

Iva Rinčić Lerga

Sveučilište u Rijeci, Medicinski fakultet, Braće Branchetta 20, HR- 51000 Rijeka
rinciciva@hotmail.com

First International Summer School of Integrative Bioethics

Mali Lošinj, Croatia, September 4–16, 2006

Abstract

The article offers an analytical review of the First International Summer School of Integrative Bioethics held in Mali Lošinj (Croatia) on September 4–16, 2006. The school presented in article is a mutual scientific-educational project of German and Croatian institutions whose general goal is to research integrative bioethics as a concept that goes beyond individual solutions, promotes interdisciplinarity and mutual collaboration in the consideration, contemplation and endeavours in solving complex (bio)ethical problems. Through an review and analysis of the school's organisational scheme, employed methodological strategies and realised educational climate, we endeavoured to define a framework for the teaching of integrative bioethics, and the extent to which precisely the concept of integrative bioethics was a crucial element for the activity of the school.

Keywords

integrative bioethics, school of bioethics, teaching strategies, interaction in education

Introduction

The first international summer bioethical school under the thematic title of Integrative Bioethics was held on the September 4–16, 2006 in the Town of Mali Lošinj. On that occasion, the hotel Aurora in Mali Lošinj had the opportunity yet again to be the host of an interesting bioethical event and to successfully continue the tradition of the gathering, sharing of knowledge and experiences of a number of those interested in bioethical issues.

This year's realisation of the international bioethics school idea is a result of the perennial collaboration of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb (Croatia) and the Institute of Philosophy, Ruhr University Bochum (Germany).¹

1

The first mutual conference organised by the Institute for Philosophy, Ruhr University of Bochum and the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb, was held at the Interuniversity Centre in Dubrovnik, on October 1–3, 2004. An review of this conference was published in journal *Društvena istraživanja*: Iva Rinčić Lerga, "Međunarodna konferencija: Bioetika u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Europi – Europske intrakulturne razlike kao poticaj zajedničkog etičkog promišljanja", *Društvena istraživanja* 80 (6/2005), pp. 1219–1223. The Dubrovnik conference proceedings were

published in the book by Ante Čović & Thomas Sören Hoffmann (eds.), *Bioethik und kulturelle Pluralität. Die südosteuropäische perspektive*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin 2005. Subsequently followed an international conference surrounding the Forum titled "1. Südosteuropäisches Bioethik-Forum, *Integrative Bioethik angesichts inter- und intrakultureller Differenzen*", Mali Lošinj, held on June 16–18, 2005; the First International Bioethical Symposium in Bosnia and Herzegovina titled *Integrativna bioetika i izazovi suvremene civilizacije*, Sarajevo, 31st



The numerousness and substantiality of their former assembly and mutual events refer to an intensive research work in bioethics and effort made for the promotion and popularisation of bioethical topics within reputable scientific communities, but also outside the frames and scopes of academic circles. The quest for new and innovative forms of collaboration encouraged the shaping and activation of a new perennial programme – the international summer school of bioethics – thus representing not only a carefully planned step forward towards a successful integration and collaboration of German and Croatian scientific institutions, but also a stronghold for certain new mutual projects.²

The incentive for an analytical review of the Lošinj summer bioethical school initially arises from the general interest in bioethical topics (especially in those of integrative character), in other words, in the methods by which bioethical contents become, may be and are themes of education, in this case surrounding the summer school, and the attempts to give answers to the issues of requirement, benefit and significance of this type of bioethical education for Croatia,³ but also for other countries of the region, and Europe itself.⁴ Until recently, outside the field of individual scientific-research, higher education institutions and a some educational programmes at the secondary school level, there was no bioethical education in Croatia, thought out and organised for special issues and topics, interests of students or for the activity requirements of specific bodies and institutions.⁵ In context of the specified, one needs to raise the question if the Lošinj summer bioethical school is (but) a two-week education without a greater societal significance or, hopefully, witnesses the specific positive changes of the status of bioethics in general, the increase of the level of bioethical awareness, the long expected recognition of the importance of continued bioethical education and a clear attitude on the immediacy of introducing bioethics to all spheres of social life. On path of the specified issues, the review of the Lošinj School of bioethics is an attempt to recognise the school's importance not only as a significant educational project, but also as a project of broader meaning for society in general.

Teaching strategies, attendants and teachers

The educational methods of the international bioethics school were various – lectures, work in seminary groups where prevailed discussions regarding the professional structure of the school attendants and endeavours to express the perspectives they belong to; and as each, the educational process of the bioethics school ended with an evaluation of the achieved and an examination for school attendants.

Organizers of the first international bioethics school (the working language of the school was English) were certainly challenged with the selection of school attendants – participants, who were mainly representatives of South and Southeast European countries, and Germany; apart from the equal representation of individual countries, the attendants were expected to possess distinctive previous knowledge and interest for issues and problems of contemporary bioethical thought. Thereby organizers brought together in one-place participants of different education, scientific and professional orientation – although young philosophers outnumbered the other participants, the school was also attended by physicians, political scientists, theologians, lawyers, biologists and ecologists. The attendants selection, although a responsible task, was objectively much easier than bringing together lecturers,

excellent and competent internationally affirmed bioethicists, specialised in certain fields. The decision on whom to invite as lecturer at the first international school for integrative bioethics could only look like a formal part of the entire organisational work – in reality, precisely the choice of lecturers presented an especially responsible part of the preparations, and was a basis for the success (or possible failure) of the whole summer school of integrative bioethics project. Namely, on the premise that bioethics, being confronted with challenges of biotechnological progress, and if it genuinely strives to be the ethics of a new, technological civilisation, no longer has only a regional, but also a global dimension, the organizers of this summer school reached for *integrative* bioethics. Integrative bioethics, as was stated, presents a concept that supersedes individual viewpoints (an example of such understanding is bioethics as a new medical ethics), and promotes interdisciplinarity and mutual collaboration in considering ethical problems, but also in their deliberation and solution. The horizon of contemporary bioethical thought includes an exceptional number and diversity of topics and issues – following the addressed, with the evident need for global and integrative bioethical deliberation and activity, opens a space for a type of counterbalance, process of concretization and specialization for certain fields and problems. Aware of the responsibility to study and lecture bioethics, the organizers of this summer school brought together as lecturers six renowned specialists in specific narrow thematic fields, following the conception of *integrative bioethics and philosophy* (2 lecturers), *medicine, theology, molecular medicine, agronomy and environmental ethics*.

Teaching topics and the concept of problem approach

Prof. Dr. Walter Schweidler (Institute of Philosophy, Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany) opened the first working day of the summer bioethics school. Not holding at just a formal speech in role of organizer, prof. Schweidler offered an inspirational lecture on the initiatives of global bioethics from the

March – 1st April 2006, and the international conference titled *Integrative Bioethik und Bildung* surrounding the 2. Südosteuropäisches Bioethik-Forum, Mali Lošinj, June 15–17, 2006. The list and abstracts of topics of the addressed events are available at regular program books.

2

Coordinators of the entire project of collaboration are prof. dr. Walter Schweidler from the Institute of Philosophy, Ruhr University of Bochum (Germany), while the head Croatian representative is prof. dr. Ante Čović, Head of the Department of Ethics (Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb). The coordinator of the summer bioethical school is prof. dr. Thomas Sören Hoffmann, also from the Institute of Philosophy (Ruhr University Bochum, Germany). The quality of their mutual projects were recognized and are financially supported by the DAAD / Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, and Volkswagenstiftung.

3

The position of bioethics in Croatia was addressed by Marijan Valković, “Bioetika u Hrvatskoj: kratko izvješće”, in: Ivan Cifrić (ed.), *Bioetika: Etička iskušenja znanosti i društva*, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo – Zavod za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb 1998, pp. 297–293.

4

For more details on bioethical trends in Europe, one can read Hans-Martin Sass, “Bioethics in Europe”, *Društvena istraživanja* 23–24 (5/1996), pp. 629–649.

5

Nada Gosić offered an exceptionally systematic and efficient research of bioethical education in general, with special overview of Croatia, in her book titled *Bioetička edukacija* (Pergamena, Zagreb 2005).

European perspective (an interesting overview of the position of German national legislation to practical acceptance and (im)probabilities of implementing the European Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine ETS No. 164, should undoubtedly be mentioned) and highlighted the frame of his own interpretation of the fundamental bioethical conflict on the relation culture of norms – culture of utility.⁶

The first (working) part of the summer school – Integrative Bioethics and Philosophy, began after the introductory lecture. Prof. dr. Marco Olivetti (Department of Philosophy, La Sapienza University, Rome, Italy) in his presentation spoke of the *Foundations of an Integrative Bioethics from the Philosophical Point of View (I) – Life, Being and Person*. In his interesting and inspiring presentation, prof. Olivetti conceptualized bioethics as an integrative force of different disciplines, and different cultures. Despite evident differences between particular cultures and traditions, explained prof. Olivetti, it is difficult to disavow the fact that universal values and categories exist and require to be preserved. Speaking of the importance of recognizing and not endangering the mentioned values by our instantaneous and transient interests, prof. Olivetti concluded that the character of the new and unknown, and the unpredictability of final consequences of the uncontrolled and unlimited applications of modern science and its ancillary techniques, urgently requires the introduction of additional caution into our activity.⁷ In the central part of his presentation, prof. Olivetti problematized levels and forms of *responsibility* – responsible action is not just a phrase or task we can take lightly, but urgently includes the definition of theoretical frames, and practical solutions. Olivetti dedicated the final part of his presentation to the deliberation and search for strongholds for his viewpoints, specially paying attention to Kant's duty ethics that even today, according to many, represents the governing regulative idea of (bio)ethics.⁸ If we leave out often (unnecessarily) speculation of Kant's duty ethics, it is always possible to find a valuable conclusion in the works of Kant himself – our action must always and again be defined only by a maxim at the universal level, never calculating the final results of the action itself. The realisation of bioethical, and universal values in general, is possible only through an uncompromising acceptance of Kant's ethical categories, because no other option offers an acceptable ethical solution, concluded prof. Olivetti.

On the second day of presentation, prof. Olivetti dedicated his account to *Responsibility and Life* in which he attempted to regard the *responsibility for life* as one of the central concepts and problems of contemporary bioethics. Interfacing arguments of sanctity and quality of life, prof. Olivetti addressed a vitally bioethical problem that can be, in one way or another, recognized in most bioethical dilemmas. Responsibility that is established and powerfully confirmed an ethical category (Kant, Levinas⁹) to prof. Olivetti in the same moments represents a starting point, direction and goal for our bioethical action. Namely, being responsible is not merely a state, but is purportedly manifested precisely as a potential for responsible action (the more we are responsible, the more we become responsible – responsibility for responsibility), whereat the objects of our ethical action, or *responsibilities*, are not merely the existing living beings, but also all those that will be, that still need to be, they ought to be because they ought, life in general. Prof. Olivetti offered an interesting argument interpreting the relationship of mother-child on the example of feeding: although the mother is aware that in feeding the child she gives part of herself and tears-off from her corporality, the responsibility she feels toward her child puts into second plan what she would normally feel a sacrifice and certain violence against her. The naturalness and harmony

of their parent-child relationship is the best possible means to present the essence of responsibility – namely, although a child is completely helpless in fulfilling its daily needs and has no ability to influence someone else's decision on (not) feeding, the mother accepts it as part of her own self and to it, often more than towards herself, feels responsibility.¹⁰ Although such a comparison may seem far too abstract, it is possible to draw a parallel in the sense that responsibility does not just include those that are fully present and obvious participants of today's world, but all those that will yet be – they come first (before ourselves), even if and in spite of the fact that they yet have to be. Between *being* in the present and *being* in the future, *being* in action and yet *having* the possibility, has no ethical difference, concluded prof. Olivetti. The third and fourth working day of the summer school were also dedicated to philosophical issues in integrative bioethics – the morning section began with the lecture *Moral Theory and Bioethics: Methodological Concerns in Bioethics and Bio-medical Ethics: Concepts and Cases (I)* illustrated by prof. dr. Stavroula Tsinorema (Department of Philosophy and Social Studies, University of Crete, Rethymnon, Greece). Starting from the definition and contents of bioethical scandals, moving across societal circumstances of its emersion (not failing to expose interesting cases of bioethical scandals from not that long ago)¹¹ to the issue of applicability and sustainability of traditional

6

Professor Schweidler offered attendants two of his texts in the textual manual of the summer school (Reader): *Global Bioethics Initiatives from the European Perspective* and *Between Norms and Utility* (Working material on 1st International Summer School of Integrative Bioethics, Mali Lošinj, Croatia / September 4–16, 2006).

7

For the introduction of *beting* elements into the ethical consideration of certain options of action, it is particularly necessary to point out the work of Hans Jonas (never must the existence or essence of 'man' as a whole be made a stake in the hazards of action... given that the eventual risk of our actions and self-ish goals by no means suggest the option of endangering life in general). – Hans Jonas, *Princip odgovornosti – pokušaj etike za jednu tehnološku civilizaciju*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo 1990, pp. 61–62).

8

Here it is certainly required to highlight the original literature that prof. Olivetti offered to attendants for reading and preparation of seminary work. Namely, the original Kantian texts that are nowadays quoted and referred to in bioethical literature are: *Critique of Practical Reason* and *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals* – Kant's text was published in the school's Reader (in English) – Introduction of Book I, *Religion within the Bound of Bare Reason*.

9

Attendants had the opportunity to be acquainted with certain parts of the works by Emmanuel Levinas through the text *Other-*

wise than Being or Beyond Essence, also in the Reader handbook.

10

Parental responsibility belongs to the natural kind of responsibility, it arises from nature itself and is thereby independent of previous consents, and it is irrevocable and cannot be withdrawn. It is the consequence of the most intimate and most elementary natural relationship, it potentially belongs to all of us, and the object of its responsibility is the narrow surrounding of the most intimately related descendants. – H. Jonas, *Princip odgovornosti*, pp. 136–143. Richard M. Hare also addressed the issue of parent-child relationship in his book about the application of ethical theories on practical issues, *Essays on Political Morality*. Although he uses the concept of *parental obligations*, the interpretation he gives is close to Jonas' concept of parental responsibility (parental responsibilities – such as feeding a child – are our inalienable moral responsibilities from the moment we become parents) – Richard M. Hare, "Political Obligation", in: Richard M. Hare, *Essays on Political Morality*; Oxford University Press, New York 1998, pp. 8–20.

11

Much has already been written on bioethics to the present day, but equally remain interesting and controversial the topics that permanently occupy the attention of bioethicists, and the wider public. A systematic account and ethical development of the most famous bioethical scandals offers Tonči Matulić in his book: *Bioetika*, Glas koncila, Zagreb, 2001.

theoretical paradigms in bioethics (such as Kant's ethics) to modern society, prof. Tsinorema elaborated an impressive corpus of bioethical topics in her thorough account. Indicating to renowned authors (R. M. Hare, E. Winkler, O. O'Neill, R. Dworkin, C. L. Stevenson, P. Singer, A. Caplan, J. Habermas, A. MacIntyre, R. Veatch, T. Beauchamp, J. Childress, J. Rawls), prof. Tsinorema not only confirmed an excellent knowledge of a wide spectre of the bioethical problematic, but also set the foundations and opened a possibility (possibilities) for a stimulating discourse. Especially encouraging was the search for the frameworks of a substantially concrete, but not limiting definition of bioethics – with this idea, prof. Tsinorema offered three possibilities for interpreting bioethics: i) bioethics as a philosophical reflection on the biological science; ii) bioethics as an ethical concern for the biosphere, and finally; iii) bioethics as an ethics of vivos (the living) in the biotechnological contemporary era. Problematizing and argumentatively indicating to an unacceptable reductionism of the first two interpretations, prof. Tsinorema points for the third option – bioethics is a normative ethical theory of the modern age of advanced science and technology which endeavours, on ethically acceptable stands, to offer answers on what is right, and what is not (however, the problem of justifiability and acceptance of bioethics, even presently remains one of the more significant problems in bioethics).¹²

The second day of lecture continued in a similar atmosphere (*Bio-medical Ethics: Concepts and Cases /III/*) – putting an emphasis on the topic of principalism vs. non-principalism (theory of virtue, health care ethics, contextualism) in bioethics, prof. Tsinorema unavoidably opened space for a debate on concrete bioethical issues (abortion, euthanasia, dysthanasia, rights of patients, informed consent, use of animals in research trials). Always interesting bioethical topics understandably encouraged interest of school participants – openness, accessibility and invitation to participate in the work of seminar groups, but also during prof. Tsinorema's lectures, in this case truly shifted the barriers of education as a process of exclusive knowledge and information transfer in the direction of a mutual, and interactive relation within live bioethical education.

The second thematic part of the summer school bore the title *Integrative Bioethics and Medicine* whose lecturer was prof. dr. Herbert A. Neumann (Faculty of Medicine, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany). As opposed to previous days dedicated to theoretic/philosophical issues in bioethics,¹³ the longstanding medical and clinical experience of prof. Neumann enriched his lecture with a whole series of practical examples from everyday medical practice. The title of the first lecture on which prof. Neumann presented the unenviable situation of the contemporary German health-care system and operative model of insurance companies, was *Bioethical Issues from the Physician's Point of View (I): Problems of the Financing of our (German) Health-care Systems*. Namely, until recently the model of organizing and financing health insurance on principles of the *welfare state*, that originated from the second half of the 19th century, was in force, but during the time it could not any more meet the needs and costs of contemporary medicine and healthcare.^{14,15} The crisis of welfare states in the final quarter of the 20th century is primarily a consequence of economic factors, and numerous specific causes (improvement of the quality of life and its effects on demographic changes, prolongation of human life, increase of the proportion of elderly population and overloading of funds with retirement pensions and health insurance) – confronted with such

pressures, the welfare state takes a series of measures such as the abolition of individual programmes, reduction of the quality of services, transferring portions of the expenses on beneficiaries themselves, which is particularly most present in healthcare services. Gradually, some forms of the social security provision become attractive to private entrepreneurs and insurance companies who thereby become partakers of the insurance system. The concept of governmentally monitored and corrected *generational solidarity* is thus replaced with a system of privately owned insurance companies whereby the problem of a much expensive and for many unavailable care, is still not solved.¹⁶ The described condition is also present in Germany – demographic changes of the ageing population continuously, and without greater aspects for changes in the foreseeable future, burden the healthcare system increase health-care costs, decrease resources for new researches, decrease preventive, and increase costs (more expensive) of curative medicine, influence the unequal and unfair allocation of health resources, increase the inequality of the rich and poor, and represent one of the more important, not only social, but political issues – Neumann pointed out.

12

Prof. Tsinoema sought the argumentation for her statements especially in the works of Earl R. Winkler and Jerrold R. Coombs (ed.) *Applied Ethics: A Reader*, and Onora O'Neill: "Practical Principles, Practical Judgement" (see the Reader).

13

Although a discussion on the division and levels of bioethics is quite ungrateful, the search for an acceptable, sufficiently comprehensive, and yet sufficiently concrete option is neither a rare nor a redundant instance. We can find a systematic division brought by Snježana Prijčić-Samaržija. According to her, at the present, topics and problems within bioethics may be classified into four groups: the first group includes a discussion on the character and substance of bioethics, relationship of bioethics and other disciplines (law, theology, ethics...), and discussion on different ethical approaches in bioethics (deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics...); the second group concerns the more abstract philosophical topics on the intrinsic value of life, issue of life and death, and the beginning and end of life; the third group consists of concrete topics (abortion, euthanasia, genetic therapy, organ transplantation and donation, cloning, AIDS, experiments on stem-cells, embryos, fetuses, human beings and animals, in-vitro fertilization, issues of population policies and similar), while the fourth group includes issues related to the actual functioning of healthcare, instruction, education and bioethical practise, structure and activity of ethical committees – Snježana Prijčić-Samaržija, "Uz temu", *Vladavina prava* 5 (4/2000), pp. 7–8.

14

At the time of Chancellor Bismarck (his decision on mandatory health insurance for all citizens was a carefully planned move to re-

press the increasing social problems and turmoil), Germany became the first country that enacted social-security legislation: mandatory health insurance in the year 1883, work accident insurance in the year 1884, and pension plan insurance in the year 1889. The Weimar Republic would introduce insurance against unemployment in 1927, and lately, in the year 1995, the welfare security was introduced (Marijan Valković, "Solidarnost i Pravda kao temelj socijalne države", in: Vlado Puljiz/ed., *Hrvatska kao socijalna država: zadanost i usmjerenja*, Centar za industrijsku demokraciju SSSH, Zagreb 1997, pp. 30–60).

15

The stated (German) type of welfare state that undertakes responsibility for the material benefit and social security of its citizens is defined as a corporate welfare state. Today we can generally distinguish between three main types of welfare states: the liberal one provides minimum guarantees for the poorest (USA), the corporate provides for the employed through contributions of the insured and employers (Germany) and the social-democratic ones that principally provide for everyone, for all equally (principle of equality and universality – Sweden is an example of such a state) – Eugen Pusić, "Uvjeti institucionalne stabilizacije socijalne države", in: V. Puljiz (ed.), *Hrvatska kao socijalna država: zadanost i usmjerenja*, pp. 9–29.

16

According to Neumann, during the first years of the reformed healthcare system, the number of insurance companies in Germany ranged around 600, but challenged by the market-oriented medicine, most did not manage to stand their ground. Today around 200 are active.

The topic of Neumann's second day of lecture was *Examples of End-of-life Questions – (Physician Assisted Suicide, Palliative Care etc)*¹⁷ – although the title of the lecture itself was interesting and indicated to an evermore provocative bioethical topic, what certainly needs to be mentioned is that prof. Neumann also displayed this topic from the perspective of organizer and head of the institution of the first Bochum hospice. His long-lasting confrontation with the needs and suffering of palliative patients, without the ability to help them within the existing system of medical and health care, motivated prof. Neumann to introduce the attendants with the steps and efforts of the process of organizing hospices, as well as with practical experiences and constant challenges of his work.¹⁸ Although the lectures prof. Neumann held on both days were exceptionally interesting and full of useful contents, school participants were extremely attracted to the topic of physician decision making at the end of life,¹⁹ especially cases from practise. On the other hand, an account of the German health-care system, with all its advantages, and obvious imperfections, could serve as a good example to countries that still expect such social changes and which have to adapt to the challenges of a market-oriented health-care system.

Integrative bioethics and theology was the title of the third day of summer school in which prof. dr. Peter Schallenberg (Faculty of Theology, Fulda, Germany) presented the topic *The Project of an Integrative Bioethics from the Perspective of Theology (I): Foundational Issues*. The topic of relationship bioethics-ethics-theology, attracted great attention of school attendants, specially regarding the presence and influence of theological standpoints in bioethics of today. Starting from the clarification of individual concepts (theologian perception of God, to the relationship of natural and supernatural and the sense of (human) life), prof. Schallenberg put at the centre of his exposition principal positions of contemporary theology (theology is the reflection of God, God as an *ultimae potencie*, the sum of all reflective possibilities), and the frames for recognizing, perceiving and interpreting particular bioethical problems. An interesting part of the lecture was the interpretation of ethics as a theory of good life (that is, tention for a good life) and bioethics, which, according to prof. Schallenberg's words, is a part of ethics – bioethics is a reflection of human life problems and life in general (especially in reproduction) in the biotechnological era. Defining the relationship God-man, as a relationship of unconditional love, prof. Schallenberg concluded how human life in its core is holy, in its nucleus represents a fulfilment of love for God – this alone makes his dignity unconditional and nothing should ever violate it.

Theoretical viewpoints on the first day of presentation, the next morning ceded space to practical topics (*II) (Cases and Application)*, and it did not take long before a discussion opened in which participated almost everyone present. Prof. Schallenberg consistently presented clerical standpoints on the significance of marriage as a holy institution of man and woman (wherewith he simultaneously positioned the Church's standpoint on the more frequent registering of homosexual partnerships and marriages), an act of love and not interest;²⁰ on the issue of abortion (in Germany abortion is allowed only in cases when there exist certain indications – by approving and vaguely defining social indications as reasons for abortion, the state slipped away from a single-valued and to criticism subject attitude to abortion);²¹ on reproductive technologies and IVF;²² preimplantational diagnostics (conducting these procedures would basically imply the acceptance of IVF, which the Church considers unacceptable for stated reasons) and prenatal diagnostics (the Church

does not oppose PND procedures, unless their results are used as indications for abortion), organ donation and transplantation (as an act of free will, not duty or coercion), surrogate motherhood,²³ euthanasia (active-passive, indi-

17

Prof. Neumann submitted to the school's reference material texts by M. Greg Bloche, *Managing Conflict at the End of Life*; Inez de Beaufort, *Patients in a Persistent Vegetative State – A Dutch Perspective*; and Ante Čović, *New Paths of Medical Ethics*, as additional supplements for deliberation on this topic.

18

Among numerous difficulties that Neumann encountered from the moment when he and his colleagues set out to establish the first hospice institution, he specially pointed out the sensibilization of the public on evident problems of a large number of palliative patients in Germany, the organization of an initial volunteer group gathered round a mutual goal of establishing a hospice, promoting and executing a necessary education on palliative care for health and non-health participants of the whole project, recognition of the necessity of opening hospices on the part of entrusted social structures, collection of initial resources and continuous financing of hospices' work.

19

Surrounding the discussion carried out on this topic, once again the problem was touched and official stance of Germany explained, regarding the ratification and adoption of positions on, and the contents of the European Convention on Human Rights in Biomedicine (with due caution for this topic, the reasons of the stated attitude may be sought in the Nazi heritage of the German state, reminded prof. Neumann).

20

Although modern society disturbed the original sense of marriage, the Church holds the opinion that marriage remains (or should be) an act of expression and creation into which man invests all his strength and love, and not an act of production (act of expression vs. act of production). Using the paradigm of heavenly life, prof. Schallenberg pointed out that marriage is *frui* (to enjoy oneself with another person without asking questions and calculating how much this is beneficial), opposite to *uti* (interest in being together) – to reject *frui* in one's life means to exit heaven, and outside of heaven, everything is *uti*.

21

Related to the topic of abortion, the attention was once again directed at the European Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine. The standpoint of the mentioned Convention, as prof. Schallenberg reminded, is that the human being starts to evolve to a person from the moment of conception – numerous theologians and philosophers of the continental orientation (a great majority also present

in Germany), object to this holding a position to which an acceptable definition should read that the human being starts to develop as a person from the moment of conception. A discussion also opened on the topic of legally regulating the rights to abortion in certain European countries. For more detail on the status of certain aspects of the European Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine within German legislation see Frank Hoffmeister, "Germany: Status of European Convention on Human Rights in Domestic Law", *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 4 (4/2006), pp. 722–731.

22

Referring to the texts *Donum Vitae* (1987) and *Evangelium Vitae* (1995), Schallenberg affirmed how one of the reasons why the Church opposes the use of in vitro fertilization is that conception realized by means of technical assistance disrupts the sanctity of a marital sexual act. Even the presently accepted clerical doctrine believes that the male sperm is composed of "living beings" – the collection of sperm outside the (marital) sexual act (for possible use in IVF procedures) would be intentional murder and this in itself implies inadmissible acts. However, it is not completely clear what the attitude of the Church is to recent achievements by which it is possible, through requisite technical interventions, to "transform" a somatic cell with 46 chromosomes into a germ cell with 23 chromosomes – this procedure does not intentionally kill millions of living beings in the male sperm (reduced by 1 that could inseminate a female cell), however, the *problem* of technical assistance continues to remain. Still, these procedures are not performed even in countries that allow IVF, for the simple reason that there is no reason for such a complicated acquisition of germ cells.

23

The Church does not accept acts of surrogate motherhood, recommending to couples – potential parents, in its stead, the realisation of parenthood by adopting already born children. Ultimately, the discussion on surrogate motherhood extends to the debate on IVF and the millions of embryos which resulted from mentioned procedures, and which are used, in great numbers, for research purposes. The Church believes that their best option would be to implant them into women who wish to bring them into this world, and would subsequently give them up for adoption. Even the option of leaving them to die is better than treating them as mere objects for the purposes of research (instrumentalization for research material).

rect).²⁴ The remarkableness of prof. Schallenberg's account and the presented clerical attitudes on numerous medical, and other issues, motivated most of the attendants, almost without exception, to an active participation in seminary class and contribution to bioethical discussion. Considering the dedication with which school attendants retained their personal standpoints, it is difficult to judge to what extent prof. Schallenberg's arguments were convincing and acceptable, but what truly needs to be commended and highlighted is the reciprocal experience of tolerating various attitudes and appreciation of opposite theoretical bases, as the only acceptable path towards a pluriperspective and integrative bioethics.

Prof. dr. Jasminka Pavelić (Division of Molecular Medicine, "Ruđer Bošković" Institute, Zagreb, Croatia) was the summer school's lecturer of the topic *Integrative Bioethics and Molecular Medicine* that she conceptualized into four sub-topics: *Molecular Medicine: Basic Knowledge*; *Studies of Gene Therapy: Ethical and Social Issues*; *Ethical Issues in Genetic Screening, Testing and Profiling*; *On the Scientific and Ethical Issues in Cloning*.

In the first part of her interesting lecture, prof. Pavelić offered a comprehensive introduction into the topic of molecular medicine that included the clarification of basic concepts (molecular medicine is the use of the techniques of molecular biology in medicine), a review of the historical development of the new genetics from 1953 and the discovery of the double helix structure of the DNA, up to the latest investigations and conclusions of the first phase of the Human Genome Project. The mentioned topic encountered a great interest of the school attendants, since nowadays topics of the new genetic technology reasonably draw great attention of the public, and through implications of its procedures transcend the exclusive boundaries of science and become an important ethical, social, economic and political issue. However, ahead of the tempting possibilities that nowadays become available to an increasing number of people within the frame of genetics and molecular medicine become available, rest many mysteries, limiting circumstances and unpredictable consequences that have to be taken into consideration while their use is being decided on, reminded prof. Pavelić. Presenting the second and third topic, prof. Pavelić spoke of gene therapy researches and applications and genetic testing (and the associated procedures of genetic screening, test selection, genetic mapping and gene profiling), at the same time taking a significant step forward from exclusively scientific facts and possibilities of their technical realization to other issues, especially those of bioethical character (informed consent, financial justification of expensive scientific researches, data use and confidentiality, privacy, cases of adversity and destructiveness of gene therapy, possibilities of discrimination and manipulation). Thereat, of special interest for school attendants were accounts on some already known,²⁵ but also more recent cases of gene therapy – the medical-clinical background of the cases themselves, in the manner explained by prof. Pavelić, set a frame for reflection on the problem that transcends solely issues of practical character, technical practicability, and even the therapeutic effect, opening at the same time a wider bioethical discourse on their potential deliberation and solution. Only with the introduction and respect for bioethical methods, theoretical principles and potential bioethical solutions into the practice of gene therapy, can we set prerequisite conditions of acceptable ethical action within the gene therapy procedure.

The final part of prof. Pavelić's account was especially interesting, not only for reasons of the cloning topic, but also for the educational method of approach to the topic itself. In the first part of her account on the topic of cloning, prof. Pavelić clarified the scientific and technical bases of the procedure

itself, basic concepts (reproductive, therapeutic cloning), examples of cloning from the recent past (the cloning of Dolly the sheep in 1997), and perspectives for developing the cloning procedures. The lecturing part of the account of prof. Pavelić preceded the second part that was planned as an educational method of work on text in small student groups.²⁶ By developing work on the text in smaller student groups, Pavelić directly included all attendants into class-work – reading of the text and giving accounts on the read, and pointing to certain issues of bioethical character, through a skilled lead discussion (the main topics of discussion were control, instrumentalization, risks and responsibilities of the cloning procedure) on the part of prof. Pavelić, all present gained incentive and chance to participate in class, and the school of bioethics came to life in the full sense of the word.

The final two days were foreseen for the topic *Integrative Bioethics, Agronomy and Environmental Ethics* that was expectedly given to prof. dr. Marijan Jošt (College of Agriculture in Križevci, Croatia) with the lecture *Bioethical Issues within the Field of Agronomy (I): General Issues* and *(II): Practical Issues*. Although we usually (unjustifiably) leave out topics with the denomination of agronomy and environmental ethics from the list of most important bioethical topics, this was not so in the case of the lecture held by prof. Jošt. In his introductory lines, prof. Jošt set the main frames, but also the guidelines for the topic he dedicated his account to: interpreting the concept *ETC Century*, which was also the sub-title, and the entire denomination of the lecture, he concisely sketched the societal-historical context of the contemporary bioethical-ecological debate: E for environmental erosion, T for technological transformation and C for corporate merger. By substantiating his account with novelty information and interesting, often shocking statistical data, Jošt pointed out to the disturbing status of natural resources, constantly present trend of complete extermination of particular plant and animal species, fatal consequences of soil and water destruction as the most important and necessary natural resources

24

For more details on clerical standpoints, see the school's textbook material, chapter titled *Integrative Bioethics and Theology* (William E. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*).

25

Although the first gene therapy experiments, with a special permission of the American Institutional Review Board (IRB), were performed as yet in 1980, on two patients of the University of California in Los Angeles, the first approved gene therapy prescribed by protocol, was done on 14th September 1990, on a four year old girl Ashanthi Desilva who was suffering from adenosine deaminase (ADA) deficiency, an enzyme necessary for sustaining in life and functioning of immune cells (Ronald Munson, "Genetics: Intervention, Control and Research", in: Ronald Munson, *Intervention and Reflections: Basic Issues in Medical Ethics*, Woodsworth Publishing Company, Belmont 1996, pp. 423–488). Because the immune system is endangered, the most frequent consequence of this disease is death from infection. With a view to prevent new infections, those suffering from this disease are forced to rigorous life conditions –

this is also the reason why this disease is also called "the disease of the boy in the balloon". – The quoted case of somatic gene therapy on Ashanthi Desilva, at that time caused numerous positive public reactions because of its success. At the same time, the public was not informed on the former long-standing medication therapy, which successfully elevated the girl's immune system level. Today, the extent to which the improvement of the girl's health condition was a result of gene therapy, or the previous intensive administration of medicaments, remains a mystery for a wider public.

26

Texts that prof. Pavelić offered for work in smaller student groups were collected in the school reader under the title *Integrative Bioethics and Molecular Medicine* (SRT Project, *Human Cloning – The Ethical Issues*, Magen Garner: *Gene Therapy: Is it Ethical?*, Brenda Almond: *Genetic Profiling of Newborns: Ethical and Social Issues*, BBC News Magazine: *Trading Faces, Woman has First Face Transplant, Doctors Perform First Partial Face Transplant* and MSNBC.com: *Face Transplant Patient Makes an Appearance*).

on Earth. Not only are the consequences visible through the prism of economic merger and financial monopoly of multinational companies (especially biotechnological companies that deal in genetic engineering), but through the multiplied destructive actions of systematic exploitation and pollution of Earth. Although advocates of GMO production and application point out that the use of genetically modified food may help in the battle against hunger and poverty in certain parts of the world, prof. Jošt warned how facts speak differently – the real causes of food shortage in certain parts of the world are not a consequence of the lack of its quantity in the world, but its unequal allocation between the rich and the poor. As long as such a situation remains in favour of large companies, it is hard to believe in more significant shifts and a true, not only proclaiming solution of problems, concluded prof. Jošt. After the lecturing part, prof. Jošt enriched the educational methods and school contents with an interesting recording of an interview with F. William Engdahl, taken during his stay in Croatia and promotion of the book *Sjeme uništenja – geopolitika genetički modificirane hrane i globalno carstvo*.²⁷ The content of the film, especially statements of the author of the book on extents and consequences of globalization, and manipulation of the food market by production of genetically modified food, encouraged students to ask prof. Jošt new questions, at which point ecological questions were only seemingly at the centre of discussion, and the focus of attention were economic interests, political power and geopolitical strategies of the world powers.²⁸ With the presentation of prof. Jošt ended the lecturing part of the school for bioethics, but not the entire work of the school. The intense deliberation of bioethics surrounding different thematic units, opened a wide spectrum of issues, pursued by lecturers to a greater or lesser extent, and school attendants, at which point the idea of a concrete and uniform solution of individual bioethical problems on no account was the leading thought of the initiator and head of this summer school – the goal of the mentioned school for integrative bioethics primarily arose from the endeavour for a positive and stimulating climate of study and teaching of bioethics.

According to the earlier mentioned schedule, after the lectures, school attendants individually took the oral examination on the knowledge adopted and experience from lectures taken, and the main examiner was the coordinator of the whole project of the summer school, prof. dr. Thomas Sören Hoffmann. After the successfully completed exams, which were not only a test of knowledge, but also a discourse of the examiner with the attendants on their individual interests and plans in the field of bioethics, all the attendants received a certificate of school attendance.

The final day of the international summer school of bioethics passed in a somewhat relaxed tone in which still remained time for school attendants, for the last time assembled before leaving Lošinj, to set forth their experiences and evaluate school work. Judging the set forth, the two weeks of bioethics were not only an interesting educational project, but also an appropriate method for the exchange of opinions, agreements for certain new collaboration and association. Before the mere closure of the work of (this first) school, prof. Hoffman specially thanked the lecturers, and the school attendants, announced the new cycle of the summer school for bioethics and invited everyone for further collaboration in the field of (*integrative*) *bioethics*.

Instead of conclusion

We are of the opinion that the realized pedagogical atmosphere of the Lošinj school for integrative bioethics deserves a high evaluation, not only as an as-

pect for the education of attendants that belong to bioethical spheres anyhow, but as a well planned and professionally processed project of an outside institutional (summer school), but intensively and thematically directed (integrative bioethics) work. The reasons for the achieved are numerous and complex: choice of topic (deliberating on the concept of *integrative* bioethics), invitation to participate and response of competent lecturers, actuality and interestingness of lectures, texts printed in the Reader of the school as reading material for attendants to prepare themselves for work in seminary groups in a timely and suitable fashion, openness of the teaching process and encouraging the problematization of particular topics outside of the lectures themselves, introducing the attendants to the educational process through active and dynamic participation, work in seminary groups, work on the text and organizing discussions on individual topics – form all the stated, it seems that we can reasonably conclude how the organization, course and echo of the summer school of bioethics is of special significance for bioethics, but also in wider social dimension, and how the inaugurated initiative will continue with its successful work.

References:

Ante Čović, “Bioetika u Hrvatskoj: Izazovi razvoja”, in: Ante Čović, *Etika i bioetika*, Pergamena, Zagreb 2004, pp. 149–152.

Ante Čović & Thomas Sören Hoffmann (eds.), *Bioethik und kulturelle Pluralität, Die südosteuropäische perspektive*, Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin 2005.

Božidar Vrhovac, “Predgovor: Stanje i problemi etičke regulacije u hrvatskom zdravstvu”, in: Robert Craig & Carl Middleton & Lawrence O’Connell, *Etički komiteti – Praktični pristup*, Pergamena, Zagreb 1998, pp. 5–11.

Eugen Pusić, “Uvjeti institucionalne stabilizacije socijalne države”, in: Vlado Puljiz (ed.), *Hrvatska kao socijalna država: zadanosti i usmjerenja*, Centar za industrijsku demokraciju SSSH, Zagreb 1997, 9–29.

Frank Hoffmeister, “Germany: Status of European Convention on Human Rights in domestic law”, *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 4 (4/2006), pp. 722–731.

Hans Jonas, *Princip odgovornosti. Pokušaj etike za jednu tehnološku civilizaciju*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo 1990.

Hans-Martin Sass, “Bioetika u Europi”, *Društvena istraživanja* 23–24 (5/1996), pp. 629–649.

Iva Rinčić Lerga, “Međunarodna konferencija: Bioetika u južnoj i jugoistočnoj Europi – Europske intrakulturne razlike kao poticaj zajedničkog etičkog promišljanja”, *Društvena istraživanja* 80 (6/2005), pp. 1219–1223.

Nada Gosić, *Bioetička edukacija*, Pergamena, Zagreb 2005.

Marijan Valković, “Bioetika u Hrvatskoj: kratko izvješće”, in: Ivan Cifrić (ed.), *Bioetika: etička iskušenja znanosti i društva*, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo & Zavod za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb 1998, pp. 297–293.

27

Sjeme uništenja is one of the most controversial books that have appeared in the recent couple of years on the world market. It was printed in Croatia in the year 2005 by Detecta d.o.o., from Zagreb, that is, as a world premiere. Only after this edition was it printed abroad, in Germany and the USA.

28

For those especially interested in this topic, Jošt prepared more texts in the Reader: Marijan Jošt, *The Ethics of Science and Techno-*

logy; Peter T. Saunders: *Science in and For Society*; Marijan Jošt: *The Impact of Agricultural Biotechnology on Environment and Food Security*; Thomas C. Fox: *Two Scientists Debate Genetically Engineered Food*; Iza Kruszewska: *US Government Threatens WTO Action if Croatia Bans GMOs*, Foreign Agricultural Service: *Croatia Biotechnological Draft GMO Law and Government Anti-GMO Campaign 2001*, *The Lošinj Declaration on Bioethical Sovereignty*.

Marijan Valković, “Solidarnost i pravda kao temelj socijalne države”, in: Vlado Puljiz (ed.), *Hrvatska kao socijalna država: zadanosti i usmjerenja*, Centar za industrijsku demokraciju SSSH, Zagreb 1997, pp. 30–60.

Richard M. Hare, “Political Obligation”, in: Richard M. Hare, *Essays on Political Morality*, Oxford University Press, New York 1998, pp. 8–20.

Ronald Munson, “Genetics: Invention, Control and Research”, in: Ronald Munson, *Intervention and Reflections; Basic Issues in Medical Ethics*, Woodswoth Publishing Company, Belmont 1996, pp. 423–488.

Snežana Prijčić–Samaržija, “Uz temu”, *Vladavina prava* 5 (4/2000), pp. 7–8.

Tonči Matulić, *Bioetika*, Glas koncila, Zagreb 2001.

Working material in 1st International Summer School of Integrative Bioethics, Mali Lošinj, Croatia / September 4–16, 2006.

Iva Rinčić Lerga

1. Internationale Sommerschule der Integrativen Bioethik

Zusammenfassung

Der Artikel gibt eine analytische Übersicht der „1. Internationalen Sommerschule der Integrativen Bioethik“, die vom 4. bis 6. September 2006 in Mali Lošinj (Kroatien) stattfand. Die Sommerschule ist ein wissenschaftlich-educatives Gemeinschaftsprojekt deutscher und kroatischer Einrichtungen mit dem Hauptziel, die ‘Integrative Bioethik’ als ein individuelle Lösungen überschreitendes Konzept zu erforschen sowie Interdisziplinarität und Zusammenarbeit bei der Erwägung und Reflektierung komplexer (bio-)ethischer Probleme zu fördern und in die Anstrengungen zu ihrer Lösung einzubinden. Die Verfasserin präsentiert und analysiert den organisatorischen Aufbau der Schule, die angewandten methodologischen Strategien und die erzielte edukative Atmosphäre. Sie ist bemüht, den Rahmen für die Integrative Bioethik als Unterrichtsfach zu definieren und darüberhinaus zu ermitteln, in welchem Ausmaß das Konzept der ‘Integrativen Bioethik’ tatsächlich auch als Schlüsselement für die Tätigkeit der Sommerschule bestimmend war.

Schlüsselbegriffe

Integrative Bioethik, Bioethikschule, Unterrichtsstrategien, Interaktion im Bildungsprozess

Iva Rinčić Lerga

La première école d’été internationale de bioéthique intégrative

Résumé

L’article présente un compte rendu analytique de la « 1^{ère} école d’été internationale de bioéthique intégrative », tenue du 4 au 6 septembre 2006 à Mali Lošinj en Croatie. L’école en question est un projet scientifique et éducatif commun élaboré par des institutions allemandes et croates. L’objectif global du projet est d’examiner le concept de « bioéthique intégrative » qui se situe au-delà des solutions individuelles et qui favorise l’interdisciplinarité ainsi que la collaboration en matière d’examen, de réflexion et d’effort dans la résolution de problèmes (bio)éthiques complexes. À travers un compte rendu et une analyse du schéma d’organisation de l’école, de la stratégie de méthodologie employée et du climat éducatif développé, nous essayons de définir un cadre pour l’enseignement de la bioéthique intégrative mais aussi de déterminer dans quelle mesure le concept de bioéthique intégrative a été un élément clé de l’activité de l’école.

Mots-clés

Bioéthique intégrative, école de bioéthique, stratégie d’enseignement, interaction dans l’éducation