

# International Journal of Health Science

## INTERVENTION BIOETHICS AND LIFE STYLES: CONTRIBUTIONS TO A CRITICAL UNDERSTANDING OF LIFE STYLES

---

*Kirla de Lima Nakayama*

``Universidade de Brasília``, Brazil  
Master - Postgraduate Program in Bioethics,  
``Universidade de Brasília`` (UnB)  
Brasília, DF

*Camilo Manchhola*

``Universidade de Brasília``, Brazil  
Teacher of the Postgraduate Program in  
Bioethics, ``Universidade de Brasília`` (UnB)  
Brasília, DF

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



**Abstract: Purpose/ Context:** This article, without intending to be exhaustive, sought to systematize the concepts of Life styles and intervention bioethics as a construct to increase the construction of healthy Life styles. Reflecting on Life styles and ways of living in modernity is a complex task, as the capitalist way of life, as well as social inequalities, strongly reflect different types of Life styles. **Methodology/ Approach:** Initially, bibliographical research was carried out in databases and virtual libraries and documentary research, using the categories “Life styles” and bioethics; then, the results were analyzed; Finally, an approximation between Intervention Bioethics and Life styles was proposed. **Results/ Findings:** The results are in this framework of observations, the context of bioethics was presented, and in particular intervention bioethics that aims to resolve moral and ethical issues for a fair, supportive and healthy society. A healthy life is truly the greatest aspiration of all. So, without health, life does not have the same meaning. **Discussion/ Conclusions/ Contributions:** In this framework of observations, the context of bioethics was presented and, in particular, intervention bioethics that aims to resolve moral and ethical issues for a fair, supportive and healthy society. **Keywords:** Life styles 1, Health 2, Bioethics 3, Intervention Bioethics 4

## INTRODUCTION

The terminology Life styles (VE) and its pre-eminent developments arise from the field of human and social sciences, such as Sociology and Anthropology, emerging as references such as Marxism, Weber's sociology, psychoanalysis and American anthropological culturalism. For this set of sciences, EVs are common patterns, in which social organization has a significant influence on the formation of behaviors (1). Bioethics,

which covers issues whose moral and ethical dimension is involved, with a multidisciplinary concept, combines research, conduct and procedures in the areas of biology, medicine and the right to life.

The Life style theme is connected to the issue of the process of individuality in society. It is possible to debate the topic through the concept of individual freedom, originating with the social concept.

Bioethics relates to the work of humanists and scientists in the search for knowledge. Knowledge as an incentive to promote social well-being. The social body of a culture holds an immensity of ways and styles of life that, in turn, support or conflict with each other. Life styles are involved in the intermediate layer between socioeconomic, cultural, environmental and political markers, in addition to individual aspects. The modus operandi of each individual and the society they live in, local culture, access to information and services, establish people's chances of being healthy.

In this sense, health promotion would reflect fields of action such as: healthy public policies, environments favorable to health, reinforcing attitudes that favor health.

Understanding the complexity of society, as well as the connection between the different segments that make it up, is an essential condition for the development of environments that promote healthy Life styles.

## METHODOLOGY

Initially, bibliographical research was carried out in databases and virtual libraries and documentary research, using the categories “Life styles” and bioethics; then, an analysis of the results obtained was carried out; Finally, an approximation between Intervention Bioethics and Life styles was proposed.

## LIFE STYLES

Life style is a contemporary word that refers to the stratification of society – a sociological conception that surrounds the specification of people into groups based on group socioeconomic conditions. A relational grouping of differences with economic, social, political and anthropological depths. When dissimilarities lead to an exclusive status for some groups at the expense of others – The determination of Life style does not deviate from the rules of constitution and differentiation of cultures. It is the way in which a person or group of people experiences the world and, as a result, behaves and makes choices.

Starting from the perspective of sociology, the concept of way of life – mode (genre) of life – was the occupation of the anthropologist Lewis Morgan (1877) and would later be resumed by the theorists and creators of the political economy of Marx and Engels, in different ways. writings.

For B. D. Paraguin, the genre of life is constructed by circumstances and relationships that, in a certain sense, go beyond the group of production and social political life and are connected with the direct satisfaction of the daily needs and desires of human beings. It can be considered in fundamental degrees: connection with community services, family ties, coexistence with different social groups (neighborhood; friends; acquaintances and strangers. Connection with individual free time and leisure.

The content of Life styles is surrounded by issues of the process of individuality in society. Simmel covers this theme through the definition of individual freedom arising from social development in the expansion of capitalism from the 19th century onwards, and highlights, above all, the city and urban reality as the characteristic locus of this freedom.

Individual freedom, so well analyzed by Simmel in his writings, is socially enhanced

through interactional bonds between individuals. It is in the interactivity between social individuals that this freedom is in force, building what he called subjective culture in an urban reality.

This subjective culture, built on international exchange between the collective possessing a quantum of freedom, allows for increased particularization between each individual and in the groups and social arrangements ordered by them. Complexifying relationships and life in the city. The conception of distinction, therefore, in Simmel, is connected to the conceptualization of individuality which, in turn, plays a complexification and progress of subjective culture in urban locations.

This contest between freedoms in relation does not correspond to a merely harmonious framework, the process of composing a subjective culture makes use of the individual distinction structured by the freedom experienced by people and agrees on more or less stable conflictual characteristics, fostering groups, classes, institutions, styles and ways of life, as objective culture.

Objective culture, therefore, is socially exposed as the result of the subjective exchanges of individuals in an interactional struggle, forming interests and divergences, trends, styles and ways of living. These issues increase and further, it complicates the process of individuality, causing an aggrandizement of subjective culture, and aiming to continue a sequence of objective production of culture and ways of living in society. The distinction, if it gives one sphere, produces encounters and new forms of individual insertion in the urban, in another sphere, foci of divergence and conflicts emerge that point to a greater differentiation of views on oneself and others.

Reflecting on life and ways of living in modernity is to create methodological and theoretical exercises that take into

consideration, the multiplicity of Simmelian's conception of individual and group freedom as a subjective culture in uninterrupted development since the implementation of the capitalist mode of production, previously having the city as a nodal milestone in its development towards individualization and then involving the other forms of culture in a state. Simmel was concerned about the diversity of styles in our culture, as well as freedom of choice.

Life styles involve daily conduct and consumption patterns that encompass specific and identity choices in contexts as diverse as housing, food, use of the body, clothing, appearance, work habits, leisure, religion, art, organization of space and time or communion with other social actors.

Diverse or not, with significant correlations uniting their different components, Life styles intend to be configured in a coherent way and to express personal and collective identities.

Modernity established the impersonality of large cities, rationalization, objective culture, the stamp of currency, calculation and abstraction. Concomitantly, with the expansion of markets, the complex division of labor, urban diversity, the choice options offered to social actors, increased options allowing them to adopt and establish their own Life styles. These styles individualize us and protect our subjectivity, working as a kind of sphere of welcome and resistance in the face of the rectifying tendencies of mass society.

## **BIOETHICS**

Bioethics emerged in the 1970s as a new field of knowledge, with the propensity to rescue the human sciences. Originated by the period of critical thinking in association with reckless capitalism, which created several evils for civilization, bioethics brings with it the sense of consolidation of individualistic values, regarding the feeling of possession and power.

At a time when the empirical sciences separated themselves from the human sciences, they deprived themselves of the capacity for perception and self-reflection on themselves, they destroyed the capacity for self-criticism and highlighted the possibility of conceiving meaning in their activities.

In 1970, the American oncologist Van Rensselaer Potter coined the neologism Bioethics to expose a new science which must be the link between empirical and human sciences, especially ethics. The purpose of which is the preservation of life on the planet, since scientific development without criteria would be capable of risking life on the planet.

Bioethics awareness has faced several transformations, we highlight the proposal by Potter. Where he primarily envisioned a Bioethics bridge, which could unite science and philosophy to provide survival opportunities. Later evolving into a global bioethics, given the convenience of merging biomedical ethics with ecology, bringing public health issues to the fore. Nevertheless, its function continues to be the development of ethics for the long-term conservation of life.

Subsequently, deep bioethics emerges, expanding discussions about life. Deep bioethics is related to genetic discoveries, ethical conduct and global bioethics.

Ethics focuses on the study of behavior in the search for the best way to act. The ethical way of acting will be above acting intuitively or based on life experiences. Ethics encourages us to ensure that our actions are ordered by principles, with emphasis on continuous reflection. Acting critically expresses a conscious attitude. It is the development of the ability to reflect, analyze the facts of life and act as subjects of a constructed narrative. It is understanding that our attitudes have consequences for everyone, since at all times we are reproducing or building new values.

The way we think was influenced by our history, thus causing us to not follow the evolution of empirical sciences together with the human sciences. This divergence caused the inadequacy between knowledge and wisdom, resulting in conflicts in everyday life. In this sense, bioethics offers a broad field of reflection through the theoretical models developed, which help to reflect on life or conflict situations, the so-called emerging and persistent problems. Bioethics is aligned with the continuous search for wisdom, criticism, the use of information and fields of knowledge to improve living conditions and their preservation.

Bioethics has been advancing in the context of applied ethics, in this evolution three basic references support its epistemological status: multidisciplinary, respect for moral pluralism, the non-existence of universal bioethical paradigms.

Since principlist bioethics reduces the discussion into four principles (principle of autonomy, principle of non-maleficence, principle of beneficence and principle of justice), and which stamps a universality of parameters and investigation; were emerging: Bioethics from the perspective of Liberation Theology, Hard or strong Bioethics, critical Bioethics of feminist inspiration; Feminist and anti-racist bioethics; and Bioethics of autonomous reflection. This way, it can be observed that ethical dilemmas are not universal, since some countries have already resolved dilemmas in which others are not yet involved.

Intervention bioethics intends to give legitimacy to the field of study of moralities and application of ethical values, in a broad vision, which covers all social aspects, contributing to the foundation of a critical bioethics that has applicability in peripheral countries, especially, in Brazil. Intervention bioethics advocates as morally justifiable,

in the public and collective context, the prioritization of policies and decisions that benefit the greatest number of people over the longest period of time, and that result in the best consequences, whether in the individual or private sphere; seeking viable solutions and practices for locally identified conflicts; considering the context that occurs and the contradictions that they enhance.

“Thus, this new theoretical proposal seeks a concrete alliance with the historically more fragile side of society, including the reanalysis of different dilemmas, including: autonomy versus justice/equity; individual benefits versus collective benefits; individualism versus solidarity; omission versus participation; superficial and temporary changes versus concrete and permanent transformations”.

## DISCUSSION

The Life style theme is involved with the process of individuality in society, individual freedom, originating from the development of the social system arising from capitalism. Ways of life move influenced by the way individuality is produced in capitalism. The heterogeneity of the capitalist way of living, under the prominence of difference and under the power of large urban centers, offers different views of an energetic system of communicating vessels through which people are shown, under the hegemony of dissimilarity and under the sovereignty of large urban centers, offers diverse views of a dynamic system of communication channels through which people, solidarity, conflicts, money, etc. travel. Life styles involve everyday patterns and modes of consumption that encompass particular and identity choices in different domains such as housing, food, use of the body, clothing, appearance, work customs, leisure, religion, art, orderliness of space and time or coexistence with other social protagonists. Life styles aim to appear

coherently (Bordieu) and to manifest personal and collective identities (Giddens).

Individuals engender ethical problems, since they arise from relationships, from differences caused by the individual's addition to culture. We observed that bioethics would have as its principles (autonomy, beneficence and justice), which ends a moralistic ethics, since it tries to embed individuals in social hypotheses, which do not always constitute individual values. Science offers knowledge, bioethics leads to reflection on the application of knowledge in the practice of bioethics.

From a quality of life perspective, we must consider that it is not enough to live, it is necessary to live well. Each being needs and has the right to satisfy its primary activities. In order for us, in our group, to enjoy conditions of physical, psychological, economic, environmental and social well-being, social and cultural changes must occur. Bioethics argues that ownership of life translates into each human being taking possession of the means necessary for a dignified life.

Ontologically, we must take into consideration, the breadth of each person, since they are all conceived as having a common nature. Starting from the importance of individual value in the social context. This is the reason why the invalidation of the person in the social and collective world would represent the most serious disorder, and true ruin for humanity.

Each human being is a preceptor component of society. A person's individuality encompasses the whole of the world. Social organization and legal order are installed there. The awareness of the common good cannot be converted to the value of material goods, but of the good that is achieved in each and every member of society. Bioethics thus emerges, which observes the need to understand and consider the "symptoms" of modern society. In this vein, intervention

bioethics comes to profile the field of study of morality and ethical values, in a broad vision, which encompasses social aspects, helping to build a critical bioethics that can be adopted in peripheral countries. Intervention bioethics defends as morally legitimate, in the public and collective field, the prioritization of policies and decision-making that support the largest number of people for the longest period of time and that derive the best consequences; in the private and individual sphere, which creates viable solutions and adopts mechanisms in the search for possible and practical solutions for locally identified conflicts, observing the context in which the distinctions occur.

Intervention bioethics preserves the idea that the body is the manifestation of the person, the corporeal completeness of the person, where the physical and psychic dimensions are linked, which jointly express social interrelations and those with the environment.

In this step, intervention bioethics meets the maintenance of Life styles that offer individual and collective well-being. A healthy Life style is one that keeps the body in shape and the mind alert. A healthy Life style helps protect against disease, as well as preventing chronic illnesses from getting worse. Life style is intrinsically linked to social and moral issues. This is the key point of intervention bioethics. Guaranteeing access to services that constitute quality of life, such as health and education.

Thus, the changes that have occurred in terms of time and space, together with the decontextualization of social systems, provide transmutation, the opening of social life, the multiplicity of frameworks and the dispersion of authority. There is no other option than to make choices. These choices tend to solidify into Life styles, unique to specific groups or social strata. Life styles thus acquire greater

importance, both in the definition of daily practices and in the foundation of personal identities.

Intervention bioethics fights for access to services that characterize quality of life; health, education, good living.

Intervention bioethics that suggests what is morally justifiable, in the public and collective field, emerges as an instrument for reflection and outlining alternative paths to resolve ethical and bioethical problems, which are present in a context of social differences, the so-called persistent situations, which in general are involved in life, health, ethics and politics. Results: Currently, life and health sciences face several problems: public health, living well, among others. Bioethics, as it is multidisciplinary, interacts with Law in such a way that it deals with disciplining social life and biomedical procedures. Bioethics is a moral investigation. It is fundamentally an applied ethics. Its principles are: Autonomy – guarantee self-determination; Beneficence – doing good; Non-maleficence – not causing harm; Justice – ensuring freedom and equity. A dignified life is desired by all people, that is, a life that is characterized by basic conditions of health, well-being and happiness. Life styles represent the habits and activities that an individual carries out, and that influence their health; are individual and collective responsibility. To achieve a healthy life, a system of efficient and effective public policies is essential, and compliance with the principle of equitable justice is essential. In this vein, intervention bioethics works for the freedom of human beings in which self-respect and respect for others is the first condition of ethical attitudes for a healthy Life style. Ethics are distinguished from morals, in the same way that the desire to live well is not identified with compliance with mandatory norms. To be asked, why must one worry about how to live? Whose role is

it to make life good (individually, collectively, or the State)? Ronald Dworkin observes that this is everyone's concern, everyone must be concerned about the *modus vivendi*, from the beginning of human life (all human lives), since it is of paramount importance that it be successful, and not devastated.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Life style plays a fundamental role in the impact on health and quality of life. Health promotion and disease prevention, as well as social conditions influence living conditions. However, measuring a Life style is complex given the various factors that make up the results. In this sense, actions with a complex look at the issue must be adopted since social aspects must be considered as well as the economic model and culture.

Life style has a broad contextualization that includes the person as a whole, has varied aspects. These aspects intertwine and interfere with individual health in the most diverse areas. Work, recreational, social relationships, etc. are included in the Life style.

Life style is a neologism that refers to the stratification of society through behavioral aspects, generally exposed in the form of consumption patterns, routines, habits. Its indication, however, does not deviate from the rules of the formation and differentiation of cultures. Life style is the way a person or group of people experience the world, resulting in behavior and choices. In this area, intervention bioethics provides the growth and debate of issues that encompass social discrepancies and the difficulty of the least favored in having a healthy Life style. In this premise we can understand that intervention bioethics supports everyone to have a healthy Life style, as it can influence the relationship between those involved, seeking good conduct, respect for dignity, health, will, freedom and suffering and thus offering well-being and the

development of a fair and supportive society.

This way, reflecting on choices and Life styles leads us to a complex area that still causes us questions and the need for analysis and conceptual investments, that is, it is necessary for the topic to be widely debated in the search for understanding and creation of contexts. that offer adaptation to the most

diverse Life styles and societies, even if these are discrepant.

Bioethics as ethics of life, health and the environment has a transdisciplinary character in the area of life and health; a cry for the rescue of human dignity, emphasizing quality of life, which healthy offers better health conditions and living well.

## REFERENCES

1. COCKERHAM, W. C.; RÜTTEN, A.; ABEL, T. Conceptualizing contemporary health Life styles: moving beyond Weber. *The Sociological Quarterly*, Berkeley, v. 38, n. 2, p. 321-342, 1997.
2. CASTIEL, D. L.; GUILAM, M. C. R.; FERREIRA, M. S. *Correndo risco: uma introdução aos riscos em saúde*. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz, 2010.
3. DELLA CUNHA, DJASON B. Biodireito: o novo Direito face à Bioética. *Revista da Esmape*, Recife, v. 6, n. 13, p. 93-109, jan./jun. 2001.
4. SALLES, SERGIO DE SOUZA. O sentido teológico da justiça em Paul Ricoeu. Págs 159 - 173 PDF. Disponível em: <http://www.publicadireito.com.br/artigos/?cod=107030ca685076c0>, acesso em 14 de junho de 2021. XXI Congresso Nacional do CONPEDI. 2012.
5. DWORKIN, Ronald. *A Virtude Soberana – a teoria e a prática da igualdade*. Trad. Jussara Simões. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.
6. MG, Ferreira Filho. Livro - Direitos humanos Fundamentais. Dora Porto, Volnei Garrafa; Bioética de intervenção: considerações sobre a economia de mercado. [https://revistabioetica.cfm.org.br/index.php/revista\\_bioetica/article/view/96/91](https://revistabioetica.cfm.org.br/index.php/revista_bioetica/article/view/96/91), acesso em 14 de junho de 2021.
7. GARRAFA, VOLNEI, De uma “Bioética de Princípio” a uma “Bioética Interventiva” – Crítica e Socialmente Comprometida. DA, em [https://files.certcompu.ufg.br/web/up/128/o/BIOETICA\\_COMPROMISSO.pdf](https://files.certcompu.ufg.br/web/up/128/o/BIOETICA_COMPROMISSO.pdf), acesso em: 14 de junho de 2021.
8. Nascimento, Wanderson Flor. Garrafa, Volnei. Por uma vida não colonizada: diálogo entre bioética de intervenção e colonialidade. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/sausoc/a/HFbxZhqrS7qcs46XDtjLmWm/?lang=pt> . Acesso em 14 de junho de 2021.
9. Determinação social das doenças crônicas não-transmissíveis, *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, v.9 n.4 (865-884), RJ, ABRASCO, 2004 Disponível em PDF
10. ENGELS, FRIEDRICH. *A Origem da Família, da Propriedade Privada e do Estado*. RJ, Civilização Brasileira, 1985.
11. GEERTZ, CLIFFORD. *A interpretação de culturas*. RJ, LTC, 2008
12. MURRAY, HENRY A.; KUCKHOHN CLYDE (org.). *Personalidade: na natureza, na sociedade e na cultura*. MG, Itatiaia, 1965
13. PARIGUIN, B.D. *A psicologia social como ciência*. RJ Zahar, 1972
14. STREY, MARLENE NEVES et AL. *Psicologia Social Contemporânea: livro-texto*. Petrópolis, RJ, Vozes, 2008



15. BENJAMIN, W. A obra de arte na era de sua reprodutibilidade técnica. In: BENJAMIN, W. Obras escolhidas: vol. 1. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985. p. 165-196.
16. CADOZ, C. Les réalités virtuelles Paris: Flammarion, 1994.
17. COSTA, R. da. Por um novo conceito de comunidade: redes sociais, comunidades pessoais, inteligência coletiva. Interface, v. 9, n. 17, p. 235-248, 2005.
18. DABAS, E.; NAJMANOVICH, D. Redes: el lenguaje de los vínculos. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1995.
19. DURKHEIM, É. Georg Simmel: Philosophie des Geldes (Philosophie de l'argent). Revista Brasileira de Sociologia da Emoção, v. 1, n. 2, p. 238-241, 2002.
20. ELIAS, N. O processo civilizador: volume 1. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1990.
21. ELIAS, N. O processo civilizador: volume 2. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1993.
22. GIDDENS, A. Modernidade e identidade Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2002.
23. KOURY, M. G. P. Introdução à sociologia da emoção João Pessoa: Manufatura; Grem, 2004
24. SIMMEL, G. Philosophie der Geldes 2. ed. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1907.
25. SIMMEL, G. Simmel e a modernidade Organizado por Jessé Souza e Berthold Oëlze. Brasília: Editora da UnB, 1998
26. WAIZBORT, L. As aventuras de Georg Simmel São Paulo: Editora 34, 2000.
27. POTTER, VR. Bioethics: Bridge to the future. Englewood Cliffs (NJ); Prentice-Hall Inc; 1971.
28. MILL, JS. Da Individualidade, como um dos elementos do Bem Estar. In: Da Liberdade. São Paulo: Ibrasa; 1963.
29. DORA, PORTO, GARRAFA, VOLNEI. Bioética de intervenção: considerações sobre a economia de mercado, [https://revistabioetica.cfm.org.br/index.php/revista\\_bioetica/article/view/96/91](https://revistabioetica.cfm.org.br/index.php/revista_bioetica/article/view/96/91)
30. SEGRE, M.; Cohen, C. Bioética. São Paulo, Edusp 3ª edição. 2003.
31. FREUD, S. (1930). "El malestar en la cultura". In Freud, S. Obras completas. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu Ed. volume 21. 1980.
32. COHEN, C.; Ferraz, F.C. "Direitos humanos ou ética das relações". In: Segr, M.; Cohen, C. Bioética. São Paulo, Edusp 3ª edição. 2003.
33. Cohen, C.; Marcolino, J.A.M. "Noções históricas e filosóficas do conceito de saúde mental". In Cohen, C.; Ferraz, F.C., Segre, M. *Saúde mental, crime e justiça*. São Paulo, Edusp, p.13-24. 1996.