Anthropomorphism: In The Web of Culture

by Leesa Fawcett *

As a conservationist and an environmental educator, I am intrigued by human relationships with animals. The umbrella question for me is in what ways do people relate to animals at this moment in Western history? I have focussed here on one type of relationship that humans have with animals -- the anthropomorphic relationship.

How would you know anthropomorphism if you bumped into it? The Greek word "anthropomorphos" literally means "shaped like a man." The range of meanings in the Random House dictionary (1966) includes the following: "anthropomorphic 1. ascribing human forms or attributes to a being or thing not human, esp. to a deity; and anthropomorphize: to ascribe human forms or attributes to (an animal, plant, material object, etc.)."[1] The commonly accepted definition of anthropomorphism implies a distinct separation between the human and the non-human. I do not assume that we, humans, are so neatly separated from the animal world. I believe Nature and "animalness" is not only found "out there" in the shrinking wilderness areas, but is just as much "in here," inside us. Hence my fascination with the anthropomorphic relationships began.

Traditionally, to anthropomorphize was heretical because one was ascribing human characteristics to a deity -- an unforgivable insult to the integrity of the deity to be likened to a mere mortal. Nowadays, the major "faux pas" lies in ascribing human characteristics to animals or "beasts," thus slandering the sacred character of humans. So at first it was a defamation to see a god as like a human, and now it is sacrilegious to see a human as like an animal. This, in and of itself, is an intriguing historical change.

Neil Evernden, in "Nature In Industrial Society," suggests that this taboo against anthropomorphism has something to do with the fact that we live in an age of secular humanism.[2] God is supposedly dead and human individuals are the main source of value and meaning. The general feeling is that anthropomorphism is a cultural no-no, and definitely unscientific, yet it keeps reappearing. We tend to be anthropomorphic.

The way in which people conceive of anthropomorphism is intimately connected to the way in which they perceive their relationship to nature. Anthropomorphism is not an isolated phenomenon. It is found hanging precariously in a web, connected to all the "facts" and values, thoughts and feelings that we, as individuals, hold and collectively reinforce among ourselves as a culture. The definition of anthropomorphism one works from depends on one's focal point. **Do you see humans as the centre point, and then you magnanimously ascribe human characteristics to animals? Or do you see humans in relationship with (historically and bodily), and continuous with nature?** From this latter reference point one could identify commonalities in our shared experience of life. Of course there are many possible places to start, but I am concentrating on these two polar ones and their consequences.

The dominant way of seeing the world is an anthr**opocentric** one. Humans are generally thought to be the centre of the world and the pinnacle of evolution. This type of thinking is reflected in the embedded concept of "man as the measure of all things."[3] The anthropocentric view is expressed implicitly in the commonly reiterated ideas of "dominance over nature" and "nature valued as a human resource." In stark opposition to this dominant framework, alternative environmental worldviews believe in "nature valued in and of itself," and "harmony with nature."

Tables I and II illustrate this point by juxtaposing the dominant paradigm with: a well outlined generic environmental paradigm by Stephen Cotgrove (Table I), and the beliefs of deep ecology as presented by George Sessions and Bill Devall (Table II). I was struck by the similarities between the two descriptions of the dominant paradigm. Cotgrove explains that the dominant social paradigm is "dominant not in the statistical sense of being held by most people, but in the sense that it is the paradigm

* Leesa Fawcett, a marine biologist and environmental educator, recently completed her Master in Environmental Studies at York University. Her thesis focused on children's anthropomorphic conceptions of animals. She is currently teaching part-time in the Faculty of Environmental Studies.

Table I: COUNTER PARADIGMS

	Dominant Paradigm	Alternative Environmental Paradigm
Core values	Material (economic growth)	Non-material (self-actualization)
	Natural environment valued as a resource	Natural environment intrinsicly valued
	Domination over nature	Harmony with nature
Economy	Market forces	Public interest
	Risk & reward	Safety
	Rewards for achievement	Incomes related to need
	Differentials	*Egalitarian
	Individual self-help	Collective/social provision
Polity	Authoritative structures: (experts)	Participative structures: (citizen/worker involvement)
	Hierarchical	*Non-hierarchical
	Law and order	*Liberation
Society	Centralized	Decentralized
	Large-scale	Small-scale
	Associational	Communal
	Ordered	*Flexible
Nature	Ample reserves	Resources limited
	Nature hostile/neutral	Nature benign
	Environment controllable	Nature delicately balanced
Knowledge	Confidence in science and technology	Limits to science
	Rationality of means	Rationality of ends
	Separation of fact/value, thought/feeling	Integration of fact/value, thought/feeling

*Some environmentalists want a return to small-scale communities because they provide a traditional organic order -- differentiated, hierarchical, and stable.

(From: Cotgrove, Stephen, **Catastrophe or Cornucopia** (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982), p. 27.)

held by dominant groups in industrial societies, and in the sense that it serves to legitimate and justify the institutions and practices of a market economy."[4]

To be anthropo**morphic** does not necessarily mean one is anthropo**centric**. For instance, I am anthropomorphic with my dogs (as I'm sure are many companion animal owners), and I believe that humans are continuous with nature and not the most important member. We are "plain members and citizens" of the earth as Aldo Leopold succinctly declared in his idea of a land ethic.[5]

Table II: DEEP ECOLOGY AS AN ALTERNATIVE WORLDVIEW

DOMINANT WORLDVIEW	DEEP ECOLOGY
Dominance over nature	Harmony with nature
Natural environment as a resource for human equality	All nature has intrinsic worth/biospecies
Material/economic growth material for growing human population	Elegantly simple needs: Material goals serving the larger goal of self realization
Belief in ample resource reserves	Earth "supplies" limited
High technological progress and solutions	Appropriate technology; non-dominating science
Consumerism	Doing with enough/recycling
National/centralized community	Minority tradition/bioregion

(From: Sessions, George and Bill Devall, **Deep Ecology** (Layton, UT: Gibbs M. Smith Inc., 1985), p. 69.)

John Livingston maintains that it is natural to be anthropomorphic, and that there is no other way to be. We are human so we can only see the world from a human viewpoint. Livingston goes on to say that just as we anthropomorphize dogs, dogs "canimorphize" humans, and so on. I know my dogs definitely act as if I am part of their pack, and under their immediate care. Perhaps it's part of a natural caring process to relate the world of others (whoever they may be) to your own experience of the world.

Anthropomorphism is a specific fact which the dominant worldview finds troublesome. Humans in Western society tend to dominate and be separate from animals, and yet we persist in attributing human characteristics to them at the same time. Theoretically,

the dominant paradigm and anthropomorphism should be mutually exclusive, but they are not. According to Hans Jonas, "Any problem is essentially the collision between a comprehensive view (be it hypothesis or belief) and a particular fact which will not fit into it."[6] The problem I am defining is the collision between the unchallenged anthropocentric world-view and the enduring fact of anthropomorphism which it denies.

In the course of defining the scope of this problem I looked to others who have disagreed with the "comprehensive view" which sees humans as the centre of the world. Erazim Kohak advocates a philosophy of personalism, in which humans are continuous with nature. He eloquently asks:

> *Shall we conceive of the world around us and of ourselves in it as* ***personal****, a meaningful whole, honoring its order as continuous with the moral law of our own being and its being as continuous with ours, bearing its goodness -- or shall we conceive of it and treat it, together with ourselves, as* ***impersonal****, a chance aggregate of matter propelled by a blind force and exhibiting at most the ontologically random lawlike regularities of a causal order? Is the Person or is matter in motion the root metaphor of thought and practice?*[7]

For Kohak a "person" is not limited to humans, it is "a being who stands in a moral relation to us, a being we encounter as a Thou."[8] Therefore his philosophy of personalism incorporates the non-human as well as the human. The idea of relating to non-humans as "subjects" or "thous" is beautifully expressed by Evernden in **The Natural Alien**, in which he advocates "regarding ourselves less as objects than as sets of relationships, or as processes in time rather than as static forms."[9]

Elaborating this idea, (with insights from Merleau-Ponty), Evernden says, "If we were to regard ourselves as 'fields of care' rather than as discrete objects in a neutral environment, our understanding of our relationship to the world might be fundamentally transformed."[10] This idea of understanding ourselves as "fields of care" is nothing short of a new metaphysical approach to the human/non-human relationship. We are not merely unique individuals all bundled up in our own needs and feelings. Our very selves extend beyond our bodies, to the beings, human and non-human, to whom we are connected.

> *Heidegger's reply is that man does not look out upon an external world through windows, from the isolation of his ego: he is already out-of-doors. He is in the world because, existing he is involved in it totally. . . . My Being is not something that takes place inside my skin . . . my Being, rather, is spread over a field or region which is the world of its care and concern.*[11]

In more recent work Evernden suggests a differentiation between "nature-as-object," "nature-as-self" and "nature-as-miracle." **Nature-as-object** is "a bare-bones nature with no subjectivity and no personal variables at all: just stuff."[12] These objects of nature may be as precious as pearls, as highly useful as oil, or as common as dandelions but they are still just objects, just "stuff."

Nature-as-self incorporates the earlier idea of seeing ourselves as "fields of care" and thus nature is an extended part of ourselves. Nature-as-self may also imply "an extension of self-hood to nature -- an understanding of nature as 'like-self' or as a community of selves, of persons, with whom one has relationships similar to those within human society."[13] This classification can pose potential problems if your self-image is a destructive one and you treat others as "like-self."[14]

Nature-as-miracle is more difficult to define, mainly because we don't generally believe in miracles anymore. I understand nature as miracle to refer to the wondrous, the inexplicable and unpredictable in nature. This of course flies in the face of mainstream modern science which is predicated on the predictability of nature, and our belief in the "laws" of nature. Loren Eiseley defines a "miracle" as "an event transcending the known laws of nature." He continues:

> *Since . . . the laws of nature have a way of being altered from one generation of scientists to the next, a little taste for the miraculous in this broad sense will do us no harm. We forget that nature itself is one vast miracle transcending the reality of night and nothingness. We forget that each one of us in his personal life repeats that miracle.*[15]

These three conceptualizations of nature beg three different types of questions.

Evernden writes, "The question one asks of nature-as-object is 'what's in it **for me**?'" Once answered this question leaves us free to concern ourselves only with **how** we will use nature to serve our own ends, the hallmark of our techno-centred culture. "[W]hereas of nature-as-self one might ask 'what is it **to me**?'" which "implies a concern with the relationship of humans and non-humans." Finally, nature-as-miracle "does not prompt questions of control or even questions of kinship" instead it asks "'what is it?' -- a metaphysical question rather than an economic or a political one."[16] If Evernden and Livingston are correct in their belief that our environmental crisis is a metaphysical crisis, perhaps this is the only question with which we need concern ourselves.

It would seem that the way in which we understand our relationship to nature affects both the type of anthropomorphism we practice, and our behaviour in decision-making situations involving ourselves and nature. And this "understanding of nature which we take as obvious is in fact a rather complex and abstract one which we acquire in a lengthy cultural exercise in indoctrination."[17]

Morris Berman's concept of "participating consciousness" or "mimesis" also flies in the face of the dominant worldview by proclaiming the importance of "the state of consciousness in which the subject/object dichotomy breaks down and the person feels identified with what he or she is perceiving."[18] The kind of anthropomorphism I am calling attention to is only understandable in the context of concepts such as "participatory consciousness," "fields of care" and "personalism." This type of anthropomorphism entails a **spontaneous identification** with other life. Spontaneous because it is without effort or premeditation, and it is a form of identification because there is envelopment of another into oneself.

Arne Naess explains this process of spontaneous identification when he says:

> *We tend to see ourselves in everything alive. As scientists we observe the death struggle of an insect, but as mature human beings we spontaneously also experience our own death in a way, and feel sentiments that relate to struggle, pain, and death.*[19]

This spontaneous identification is a precursor to the types of anthropomorphism that see nature as self or nature as miracle, as opposed to the dominant mode of seeing nature as object. Spontaneous identification is not an abstract, psychological process irrelevant to the environmental movement. Naess argues that the **identification** process is the most important in making "intense personal appreciation of diversity of life forms and the whole ecosphere possible."[20]

To make this goal more easily digestible Naess points out that, "There is nothing unduly romantic or poetic here. Given our biological endowment each of us has the capacity to identify with all living beings," and "the capacity of experiencing the intimate relations between organisms and the nonorganic world."[21]

These ideas of being **in relationship and in the world**, coupled with the emphasis the different authors placed on values and morals led me to Carol Gilligan's work on moral development.[22] Moral systems have developed as a part of our "connectedness" to other humans, but they have not, and may never, fully develop with respect to other life-forms. In spite of this, Gilligan's "ethic of care" theory has a great deal to offer the environmental movement. The idea of an "ethic of care" resonates with similarities to Evernden's "fields of self" and Heidegger's "Being in the world." Although they are all from very different disciplines, each of them offers a significant challenge to the dominant worldview in which anthropomorphism is imbedded.

Gilligan's work challenges and complements the work of Lawrence Kohlberg whose long-standing theory of moral development was originally based on a biased sample of 84 boys. He equates morality with the ability to reason and to be just; consequently, Gilligan refers to his theory as an "ethic of justice." Gilligan's thesis is that by leaving out the female voice, the different or other voice, and the accompanying "ethic of care," we arrive at an incomplete picture of human development: "half of the dialectic is currently missing from most psychological accounts."[23] Half of the logical argumentation necessary to paint a picture of human development is absent. Table III summarizes and juxtaposes some of the characteristics of these two constructs of moral development. I believe it is important to understand these theories in order to locate the problem of anthropomorphism in our culture.

In the past decade there has been an increasingly loud and anxious cry for a biocentric environmental ethic as an alternative to the ruling anthropocentric ethic. The idea of an environmental ethic has always appeared

problematic. Ethics and morals are reached by rational dialogue among community members. This implies that we would have to confer with other life forms and decide together on a certain, reciprocal system of values. I strongly suspect other life forms would have no idea, nor interest, in what we are talking about. It would seem that humans are the only animals that need a system of morals to deal with their existence. Most other animals just **are**.

Table III: SUMMARY OF THE MORAL DIALECTIC

Characteristics	Ethic of Care	Ethic of Justice
Image	Web of connection	Hierarchy of power
Thought	Narrative and Contextual	Formal logic
Language	...of responsibilities that sustains relationships & informs the activity	...of rights that justifies separation and fosters & protects autonomy
Mode of Moral Discourse	Dialogue Narration	Logical deduction
Concepts and Key Vocabulary	Contextual Concepts: -harmony -relationship -care -love -hurt -friendship -betrayal	Analytic Concepts: -fairness -equality -balance -equalibrium -reciprocity -truth -deceit
Premise of Moral Judgements	...non-violence; no one should be hurt.	...universality of rights.
Individual/ Society	See individuals as interdependent in a network (web) of social relations.	Balance separate individuals in a social system equalibrated by the logic of equality and recoprocity.
Tension between	...particularly of responsibility.	...universality of rights.
Problems	Relationship betweenself & other	Conflict of self versus other.
Maturity	Interdependence/ Connection	Autonomy/ Separation

Livingston equates our need to be moral with the fact that we must live with unnatural population densities, and in a state of unceasing stress. He speaks of our moral systems as "prosthetic devices" and states: "To extend concepts of rights into nature . . . would be to export and legitimate a pathological obsession with hierarchical relationships."[24] To extend only an "ethic of justice" into nature would be disastrous **but** if we were to extend an "ethic of care" balanced by an "ethic of justice" the vision would be a much more hopeful one. Gilligan asserts:

> *These disparate visions [an ethic of care and an ethic of justice] in their tension reflect the paradoxical truths of human experience -- that we know ourselves as separate only insofar as we live in connection with others, and that we experience relationship only insofar as we differentiate other from self.*[25]

This is what anthropomorphism is. We know ourselves as **human**, only insofar as we live in connection with, and experience non-humans. We also know ourselves as individuals only if we are able to compare and differentiate ourselves from other humans and non-humans.

In a thoughtful essay entitled "Life, Death,and the Body in the Theory of Being," Hans Jonas states: "When man first began to interpret the nature of things -- and he did this when he began to be man -- life was to him everywhere, and being the same as being alive." Much later the Renaissance ushered in "Modern Thought" which decreed that reality could only be discovered "through abstention from projecting into its image our own felt aliveness. In the process the ban on anthropomorphism was extended to zoomorphism in general."[26]

Jonas traces the curse on anthropomorphism to the historical development of dualism -- the rendering of matter (body) and spirit (mind) into two separate spheres. This in turn led to the two extremes: modern materialism and modern idealism, respectively. Jonas says that a "fundamental assumption of modern metaphysics in the interest of science is that there is a basic difference of being between the nature of man and the nature of the universe." Descartes' principle that "exterior reality . . . [is] entirely detached from the interior reality of thought" exemplifies this assumption. In order to know this exterior reality vision became the primary mode of perception and brought with

it its own biases, as Jonas observes:

> *This dominance of "distancing" and objectifying perception concurred with the dualistic rift between subject and object . . . in putting a severe ban on any transference of features of internal experience into the interpretation of the external world . . . Anthropomorphism at all events, and even zoomorphism in general, became scientific high treason.*[27]

Dualism denies human continuity with nature, and does not allow the attribution of any internal, human experiences to our understanding of the external world -- the world outside ourselves. In this interpretation anthropomorphism becomes just another case of misguided projection. The verb "to project" means to "regard something within the mind, (as a feeling, thought or attitude) as having some form of reality outside the mind."[28] Projection assumes we are not supposed to be in any way extended into our environment, and it reinforces a distinct separation between the self and other, the human and non-human. And, as stated earlier, we know ourselves as separate and human, only insofar as we know ourselves connected together with other life forms.

The following argument historically traces the course of anthropomorphism in modern thought, and points out the inevitability of anthropomorphism as a fact of being. Western science from its birth rejected the notion of teleology and final causes, as part of its rejection of Aristotelianism.[29] Teleology is defined in vitalist philosophy as the doctrine that phenomena are guided not only by mechanical forces but that they also move towards the goals of self-realization. Final causes refers to Aristotle's belief that a thing or being has a reason for existence, a purpose. (Note that evolutionary biology and ecology also believe this).

Hans Jonas shows that the rejection of Aristotle's beliefs occurred without any evidence that final causes didn't exist in nature. In fact science rejected the idea of even searching for final causes: "The mere search for them was quite suddenly, with the inauguration of modern science, held to be at variance with the scientific attitude, deflecting the searcher from the quest for true causes."[30] So if life is merely a conglomeration of unrelated matter and has no reason for existence except to be propelled by mechanical forces, it is no wonder anthropomorphism is forbidden. To be anthropomorphic and ascribe the feeling of exuberance to a singing chickadee definitely contradicts a solely mechanical interpretation of the chickadee's vocal apparatus.

Modern science has had to wage war against the notion of final causes and against anthropomorphism, in order to salvage itself. As Jonas confirms: "Thus the struggle against teleology is a stage in the struggle against anthropomorphism which by itself is as old as Western Science."[31] What an odd predicament to put humans in. If anthropomorphism is unscientific, and should be denied, humans would have to deny their own subjective experience. Simplified, it is the traditional argument that objectivity truly exists. Quantum mechanics and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle have already shown us that there is no such thing as an objective observer. "What we observe, said Heisenberg, is not nature in itself but nature exposed to our method of questioning."[32]

Darwin's theory of evolution and its acceptance in the world of today also adds to the accumulated proof that humans and nature are inseparable. Consequently, "the case against anthropomorphism in its extreme form becomes problematical and is on principle reopened," leaving us two alternatives. We can either: "take the presence of purposive inwardness" in humans as valid affirmation of the universal relatedness of life forms or we can "extend the prerogatives of mechanical matter to the very heart of the seemingly heterogeneous class of phenomena and oust teleology even from the 'nature of man', whence it had tainted the 'nature of the universe' -- that is, to alienate man from himself and deny genuineness to the self-experience of life."[33]

Jonas has obviously reflected at great length on the position and meaning of anthropomorphism in the web of knowledge that constitutes our culture. Basically, he is saying that the denial of anthropomorphism is untenable, unless you want to alienate humans from their experience of life. Humans, along with the rest of nature have a "purposive inwardness," and if unencumbered they will move towards their purpose, their goals of self-realization. In a later essay he states: "there is no organism without teleology; there is no teleology without inwardness; and: life can be known only by life."[34] Anthropomorphism is a way for life (humans) to know life (non-humans).

If one agrees with the philosophical stances of Gilligan's "ethic of care," Evernden's "fields of self," and Jonas' "purposive inwardness," it is impossible to deny anthropomorphism. Anthropomorphism stands as an example of the realization that we are an integral and continuous part of the living world: bodily, emotionally and mentally.

Notes

1. **The Random House Dictionary of the English Language** (Unabridged Edition), ed. Jess Stein (New York: Random House, 1966), p.63.

2. See Neil Evernden, "Nature in Industrial Society," in **Cultural Politics in Contemporary America**, ed. Sut Jhally and Ian Angus (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1988), p. 154.
Also refer to Evernden's course notes entitled "Anthropomorphism" (p. 1) for the course "Cultural and Historical Perspectives of Nature," held in 1987 at the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, Toronto, Ontario.

3. It is not an accident that "woman" has never been proposed as the measure of all things. Feminism has also dissented from the "dominant" world-view, and could have much to offer a more critical environmental movement.

4. Stephen Cotgrove, **Catastrophe or Cornucopia: The Environment, Politics and the Future** (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982), p. 27.

5. Aldo Leopold, **A Sand County Almanac: and Sketches Here and There** (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949 reprint 1981), p. 204.

6. Hans Jonas, **The Phenomenon of Life: Toward a Philosophical Biology** (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., 1966 reprinted 1982), p. 9.

7. Erazim Kohak, **The Embers** and **the Stars: A Philosophical Inquiry Into the30**
Moral Sense of Nature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 124-125.

8. Ibid., p. 129.

9. Neil Evernden, **The Natural Alien: Humankind and Environment** (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 40.

10. Ibid., p. 47
Refer to Chapter 2 , "The Fields of Self," to get the full gist of his argument.

11. Heidegger as quoted in William Barrett, **Irrational Man** (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962), p. 217.

12. Neil Evernden, "Nature in Industrial Society," p. 157.

13. Ibid., p. 159.

14. Hans Jonas and many others talk about our culture as a culture that worships death. If that is extrapolated to the level of the "self," and we treat others as "like-self" it would follow that we would be destructive in our relationships with others, human and non-human alike.

15. Loren Eiseley, "How Natural is Natural," in **The Star Thrower** (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), p. 291.

16. Evernden, "Nature in Industrial Society," p. 159, and p. 163.

17. Ibid., p. 162.

18. Morris Berman, **The Reenchantment of the World** (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 346.
Berman's idea of participatory consciousness, referred to as mimesis, is discussed throughout the book.

19. Arne Naess, "Intrinsic Value: Will the Defenders of Nature Please Rise?" in **Conservation Biology**, ed. Michael E. Soule (Sunderland, Mass: Sinauer Associates, Inc., 1986), p. 506.

20. Ibid., p. 506

21. Ibid., p. 507.

22. Carol Gilligan, **In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development** (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982). Also check the journal Signs, for more recent work.
I attended an intensive day long workshop entitled "Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Research in Moral Development: The Work of Kohlberg and Gilligan." The workshop was excellent and led by 2 doctoral students at Harvard; Mark Tappan a student of Kohlberg and Lyn Mikel Brown a student of Gilligan. Gilligan and Kohlberg also spoke at this conference on "Controversial Issues in Moral Education," held November 7-9, 1985 at OISE, Toronto.

23. Carol Gilligan, "Do the Social Sciences Have an Adequate Theory of Moral Development?" in **Social Science as Moral Inquiry**, ed. N. Haan, R. Bellah, and P. Rabinow, & W. Sullivan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 35.

24. John Livingston, "Rightness or Rights," **Osgoode Hall Law Journal**, 22:2 (1984), p. 310.

25. Gilligan, **In a Different Voice**, p. 63.

26. Hans Jonas, **The Phenomenon of Life**, p. 7, and p. 9-10.

27. Jonas, Phenomenon, p. 35.

28. **The Random House Dictionary** of the English **Language**, p. 1150.

29. Aristotelianism is derived from Aristotle's notion of four forms of causation that are necessary for the coming into being or movement of a thing. They are the material cause, the formal cause, the efficient cause and the final cause.

30. Jonas, Phenomenon, p.34.

31. Ibid., p.36.

32. Werner Heisenberg, as quoted in Morris Berman, **The Reenchantment of the World** (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 145.

33. Jonas, Phenomenon, p.37.

34. Ibid., p.91.