

ABOUT THE PRIMACY OF PRACTICE

Lino VELJAK
University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities,
Department of Philosophy
lveljak@ffzg.hr

ABSTRACT

Different conflicting worldviews (primarily cosmocentrism, geocentrism, theocentrism, biocentrism and anthropocentrism) clash if they insist on a rigid, dogmatic claim to absolute truth. By insisting on the theoretical truth of a particular worldview (and that means on tenets/orthodoxy / one's position), even the very possibility of dialogue is ruled out. The antitheses between cosmocentric, theocentric, geocentric, biocentric and anthropocentric views of the world are eliminated by establishing the primacy of the practical as opposed to the theoretical-dogmatic persistence of a certain science. Humanism understood as anthropocentrism free from the temptation of its absolutization in this way can refer to Kant's categorical imperative (which has its deep roots in the religious and philosophical tradition, as we find in, among others, Confucius, Buddha, Thales, the Pythagorean school, the Gospel and the Proverbs of the Prophet Muhammad). Humanism may in particular refer to Kant's formulation of the categorical imperative that humanity in one's own person and in the person of another must always be used as a purpose, and in no way as a means: humanity is an end in itself and not a means to achieve some other goals. This meaningful core of humanism can also be found in the demands for peaceful, tolerant and civilized behavior among people, demands set by Herder, among others, convinced of the need for constant development of humanity, without which we are in danger of re-entering brutality. Our times, marked by the growth of verbal (and, unfortunately, not only verbal) brutality, the relativization of truth and lies, good and evil, the meaning of nonsense, the mind of madness, also marked by growing egocentrism and ethnocentrism, as well as a disquieting rise in divisions - point to the necessity of reaffirming the values of humanism conceived in the above way. Religions that adopt humanistic ethics serve and will serve to unite and connect, while those religions that insist on dogmatic differences and monopolize the right to truth will produce divisions, disputes, and ultimately violence and evil. The contradictions between the representatives of different theocentric worldviews, i.e., different religions and denominations, could be overcome through the common heritage of almost all religions and philosophical teachings. It is a golden rule that in one possible formulation reads: Treat others as you would like to be treated.

Key words: cosmocentrism, geocentrism, theocentrism, biocentrism, anthropocentrism, egoism, humanism, religion, faith

O PRIMATU PRAKTIČKOG

Različiti međusobno suprotstavljeni pogledi na svijet (u prvom redu kozmocentrizam, geocentrizam, teocentrizam, biocentrizam i antropocentrizam) sukobljavaju se ukoliko rigidno i dogmatski inzistiraju na zahtjevu za posjedovanjem apsolutne istine. Inzistirajući na teorijskoj istinitosti pojedinog pogleda na svijet (a to znači na pravovjernom ustrajavanju na vlastitim pozicijama) gubi se zbiljska mogućnost dijaloga. Antiteze između kozmocentričkih, teocentričkih, geocentričkih, biocentričkih i antropocentričkih pogleda na svijet ukidaju se posredstvom uspostavljanja primata praktičkoga nasuprot teorijsko-dogmatskom ustrajavanju na određenom nauku. Humanizam shvaćen kao antropocentrizam koji je oslobođen od iskušenja vlastite apsolutizacije na taj način mogao bi upućivati na Kantov kategorički imperativ (koji ima svoje duboke korijene u religijskoj i filozofijskoj tradiciji, kakvu – među ostalima – srećemo kod Konfucija, Bude, Talesa, u pitagorejskoj školi, u Evanđelju kao i u izrekama poslanika Muhameda). Humanizam se posebice može odnositi na onu Kantovu formulaciju kategoričkog imperativa prema kojoj se ljudskost vlastite osobe i ljudskost drugoga uvijek mora uzimati kao svrha a nipošto kao sredstvo: ljudskost je cilj po sebi a ne sredstvo za ostvarenje nekih drugih ciljeva. Ta značajna srž humanizma može se sresti i u zahtjevima za miroljubivo, tolerantno i uljuđeno odnošenje među ljudima, kakve među ostalima postavlja Herder, uvjeren u nužnost trajnog razvijanja humaniteta, bez čega upadamo u pogibelj vraćanja brutalnosti. Naša vremena, obilježena rastom verbalnoga (a nažalost, ne samo verbalnog) nasilja, reletivizacijom istine i laži, dobra i zla, obesmišljavanjem i zaluđivanjem, ukratko, rastućim egocentrizmom i etnocentrizmom, kao i uznemirujućim potrastom podjela – zahtijeva nužnost reafirmiranja vrijednosti humanizma shvaćenoga u navedenom smislu. Religije koje prihvaćaju humanističku etiku služe i služiti će objedinjavanju i povezivanju, dok će one religije koje inzistiraju na dogmatskim razlikama te monopoliziraju pravo na istinu proizvoditi podjele i sporove, a u konačnici nasilje i zlo. Kontradikcije među predstavnicima različitih teocentričkih nazora, odnosno različitih religija i denominacija mogu se nadmašiti posredstvom zajedničke baštine gotovo svih religija i filozofijskih učenja. Radi se o zlatnom pravilu koje u jednoj mogućoj formulaciji glasi: Postupaj s drugime tako kako bi htio da se s tobom postupa.

Ključne riječi: kozmocentrizam, geocentrizam, teocentrizam, biocentrizam, antropocentrizam, egoizam, humanizam, religija, vjera

Introduction

Different conflicting worldviews (primarily cosmocentrism, geocentrism, theocentrism, biocentrism and anthropocentrism) clash if they insist on a rigid, dogmatic claim to absolute truth. By insisting

on the theoretical truth of a particular worldview (and that means on tenets/orthodoxy / one's position), even the very possibility of dialogue is ruled out. Let's start from the beginning!

Cosmocentrism

Cosmocentrism, which was characteristic of the oldest Greek philosophy, is now defined in a popular encyclopedic article as follows: Cosmocentrism contrasts with other worldviews in how it gives the astronomical world a central importance in all discourses, both spiritual, philosophical, religious, and political and has become a hallmark of Astronist philosophy as a result. It challenges the worldviews of other religions and philosophies like theocentrism, geocentrism, biocentrism, and anthropocentrism, each place God(s), the Earth, animals and plants, and humans at the centre of thought respective.¹

Ken Wilber uses the term *worldcentric* to describe an advanced stage of ethical development. This involves a broadening of the spiritual horizon through the formulation of a transpersonal ethic in which we do not only desire the best for all people but for all living beings. It is this aspect where worldcentrism is viewed as an expansion of sociocentrism where one focuses beyond self-needs to also extend care about the group, community, and society. The idea is that worldcentrism situates the positive aspects of egocentrism and sociocentrism in a larger context of concern so that consideration does not only include one's self or one's people but all peoples and all beings. Synonyms of *worldcentric* include *global* and *planetary*.²

Wilber sometimes refers to an ethical stage that is beyond the worldcentric, which he calls *kosmocentric*. In a *kosmocentric* awareness, one experiences a release of attachments of the gross realm and a radical recognition of evolutionary processes so that an individual is compassionately called to action and becomes capable of letting the gravity of outcomes go.³

1 <http://www.encyclo.co.uk/meaning-of-cosmocentrism>

2 Wilber K. *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Shambhala Publications. Boston, 2000.

3 Esbjorn-Hargens S & Zimmermann M: *Integral Ecology: Uniting*

Geocentrism

According one popular encyclopedia the geocentrism consists in the following: In geocentric worldviews, the earth is the center of the universe. Aristotle thought of celestial bodies as beautiful and pure, travelling on the surface of perfect spheres, and of the earth as an imperfect place that had fallen to the center of the universe. In the second century B.C.E., Ptolemy adjusted the geocentric theory with *epicycles* (orbits imposed on the orbits of the planets) and *eccentrics* (orbits that were centered to the side of the universe) so that the theory was better able to predict the orbits of the sun, moon, and stars. The geocentric view of the universe was replaced by the heliocentric (sun centered) view that was pioneered by Nicolaus Copernicus, adopted and defended by Galileo Galilei and much refined by Johannes Kepler who discovered the elliptical nature of planetary orbits.⁴ However, the contemporary worldview meaning of geocentrism is outlined in the notion of worldcentrism (Wilber, 2000). The authors like Wilber, however, are reducing worldcentrism to an ethical dimension, while neglecting its metaphysical (precisely mystical) grounding.

Theocentrism

Theocentrism was a key element of the Philosophy and Theology (especially of the Christology) of Saint Augustine.⁵ According to one popular (religiously based) explanation “to be theocentric means to live in a way that puts God at the center of life or makes Him the main focus of life. To be theocentric is to be “God-centered.” A theocentric life is lived in the understanding that all things flow “from Him, and through Him and to Him” (Romans 11:36). By contrast, an anthropocentric life puts man at the center. Existentialism puts existence at the center—just living is meaning enough—but theocentrism points to God as the meaning and ultimate motivation for what we do; God gives us our identity and purpose. As the Westminster Confession states, “The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever.” This is a

Multiple Perspectives on the Natural World. Boulder, Colorado: Shambhala Publications, 2008: 403.

4 <https://www.encyclopedia.com/education/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/geocentrism>

5 Demacopoulos GE & Papanikolaou A: Orthodox readings of Augustine. Fordham University Press. New York, 2020.

theocentric viewpoint. It is rational to believe that finite, limited beings can find the most satisfaction when focused on the infinite, unlimited God. In times of our weakness, we find strength (2 Corinthians 12:9); in times of spiritual lack, we find fulfillment (Matthew 5:6). And the fountain never runs dry because God Himself is eternal. Putting God at the center of our lives—living theocentrically—naturally gives a finite human existence eternal meaning. Theocentrism has what existentialism and anthropocentrism do not: a focus that goes beyond the life we see around us. Living a life with God in the center encourages virtues like mercy, peace, humility, selflessness, and environmental stewardship. If, however, one is convinced that experiencing this life is all there is, the goal becomes gaining and experiencing as much as possible, as soon as possible. Unfortunately, living for the moment often leads to misery in the form of addiction, unwanted pregnancies, broken relationships, and other regrets. Living for humanistic, anthropocentric goals also has its problems—if the advancement of man is the highest good, ambitious leaders can justify almost anything to ensure the progress of humanity—even, ironically, genocide and ethnic cleansing.⁶

The basic principle of theocentrism is already clear from the decoding of this term⁷: the word is formed from the Greek “theos” (god) and the Latin “centrum” (center of the circle). Thus, theocentrism is a philosophical concept in which God is central. He is regarded as absolute and perfection, the source of any being and any good. The principles of theocentrism gained the greatest popularity in the Middle Ages - a time when science and philosophy were inseparable from religion. According to medieval theocentrism, it was God, as an active creative principle, who served as the cause of everything. He created the world and the person in it, determining the norms of his behavior. However, the first people (Adam and Eve) violated these norms. Their sin was that they wished to determine the norms of good and evil themselves, violating the data above the norm. Christ, through his sacrifice, partially atoned for this original sin, but each person still bears his burden. Forgiveness can be earned through repentance and behavior pleasing to the Almighty. Thus, according to the philosophy of theocentrism, morality is based on the veneration

6 <https://www.gotquestions.org/theocentric.html>

7 <https://eng.sciencedevices.com/chto-takoe-teocentrizm-view-704555>

of God. Service and imitation of him is interpreted as the highest goal of human life. Medieval theocentrism is a philosophy whose main questions concerned the knowledge of God, essence and existence, the meaning of eternity, man, Truth, the relationship between the cities of the earthly and the divine. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest philosopher of the Middle Ages, tried to “link” the divine will with the relationships that take place in the world of things. At the same time, he acknowledged that even the most powerful human mind is a limited tool, and it is impossible to comprehend some truths with the mind, for example, the doctrine that God is one in three persons. Thomas Aquinas first drew attention to the difference between the truths of fact and faith. The principles of theocentrism of the Middle Ages were reflected in the writings of St. Augustine. According to him, man differs from animals in that he has a soul that God breathes into him. The flesh is sinful and despicable. Having complete control over man, God created him free. But having committed the fall, people condemned themselves to lack of freedom and life in evil. Man has to do it even when he strives for good. The ideas of confrontation between flesh and spirit, original sin and its atonement, salvation before the Last Judgment, unquestioning obedience to church norms are characteristic of medieval theocentrism. This philosophy – according to the above cited source (sciencedevices.com), organically connected with the concepts of theism, has become a pivot for the further development of philosophy and knowledge of man.

Biocentrism

Biocentrism (considering all forms of life as having intrinsic value)⁸ as an ethical perspective holding that all life deserves equal moral consideration or has equal moral standing. Although elements of biocentrism can be found in several religious traditions, it was not until the late decades of the 20th century that philosophical ethics in the Western tradition addressed the topic in a systematic manner. Roots of biocentric ethics can be found in a number of traditions and historical figures. The first of the five basic precepts of Buddhist ethics is to avoid killing or harming any living thing. The Christian saint Francis of Assisi preached to animals and proclaimed a biocentric theology

8 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/biocentric>

that explicitly included animals and plants. Some Native American traditions also hold that all living things are sacred. The Romantic movement of the 18th and 19th centuries defended the intrinsic value of the natural world against the tendency of the technological age to treat all nature as having mere instrumental value.⁹ Biocentrism has been criticized for its individualism; emphasizing too much on the importance of individual life and neglecting the importance of collective groups, such as an ecosystem.¹⁰

The biocentric philosophy places the greatest importance on living individuals or living components of the environment. Biocentric theories do not consider chemical and geological elements of the environment to be as important as living beings in the way that ecocentric theories do. Biocentrists believe that all living things are equally important. For example, a tree's life would be considered just as important as a human's life. This is in contrast to an anthropocentric view in which the lives of humans are given the greatest value.¹¹

Anthropocentrism

Definition of *anthropocentrism* is according to Merriam-Webster the following: considering human beings as the most significant entity of the universe and interpreting or regarding the world in terms of human values and experiences.¹² Anthropocentrism is a philosophical viewpoint arguing that human beings are the central or most significant entities in the world. This is a basic belief embedded in many Western religions and philosophies. Anthropocentrism regards humans as separate from and superior to nature and holds that human life has intrinsic value while other entities (including animals, plants, mineral resources, and so on) are resources that may justifiably be exploited for the benefit of humankind. Many ethicists find the roots of anthropocentrism in the Creation story told in the

9 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/biocentrism>

10 Silva C: "Biocentrism" in "Green Ethics and Philosophy: An A-to-Z Guide". Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc. 2011.

11 <https://sciencing.com/differences-between-ecocentric-biocentric-18072.html>

12 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anthropocentrism#other-words>

book of Genesis in the Judeo-Christian Bible, in which humans are created in the image of God and are instructed to “subdue” Earth and to “have dominion” over all other living creatures. This passage has been interpreted as an indication of humanity’s superiority to nature and as condoning an instrumental view of nature, where the natural world has value only as it benefits humankind. This line of thought is not limited to Jewish and Christian theology and can be found in Aristotle’s *Politics* and in Immanuel Kant’s moral philosophy.¹³

But T. Hayward gives fragmented definitions of anthropocentrism, some of which, as noted, overlap with human chauvinism and speciesism. He observes that what is objected to under the heading of anthropocentrism in environmental ethics and ecological politics is a concern with human interests to the exclusion, or at the expense, of interests of other species.¹⁴

Anthropocentrism reaches a dangerous proximity to egocentrism and selfishness. At the same time, egoism can be of an individualistic character or manifest itself as group egoism (ethnocentrism, racism, etc.). We should be cautious to assume that ‘self-love can be considered a precondition of loving others’ as sometimes in consumer-oriented and often narcissistic societies, self-love often happens to be the goal in and of itself. In fact, the self-love fetish in the Western consumer society may preclude collective action, individual sacrifice, and most importantly, the altruism that the dire environmental conditions require.¹⁵

That is egocentrism: the inability to differentiate between self and other. More specifically, it is the inability to accurately assume or understand any perspective other than one’s own. Egocentrism can be also collective: The unitary ideology of “we first” (“America First”, “Europe first”, or “France first”, “Islam first”, etc.), of taking pride in oneself or of national preference, results in acts of purification and of eradicating the others.¹⁶

13 <https://www.britannica.com/topic/anthropocentrism>

14 Hayward T: Anthropocentrism: A misunderstood problem. *Environmental Values*, 6(1): 49–63.

15 Carnegie D: *How to stop worrying and start living*. New York: Simon and Schuster. New York, 2004.

16 Iveković R: *Migration, New Nationalisms and Populism*. Birkbeck Law

The result is an endless series of confrontations and conflicts (often violent) between advocates of opposing egoisms and egocentrisms.

Discussion

The same applies to the confrontations based on the contradictions between the representatives and followers of different theocentric worldviews, i.e., different religions and denominations within a particular religion, including among the followers of a particular monotheistic religion. The explanation is as follows: every organized religion (church, religious community) requires adherence to the published and / or traditions also obtained from the community in a binding way and accepted the truths of the faith. These truths are fixed as dogmas in institutionalized communities. And dogmatic differences (even within different denominations of the same monotheistic religion, and one could say: especially in such frameworks) are the source and assumption of intolerance, because as a rule heretics are perceived worse than innovators (this “narcissism of small differences” is not specific) religious differences, already occurs wherever we deal with dogmatic pretensions to the possession of authentic truth). Intolerance (even religious hatred) is especially evident where God is perceived as “our God”, one who belongs exclusively to our tribe or our people or is believed to love and protect us in a special way (whoever you “we” were) and not the other and different, even if we profess the same variant of the same religion.

The proportions this can reach is best seen in the dark role of Catholic bishops, Protestant pastors, Orthodox bishops, and not so few imams and rabbis in the First World War. Thus the German Catholic bishops encouraged the German Catholic faithful to relentlessly deal with the French soldiers of the Catholic faith as German soldiers because the French had secularized their own country; at the same time, the French Catholic bishops addressed the French Catholic soldiers in the same way, explaining that German Catholics were fighting against Catholic France together with Protestants, i.e., heretics, proving that they deserved the punishment and retribution provided by the brave and God-fearing French soldiers. Orthodox

bishops (some on the side of the Russian Empire, others on the Austro-Hungarian side), Protestant pastors (some on the British side and others on the German side) and some imams and rabbis engaged in military service acted similarly.¹⁷

The abuse of faith for violating the Fifth Commandment is evident here. Is it necessary? The answer is: by no means! It is possible to remove such distortions by which the universal God is reduced to a state or national demon.

However, something else is possible and advisable: It is possible to overcome and eliminate such contradictions in principle, and we will find the key to that superiority in the common heritage of almost all religions and philosophical teachings. This is the “Golden Rule”, which in one possible formulation reads: Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time that it should become a universal law.¹⁸ According to K. Rushworth, the concept of the golden rule appearing prominently in Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, and “the rest of the world’s major religions” (Rushworth 2003, 159).¹⁹ And not only in religions, but also in philosophy from its very beginnings. It is enough to see two formulations, the one given by Thales (“Avoid doing what you would blame others for doing”) and the one given by Seneca the Younger: in the Letter 47: “Treat your inferior as you would wish your superior to treat you”.²⁰

Humanism

This key can also be called humanism, the common heritage of all religions, especially the monotheistic ones, but which is by no means limited to believers. But what is this humanism really supposed to mean? Humanism like this is not that of The British Humanist

17 Merker N: *La guerra di Dio*. Carocci Editore. Roma, 2015.

18 Kant I: *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. Walter de Gruyter. Berlin, 1978:420.

19 Rushworth K: *How Good People Make Tough Choices: Resolving the Dilemmas of Ethical Living*. Harper. New York, 2003: 159.

20 *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca: Essays and Letters of Seneca*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1968.

Association and The International Humanist and Ethical Union: “Humanists believe that human experience and rational thinking provide the only source of both knowledge and a moral code to live by. They reject the idea of knowledge ‘revealed’ to human beings by gods, or in special books. Most humanists would agree with the ideas below: There are no supernatural beings. The material universe is the only thing that exists. Science provides the only reliable source of knowledge about this universe. We only live this life - there is no after-life, and no such thing as reincarnation. Human beings can live ethical and fulfilling lives without religious beliefs. Human beings derive their moral code from the lessons of history, personal experience, and thought.”²¹

Nor is humanism as popular psychology and self-help manuals advocate: Humanism is a philosophy that stresses the importance of human factors rather than looking at religious, divine, or spiritual matters. Humanism is rooted in the idea that people have an ethical responsibility to lead lives that are personally fulfilling while at the same time contributing to the greater good for all people. Humanism stresses the importance of human values and dignity. It proposes that people can resolve problems through the use of science and reason. Rather than looking to religious traditions, humanism instead focuses on helping people live well, achieve personal growth, and make the world a better place.²²

Of course, the humanism in question here does not mean any return to the historical epoch of Humanism and the Renaissance that marked the beginning of the modern age. Humanism here, furthermore, does not mean (re) affirmation of the anthropocentric worldview, nor can spiritual and humanistic values be interpreted in the Renaissance key of inspiration from the ancient heritage which (then and later, primarily in the Enlightenment) challenged the theocentric worldview. Anthropocentrism defined as the absolutization of the central importance of man or humanity (man as the unrestricted master of the world and all living and non-living beings) is a false alternative to cosmocentrism, theocentrism and biocentrism. Disputes among the proponents of all these “centrisms”

21 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/atheism/types/humanism.shtml>

22 <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-humanistic-psychology-2795242>

(but also within each of them, if we are dealing with rigidly understood absolutized variants of this or that worldview or the science of what is true) have led - and lead - to divisions among people, and often to violent calculation. The transcendence of anthropocentrism is possible through its reconciliation with the meaningful cores of other centrists, freed from their absolute centrality. The model of such reconciliation offers the evangelical transcendence of rigid theocentrism: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 7:21), a will that is imperatively determined by the words: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these" (Marcus 12:30-31), and that neighbor is every human being we meet, as is clear from the parable about the merciful Samaritan: On one occasion an expert in the law stood up to test Jesus. "Teacher," he asked, "what must I do to inherit eternal life?" "What is written in the Law?" he replied. "How do you read it?" He answered, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind"; and, 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'" "You have answered correctly," Jesus replied. "Do this and you will live." But he wanted to justify himself, so he asked Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" In reply Jesus said: "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, when he was attacked by robbers. They stripped him of his clothes, beat him and went away, leaving him half dead. A priest happened to be going down the same road, and when he saw the man, he passed by on the other side. So too, a Levite, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a Samaritan, as he traveled, came where the man was; and when he saw him, he took pity on him. He went to him and bandaged his wounds, pouring on oil and wine. Then he put the man on his own donkey, brought him to an inn and took care of him. The next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper. 'Look after him,' he said, 'and when I return, I will reimburse you for any extra expense you may have.' "Which of these three do you think was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of robbers?" The expert in the law replied, "The one who had mercy on him." (Luke 10: 25-37).

In this sense, the haddith (the collected oral and written accounts

of Muhammad and his teachings during his lifetime) can also be cited: “None of you [truly] believes until he wishes for his brother what he wishes for himself” or “Seek for mankind that of which you are desirous for yourself, that you may be a believer.”²³

What is the meaningful core of humanism (which we can define as anthropocentrism free from the temptation of its absolutization), the core that can be reconciled with other positions emancipated from absolutization and stubborn rigidity? To this core belongs that part of the heritage of classical humanism which is manifested in the belief that the human will is autonomous and that it is only on its basis that it can act responsibly, in the exercise of human freedom to manage common affairs (instead of obeying self-proclaimed masters, or by this authority), and in the practice of freedom of thought and scientific research. In this sense, humanism is conceptually almost identical to humanity, understood as the opposite of self-centered egocentrism, aimed at the well-being and happiness of others while respecting the dignity of all human beings (but also respecting the well-being of other living beings, in which lies the perspective of reconciliation with the rational core of biocentrism).

Conclusion

The egocentrism, which consists in the inability to differentiate between self and other and to accurately assume or understand any perspective other than one’s own can be collective egocentrism (as ethnocentrism, usw.). The result is an endless series of confrontations and conflicts (often violent) between advocates of opposing egoisms and egocentrisms. The same applies to the confrontations based on the contradictions between the representatives and followers of different theocentric worldviews, i.e., different religions and denominations within a particular religion, including among the followers of a particular monotheistic religion. The abuse of faith for violating the Fifth Commandment during the wars is evident in the history, especially in the 20th century. That is not necessary. It is possible to remove such distortions by which the universal God is reduced to a state or national demon.

23 <https://themuslimtimes.info/2013/10/27/the-golden-rule-in-islam>

It is possible to overcome and eliminate such distortions in principle, and we will find the key to that superiority in the common heritage of almost all religions and philosophical teachings. This is the “Golden Rule”, which in one possible formulation reads: Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time that it should become a universal law.

We can define such approach as real humanism.

Humanism understood in this way can refer to Kant’s categorical imperative (which has its deep roots in the religious and philosophical tradition), as we find in, among others, Confucius, Buddha, Thales, the Pythagorean school, the Gospel and the Proverbs of the Prophet Muhammad. Humanism may in particular refer to Kant’s formulation of the categorical imperative that humanity in one’s own person and in the person of another must always be used as a purpose, and in no way as a means: humanity is an end in itself and not a means to achieve some other goals.

This meaningful core of humanism can also be found in the demands for peaceful, tolerant and civilized behavior among people, demands set by Herder, among others, convinced of the need for constant development of humanity, without which we are in danger of re-entering brutality.

Our times, marked by the growth of verbal (and, unfortunately, not only verbal) brutality, the relativization of truth and lies, good and evil, the meaning of nonsense, the mind of madness, also marked by growing egocentrism and ethnocentrism, as well as a disquieting rise in divisions - point to the necessity of reaffirming the values of humanism conceived in the above way. Religions that adopt humanistic ethics serve and will serve to unite and connect, while those religions that insist on dogmatic differences and monopolize the right to truth will produce divisions, disputes, and ultimately violence and evil.

Bibliography:

1. Carnegie D: *How to stop worrying and start living*. New York: Simon and Schuster. New York, 2004.
2. Demacopoulos GE & Papanikolaou A: *Orthodox readings of Augustine*. Fordham University Press. New York, 2020.

3. Esbjorn-Hargens S & Zimmermann M: *Integral Ecology: Uniting Multiple Perspectives on the Natural World*. Boulder, Colorado: Shambhala Publications, 2008: 403
4. Hayward T: *Anthropocentrism: A misunderstood problem*. *Environmental Values*, 6(1): 49–63.
5. Iveković R: *Migration, New Nationalisms and Populism*. Birkbeck Law Press. Abingdon, New York, 2022: 188.
6. Kant I: *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. Walter de Gruyter. Berlin, 1978:420.
7. Merker N: *La guerra di Dio*. Carocci Editore. Roma, 2015.
8. Rushworth K: *How Good People Make Tough Choices: Resolving the Dilemmas of Ethical Living*. Harper. New York, 2003: 159.
9. Silva C: “Biocentrism” in “*Green Ethics and Philosophy: An A-to-Z Guide*”. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc. 2011.
10. Seneca, Lucius Annaeus: *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca: Essays and Letters of Seneca*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1968.
11. Wilber K: *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy*. Shambhala Publications. Boston, 2000.

