

Example of argumentative essay on biocentrism

[Science](#), [Biology](#)



On broad perspective, biocentrism is a word which is derived from the words ' bio' and ' central', which mean life and being the centre of focus respectively. Biocentrism is a theory that was posited by Robert Lanza, an American doctor back in 2007. The main hypothesis of the theory is that biology is the central of everything on earth. As such, it can be applied in understanding all the other aspects of life. He argues that physics is the branch of science which helps in understanding the physical nature of the world while chemistry helps in the understanding of life. However, he seeks to prove that of all these, biology is at the center.

Of course, there are various reasons as to why he puts forward such an argument. First of all, there is the belief that there is no way that anything else can exist without the foundation of life. As such, everything that people do and engage in can be based back to the understanding of what life is and what it entails. In other words, all studies start with the seed of life. Physics studies the physical aspects that can be seen from the existence of life while chemistry itself tries to understand what life is. From this argument, it is seen that biology lies at the center; it is the focal point of all the rest.

Of course, there are various criticisms in relation to the theory; some positive and others quite negative. In order to clearly understand this issue, this essay aims at looking at two main critiques of the theory of biocentrism. In order to get the feel of both sides, the essay will look at a positive criticism as well as a negative criticism, and then compare the two.

The first critique is by David Schmidt. This scholar is strongly opposed to the theory proposed by Lanza. The main argument is the fact that the theory does not specifically bring in something new to the body of knowledge. As a

matter of fact, anything new that is brought up has to add to the body of knowledge; whether in the scientific or the philosophical sense. However, Schmidt (3) argues that Lanza just did what can be termed as a duplication of efforts. There is simply nothing new to learn from the theory. Everybody understands that biology is the backbone of any other science. All the studies are aimed at understanding the science of life, which is founded in biology. It is for this reason that most sciences and studies seek to understand more and more of life. As such, coming up with a theory to prove what has already been proven does not count as a new way of learning. Schmidt also goes further to look at the feasibility of the theory, where he argues that there are quite a number of irregularities and inaccuracies in connection to the hypothesis of the theory. He has it that the theory posits that all other studies, such as the quantum physics, are just aimed at proving the theory. However, there are some aspects that are not specifically related to biology. There are also some irregularities in the connection of biology and other aspects of life. For instance, it is known from the Darwinian Theory that life is a matter of survival for the fittest. Furthermore, there is the argument that all creations are equal and this serves as the foundation for the egalitarian system. However, this is not always the case. More often than not, the wants and needs of the humans tend to override those of other creatures. How, then, can it be claimed that biology is the central figure in all forms of life whereas it has some information which seems to be incorrect? This acts as a strong basis for Schmidt to go against the biocentrism ideas. The issue of egalitarianism also comes in very strongly. In this case, Schmidt fails to understand how the humans can claim to consider the equality of

species and respect them whereas they do not have the respect for others. There is no explanation or justification as to why the humans should treat the needs of other creatures as less important whereas they consider their own needs to be important and valuable. Well, considering these factors, it appears that biocentrism does not actually apply in real life. Rather, it is a creation in the minds of a few who wish to bring about a kind of order or unity in the universe whereas this is not possible.

Another bone of contention lies in the fact that at times, humans tend to disregard the rights of other people to the benefit of their own. However, egalitarianism has it that the rights of all should be equally respected.

Therefore, when humans fail to respect this and treat others as just other beings rather than equally important creations, there is a major problem. It is for these reasons that Schmidt argues that there is no need to go with such a theory. It actually goes against what it is supposed to be protecting.

Biocentrism is not so much for the idea that biology is at the center of life; rather, it is an indication that biology does not actually apply in the real life situations.

Though there are such criticisms about the theory, there is also the positive side. There are other philosophers who feel that the theory is in place and timely to help in understanding some of the concepts on life which have not been understood for quite a long time. One such philosopher is Sterba who is in full support of Lanza's arguments. His arguments are as stated below.

First of all, Sterba (1976) has the idea that the provisions of the theory are quite successful. The different philosophies in relation to the theory are as follows. The first of all is the theory of human preservation. This implies that

the issue of human preservation should be considered very carefully. This implies that even though humans have to consider the needs of others, there is also the need to make sure that human preservation is also important. As such, the first philosophy applies that the actions that are needed to take care of the individual needs first before considering the needs of others. This can also be referred to as the theory of species preservation. This is where the needs of humans have to be well fulfilled and considered before the needs of others are.

Based on this argument, there is the fact that in the pursuit for human preservation, there is the possibility of going beyond boundaries. That is, the needs of humans can be fulfilled at the expense of the needs of others. Well, this is merely propagated by the factor of biology and life. The more the humans need to preserve themselves, the more they can have problems relating to the needs of others in the system.

The second philosophy that comes into action is the philosophy of disproportionality. This focuses on the actions which fulfill the non-basic or the luxury needs of the humans while going against the needs of the other creatures. Well, this strictly goes against the dictates of the moral or ethical issues related to the human's existence. This is an indication that though humans tend to agree that other creatures are also to be considered, yet they tend to disregard these other creatures. Well, this precipitates to the idea that humans have a very different idea in relation to humans and other creatures.

The third issue that comes up in relation to the biocentrism has to do with the principle of philosophy of human defense. Even in the Darwinian Theory,

there is the issue of species preservation. That is, every creature seeks to survive and have a quality life. This should not be compromised by anything else that is on earth. The principle of defense has it that there are occasions when the actions of humans might be endangering to the lives of others, but are justified if they are aimed at preserving the individuals' lives. At times, these actions can involve the killing of others or disregarding their rights. Armed with this argument, Sterba (577) has it that life is very crucial and important to all beings. It is no wonder that the humans can at times resolve to aggression all in the aim of conserving or preserving their own lives. No matter the level of moral responsibility or ethical considerations that an individual has, all humans are prone to act to their own advantage when in an endangering situation. Well, this indicates that life is very important and should be preserved.

The last philosophy that has to be considered in relation to biocentrism is that there is the need for reparation or compensation when the principles of others have been violated. Well, this sets the basis for the legal actions that are often taken against individuals who go against the moral or ethical considerations of the community and the people in it. Well, this also asserts the fact that life is very important and should not be looked down upon. This principle tends to assert the fact of equality where no individual's rights should be fulfilled at the expense of another. If equality has to be observed, then all have to be considered with equal measure. Whatever has to be done to one individual has to be equally replicated in another. In other words, there is the need for equality.

Looking at Sterba's argument, it can be argued that he looked at the side of

life that Schmidt did not look into. Schmidt only looked at the issue of biocentrism from a negative point of view but Sterba proved that it is actually a theory that is in play in every day life. The issue of life, which is concerned with biology, is central to very action and activity that man engages in. all that is needed is for individuals to appreciate that even if there are instances when biocentrism does not seem to apply, this happens in exceptional cases such as the ones stated above.

Looking at the above arguments, it can be said that the theory of biocentrism is quite controversial. As such, some of the philosophers tend to accept it while others do not. The main bones of contention lie in whether the theory is actually applicable and acceptable as a philosophy. To some, it looks more of general information than a theory. Therefore, its ability to deliver new knowledge and understanding is highly in doubt. Another issue is that the theory tends to have little of new knowledge. As such, the philosophers are in a dilemma as whether to accept it or not. Nevertheless, the arguments presented by Schmidt and Sterba are quite opposing on the theory. While Schmidt opposes the theory, Sterba is of the opinion that the theory is acceptable and should actually be adopted and used in the scholarly activities. Well, the issue still remains open. However, there is a greater inclination towards accepting the theory as it seems to make perfect sense and to add new understanding into the other theories. By acting like a bond between them, it brings in a greater understanding of life sciences and what they entail. It is for this reason that biocentrism is such a wave in the academic field. There are efforts to understand it more so as to know how it can be completely integrity to the understanding of life.

Works Cited

Schmidt, David. A Criticism of Biocentrism.

Sterba, James P. Biocentrism Defended.