics. According to M. Umov, "unstable is probably the state to which unorganized nature strives. On the contrary, the stability of movements is the basis of organized matter. The picture of the transformation of instability into stability is demonstrated by the history of the life of human society ... Moral principles could not guide the behavior of beings whose nature was formed from instability" (Umov, 1916). Keeping his focus on science and natural science (appreciating, in particular, the importance of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution), M. Umov insists that the main goal of ethics is the aspiration to eliminate the evils of human life through effective intervention in the life of nature, in the transformation of chaotic forces of nature into organized, "sustainable" ones. He puts forward his "testament" of new ethics: "to create on the basis of scientific knowledge" (Umov, 1916).

M. Umov sets a new benchmark for ethics - a benchmark for fighting the forces of chaos, disorder in the name of affirming life: "The great task of the genius of mankind is the protection and existence of life on Earth." The specified provisions of M. Umov's concept (regarding the fight against disorder; his commandment to "create on the basis of scientific knowledge") will later be found in the work of the American oncologist professor V.R. Potter (1911-2001) "Bioethics - a bridge to the future".

Yes, V.R. Potter notes that "it is important to pay attention to some manifestations of order and disorder in society and realize that disorder is, in fact, raw material from which order is born and develops in the future. Attempts to build a society based only on the desire for order will not succeed until they take into account the existence of some degree of disorder. The greatest benefit that science can bring to society is in the development of its methods for a clearer separation of "order" and "disorder". The destruction of ordered systems, such as a living organism, evokes an unconscious sense of protest that compels us to work to restore such a system to its original or even higher level of organization. After all, knowledge is a force that continuously changes the human environment and leads to a new proportion of order and disorder (Potter, 1971).

As we can see, the main message of M. Umov and V.R. Potter is also the ordering of human life inherent in natural law.

Turning to the foreign discoverers and researchers of bioethics, we should bring their understanding of this concept. In foreign scientific opinion, the term "bioethics" appeared in 1927. It was introduced by Fritz Jagr in the articles "Bioethics: a review of the man ethical attitude to animals and plants", "Bioethical imperative" as a concept about the moral principles of the use of laboratory animals and plants (Goldim, 2009, Sass 2007). That is, bioethics was understood as the rules of human behavior in relation to other organisms in their biological sense (without taking into account their spiritual and social components).

In 1971, the book "Bioethics: Bridge to the Future" by the American biochemist and humanist scientist, already mentioned Van Rensselaer Potter (VR Potter) was published in the USA, which became, in the opinion of many, “The Bible of bioethics” (Potter, 1971).

The author of the book defines "bioethics" as the connection of the system of biological knowledge with the knowledge of the system of human values. The goal of bioethics, according to V.R. Potter, is the separation of the doctrine of the morality of human behavior from the position of the medical - biological field and other socially oriented life sciences. With the name of V.R. Potter is associated with a view of bioethics as a science of survival. In this, he made

---

8 Antientropy is a structured and ordered inverse of entropy, which characterizes the degree of uncertainty of the system. Antientropy is the regulation of the energy of the human body, it has a positive effect on all cells and the activity of all organs, including organs, supporting their vital functions and slowing down aging. (Schrödinger, 2009).
significant progress in clarifying the essence of this science. By the way, his "science of
survival" is not know-how, before him similar thoughts were found in M.K. Roerich.

It should be noted separately that the book by V.R. Potter was dedicated to the memory
of his teacher - Aldo Leopold (1887-1948), who was a famous American public figure, writer,
and belonged to the followers of the American ecological school. In his time, O. Leopold
created a special ethics - ethics of the Earth and extended its effect not only to individuals, but
also to all species and ecological communities (Leopold, 1980). He believed that the ethics of
the Earth is designed to confirm the right to exist in natural conditions of everything that makes
up the ecosystem, as well as to change the role of man in the biosphere, turning him from an
invader of nature into a full-fledged representative of the biological community. Contrary to
the traditional view, the new ethics proclaimed the right of every species to exist, regardless of
its economic value or utility.

The ideas put forward by O. Leopold were further developed in the writings of V.R.
Potter, in particular in his mentioned book "Bioethics - a bridge to the future".

In modern times, scientists continue to formulate their own meaning of bioethics. Thus,
the author of one of the articles in the "Encyclopedia of Bioethics", which is, in fact, a
monograph, defines bioethics not only as human research in one or another field, but also as a
certain mix of life sciences and ethics, the impact of human activity (discoveries) on the
ecosystem, and also as an academic discipline (Stephen, 2004).

The authors of the collective monograph, which includes Ya. Trynova, "Social bioethics
through the prism of global bioethics" note that currently the study of the problems of global
bioethics is recognized as a worldwide trend in the development of interdisciplinary scientific
knowledge and its main direction. First of all, this is connected with the scientific and technical
achievements of mankind and its consequences for man and nature, and at the same time, with
a steady trend towards humanizing relations in society (Myshatkina, 2018).

In 2014, the "Handbook of Global Bioethics" was published (Springer Publishing
House), which was a geographical and systematic review of the current state of global bioethics
in 40 countries of the world. About 50 scientists from different countries and continents took
part in compiling this guide. It focused on issues such as bioethical education, biobanks,
biometrics, selling organs and tissues, corruption, immigration, problems of displaced persons,
transplant tourism, poverty, improvement of human nature, etc. (Myshatkina, 2018). All this
only confirms the comprehensiveness of the concept of "global bioethics".

A representative of the Catholic Church also joined in understanding the essence of
global bioethics. Thus, in 1995, in his address ("The Gospel of Life") to his flock, John Paul II
defined bioethics as the biology of spirituality, which warns young people against the dangers
of life, which often manifest themselves in the form of selfish pleasures. In his opinion,
bioethics is a set of concepts and principles aimed at the moral improvement of humanity,
protection of human rights and dignity in connection with the revolutionary achievements of
modern biology, especially molecular genetics, genetic engineering, decoding of human and
animal genomes. The task of bioethics is to determine the limits of human medical intervention,
as well as to determine the moral value of the medical actions under consideration. "The
formation and wider development of bioethics promotes reflection and dialogue (between
believers and non-believers, as well as between adherents of different religions) about the main
ethical problems related to human life." Bioethics lays a deep foundation for the "civilization
of love and life", without which the existence of individuals and society loses its most human
meaning (Ioannes Paulus PP II, 1995).

Therefore, foreign researchers, in a broad sense (global bioethics), mainly understood
bioethics as science, about the rules of human survival in nature. At the same time, we note that
the essence of bioethics was understood by them differently than the etymological meaning of
this term (Trynyova, 2013, No. 4). In its definition, the foreign definition of bioethics is similar to its understanding by domestic scientists - philosophers, whose opinions were cited earlier.

In 2005, UNESCO put an end to the discussions on the definition of bioethics, which adopted the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (2005). This document became the only official document that provided a formally established definition of bioethics, which the entire international community must adhere to in the future.

However, UNESCO, while formulating the declaration on bioethics, still departed from the main principle of Potter's bioethics - the principle of ecocentrism, co-evolution of humanity (global bioethics).

Thus, Articles 1-11 of the Declaration are formulated in accordance with the anthropocentric concept, according to which man is the center of the universe. It was against such an approach that V.R. Potter, and as a result of this approach, Potter's bioethics arose. Only in some articles of the Declaration do some signs of global bioethics appear.

These include Article 12 (Respect for cultural diversity and pluralism), which in the hypothesis of the norm supposedly establishes respect for any cultural diversity, but its disposition again interprets this rule through an anthropocentric concept.

Clauses c-e of part 2 of article 14 (Social responsibility and health) determine that in order to ensure an achievable level of health, it is necessary to: improve living conditions and the state of the environment; prevent marginalization and alienation of persons for any reason and reduce the scale of poverty and illiteracy. All of the above is inherent to global bioethics, because it extends not only to the medical field. In addition, the specified tasks are generally social tasks in the prevention of criminal offenses.

In Article 16 (Protection of future generations), the meaning of global bioethics as a science of survival, of the future, is already more apparent: "due attention should be paid to the impact of life sciences on future generations, including their genetic characteristics."

The original essence of global bioethics is also mentioned in Article 17 of the Declaration (Protection of the Environment, Biosphere and Biodiversity): "Due attention should be paid to the relationship between man and other forms of life, the importance of proper access to biological and genetic resources and their use, respect for traditional knowledge and the role of man in the protection of the environment, biosphere and biodiversity".

Summarizing, it can be noted that in the Declaration itself, the presentation of the essence of bioethics is not accurate, and therefore needs theoretical improvement.

In addition, the Declaration repeatedly mentions bioethical problems (Article 2, Article 18, 25), but there is no definition of them in its text. To clarify these problems, we are again forced to turn to the history of the emergence of bioethics and other acts related to the Declaration (Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997), International Declaration on Human Genetic Data (2003), the Oviedo Convention and protocols to it (1997)) that is, to the doctrine of bioethics.

As we can see, the objects of bioethics are the medical field, life sciences, technologies that can be applied to a person (that is, a person as an object of research) and, accordingly, that are used by people (as subjects conducting such research). In this declaration, a person is considered not simply as a living being (bio), but as a person who is endowed with certain rights that are guaranteed to him by the international community (that is, with a social component) and corresponding obligations, for the violation of which he should be subject to a certain type of legal responsibility established by law. In this way, the formally defined understanding of bioethics is similar to the definition of bioethics provided by both domestic scientists-philosophers and their foreign colleagues.

It should be noted that in 2002 in Ukraine, according to the decisions and recommendations of the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity in Connection with the Use of the Achievements of Biology and Medicine (1997), the
UNESCO General Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1998), and Resolution No. 259 of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine dated October 3, 2002 "On the results of the 1st National Congress on Bioethics", the Concept of State Policy in the Field of Bioethics was developed (2002).

Bioethics is defined in it as a set of ethical norms and principles that integrates aspects of classical ethics and the latest trends initiated by the rapid development of scientific and technical progress and the impact of negative changes in the environment on human health into a single conceptual whole.

It is also stated in the Concept that bioethics as a system of views, ideas, norms and evaluations, which regulates the behavior of people from the standpoint of preserving life on Earth, plays an increasingly important role in society. The problems of bioethics acquire a pronounced interdisciplinary character and therefore should cover all the main areas of human activity, starting with the development of measures aimed at preserving the environment, and ending with the adoption of political decisions.

Taking into account all the given definitions of bioethics, we come to the conclusion that the latter can be formulated more simply: *global bioethics is a direction of philosophy, interdisciplinary knowledge, a certain worldview regarding the rules of human coexistence with other elements of the ecosystem and the organization of the life of society according to the specified rules in order to preserve life on Earth* (Trynyova, no. 4, 2013). Of course, the purpose of formulating these rules is to follow man's instinct of self-preservation (a sign of natural law).

Given the realities of today, human self-preservation is directly proportional with a person's adherence to the concept of ecocentrism as a certain type of worldview. According to it, a person is considered as an element in a chain of other elements of the ecosystem - a person is no longer the center of the universe, as in the case of anthropocentrism, which has been dominant for thousands of years.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Bioethics and jus naturale share common features, including the goal of human self-preservation, the moral and spiritual components, the application to all states and legal systems, and the alignment with actions based on common sense and reasonable nature. Essentially, bioethics and jus naturale are closely aligned. The difference lies in the subjects representing these concepts, with philosophers and lawyers mainly associated with jus naturale, while bioethics involves doctors, mathematicians, physicists, and others. While jurists struggled to formulate concrete definitions and principles of jus naturale over centuries, another intellectual environment managed to articulate them more precisely through bioethics. Bioethics exemplifies the natural-legal understanding by emphasizing the safety of the entire ecosystem, the co-evolutionary path of human development, and adopting an ecocentric worldview instead of anthropocentrism. These elements give rise to a new bioethical morality and a fresh perspective on justice. The formalization and systematization of bioethical principles signify a positivist approach to legal understanding. Therefore, bioethics represents the synthesis of two main concepts in legal understanding, marking a significant advancement in the culture of law development and knowledge.

Limitations of the research in the field of bioethics and jus naturale include limited collaboration and communication between experts in different disciplines can hinder a comprehensive understanding of bioethics and jus naturale. Future research should encourage interdisciplinary collaboration to ensure a more holistic approach to studying these concepts. The majority of existing research in bioethics and jus naturale is predominantly based on Western perspectives and legal systems. This bias may limit the generalizability and...
applicability of findings to non-Western contexts. Future studies should strive for a more diverse and inclusive representation of cultural perspectives.
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