

Review of: "Menschenbild: An Important Factor for our Identity"

Levi Geir Eidhamar¹

¹ Universitetet i Agder

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an innovative, clarifying and systematically structured article that I recommend published. However, I propose certain clarifications, and nuances.

Chapter 1, page. 1. The usual English term is worldview rather than worldvision.[1]

Chapter 3, page 4. The individual variations regarding having clear beliefs about the various issues connect it to Menschenbilder, is parallel to the individual variations regarding clear beliefs about worldview's questions in general. One might say that just as all individuals have developed a unique worldview construction, all individuals have developed their unique individual Menschenbild.[2]

Chapter 3, page 6: "The societal Menschenbild of a typical secularized society does not contain religious convictions. These convictions, which may well be found in individual and group-specific Menschenbilder, are not part of the shared societal Menschenbild.»

This claim should at least be nuanced. Group-specific Menschenbilder with a religious background may leave its mark on the societal Menschenbild, long after belief in the religious dogmas that grounds them, has disappeared. Western secular societies regard equality and the unique value of human beings in relation to animals almost as a matter of fact. These values are not primarily based on secular science but are rather influenced by the Menschenbild of the Middle East religions. Even after having lost the belief in the Judeo-Christian dogma of man created in God's image, Western secular societies still accredit humans a unique value compared to animals. This differs from religions of Indian origin, which are more open to gradation of value. The Hindu cast system challenges human equality. The Sakdina system practiced in Thailand from the 14th to the 19th century specified the value of each person with a specific number between 100,000 (royals) and 5 (slaves).[3] Due to these religious differences, Menschenbilder of modern secular societies in the West may partly differ from Menschenbilder in modern secular societies in Asia.[4]

Chapter 3, page 7: Makes a good exemplification of Catholics, illustrating that one's Menschenbild is an integrated part of one's worldview. As pointed out above, one may even though retain the basic structure of a religiously based Menschenbild, even after having abandoned the belief in the core dogmas of the actual religion. Once again, this nuance is lacking.

Page 7: «Societal Menschenbilder are thus the most important ones. They are the fundament of individual and group-

specific Menschenbilder and almost cannot be denied in practice»

From the opposite side, one may also argue that religious group-specific Menschenbilder have contributed to the development of societal Menschenbilder.

[1] Sire, J. W. (2014). *Naming the elephant: Worldview as a concept* InterVarsity Press.

[2] Eidhamar, L. G. (2021). Dimensions of the Relationship between the Individual and Her Unique Worldview Construction. *Religions*, 12(3), p. 1-3

[3] Thongsawang, S., Rehbein, B., & Chantavanich, S. (2020). Inequality, sociocultures and habitus in Thailand. *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 35(3), p. 495

[4] Thongsawang, S., Rehbein, B., & Chantavanich, S. (2020). Inequality, sociocultures and habitus in Thailand. *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 35(3), p. 493-524.