REPORT ON THE REGIONAL MEETING
OF ETHICS TEACHING EXPERTS

Moscow, 19-20 January 2005

Information about teaching hours, syllabi, reading material, that was presented in the conference, but that is already present in the UNESCO forms for teaching programs is not repeated in this report in full detail. Rather the focus is on further information that was given as well as on the general discussions during the conference.

Introduction

The Regional Meeting of Ethics Teaching Experts was the second of its kind, following a first one in Budapest in October 2004. In this meeting in Moscow, about 20 ethics-teaching experts from Armenia, Byelorussia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia and the Ukraine participated together with observers from Israel and from the Council of Europe. The meeting was organised by the UNESCO Division of Ethics of Science and Technology together with the UNESCO office in Moscow.

The goal of the meeting was to bring together a small number of experts for intensive discussions during two days. The objective of this was threefold: first, to describe the existing teaching programs of the participants and to complete the forms created by the UNESCO division in order to introduce teaching programs into the Global Ethics Observatory (GEO) databases. Second, to create a network of experts for future activities. Third, the meeting shall be the starting point for planning further activities and regional co-operations.

19th January 2005

Welcoming and Opening / UNESCO and Ethics Teaching

The first day of the conference being chaired by J. Sàndor, Chief of the Bioethics Section in the UNESCO Division of Ethics of Science and Technology, the meeting began with an opening address by R. Apressyan, Head, Section of Ethics, Institute of Philosophy at the Russian Academy of Sciences, followed by a presentation by J. Sàndor on “UNESCO and Ethics Teaching”. The aim of the presentation was to clarify what an international organisation such as UNESCO could provide in the context of ethics teaching and to give a basic introduction to the work of the Division of Ethics of Science and Technology.

J. Sàndor explained the place of ethics in UNESCO in the Social and Human Sciences sector and gave an outline of the historical development of ethics in UNESCO. She presented bioethics, science ethics, environmental ethics and space ethics as being the theoretical basis of activities in the Division of Ethics of Science and Technology and emphasised standard-setting actions, capacity building, and awareness raising as essential to the work of the Division. As regards standard-setting actions, she introduced the participants to the different advisory bodies to UNESCO, and presented the normative instruments that have been created so far. She then proceeded to guide an outline of further planned declarations and instruments. She stated that the Division is pleased to see that so many teaching programmes include the UNESCO Declarations in their syllabi and teaching materials. Concerning
capacity building. It followed a presentation of the Global Ethics Observatory and the Ethics Education Programme of the Division, as well as different steps to be taken to implement the normative instruments. She finally turned to awareness raising, pointing to the series of rotating conferences, Ethics around the World, and to UNESCO related publications and research before finishing the presentation with a summary slide.

J. Sándor then presented the participants present at the conference, expressed her hope that the meeting will be a fruitful exchange of ideas, expertise, and challenges and problems related to ethics teaching in the countries present to the meeting. She then gave the floor to the first expert to present his teaching programs. The rest of the day was devoted to ethics teaching in Russia, Byelorussia, Ukraine, and Lithuania.

Ethics Teaching in Russia

A. Gusseinov, Deputy Director, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, was first to present his ethics teaching activities at the Moscow State University. He emphasised that his institute is the only independent ethics institute in Russia. Members of the institute teach 3 courses in ethics, plus another 20 specialized courses that are taught by non-members. Teaching in other faculties depends on the initiative of these faculties. This is according to Mr. Gusseinov typical for ethics teaching in Russia. Ethics teaching lost its status as mandatory or at least recommended subject in Russia after the political changes. Mr. Gusseinov expressed his hope that UNESCO's involvement in ethics teaching can contribute to compensate for this. The main target group of the teaching are students of philosophy, the ethics course being mandatory for them and optional for students of other subjects. All 3 courses in the institute have a common core and also a section on applied ethics. The teaching material is mainly based on own textbooks. The teaching spreads over two semesters, with two lecture hours per week and four seminar hours per week, student assessment mainly being based on papers that the students have to write. The main teaching goal is to educate the student to become a moral person, also in her profession.

B. Yudin, Director, Institute of Human Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, presented the ethics teaching activity at the Lomonosov’s Moscow State University. Here, both ethics of science and medical ethics / bioethics are taught. Mr. Yudin compared the teaching of these two and stated that bioethics should also be taught to biology students. He noticed the difficulty of philosophers teaching medical issues. As regards the ethics of science, so Mr. Yudin, the situation is even more difficult than with medical ethics since there are only a few courses in that field although the subject is of high importance because of new developments in science. While there are many organisations focussing on the teaching of bioethics and medical ethics, there is not much focus on ethics of science and technology. He suggested that UNESCO should particularly focus on this. It would be desirable if the teaching of ethics as mandatory subject could be increased in Russia.

In the following short discussion, R. Appresyan stressed the importance of ethics of professions for graduate and doctoral students and would like to see ethics focussing very much on applied ethics. Furthermore, several participants stated the possibility to begin with the teaching of ethics already in high school to increase the background
knowledge of students before they take further ethics courses at the university. L. Lwoff, Directorate General I – Legal Affairs, Bioethics Department, Council of Europe, inquired about the teaching method in the courses presented so far, asking how much emphasis there is on discussions and case studies and whether this is also relevant in a more philosophical approach to applied ethics. Both B. Yudin and A. Gusseinov stated that these elements are important in order to allow the student to formulate and defending his own opinion. Both include such elements in their teaching.

After a break, R. Apressyan presented ethics teaching at the Russian Academy of Sciences and at the State University for Humanities. A course on ethics with 120 teaching hours is taught to students of philosophy. He excluded the teaching of historical theories in ethics so as to be able to focus much more on applied ethics. The main goal is to pass ethical knowledge to the students. The teaching method is characterised by an attempt to move away from the didactic approach of lectures towards case studies and narrative analyses. Mr. Apressyan emphasised his collaboration with an international group of the Soros Foundation on ethics teaching methods, in which they develop cases that can be used as teaching material. No special courses are taught to the doctoral students, the curriculum here is much more based on elective courses and the responsibility of the student to acquire knowledge on her own. He also stated some difficulty with the UNESCO forms, since the categories of programs do not really fit to the Russian context.

V. Bakshtanovsky, Director, Applied Ethics Research Institute, Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, began his presentation by saying that in the coldest region of Russia that he represents in this meeting, ethics teaching was very active during the Soviet time. His teaching is directed not to students but to top managers and faculty staff of the university, a target group that he considers to be very important. Given this different teaching style, he stated some difficulty with the UNESCO forms, too. About 40 people participate in his courses, the syllabus of which he developed on his own. No exams or credits are given. Topics in his teaching include engineering ethics, ethics of professional success, and ethics in a career in the oil and gas sector. In addition to his teaching, he is involved in the publication of a magazine called “News in Applied Ethics”. He concludes his presentation by appreciating the role of UNESCO as initiator of this meeting and as supporter of the teaching of ethics.

V. Perov, Associate Professor at the Chair of Ethics and Aesthetics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of St. Petersburg, gave a PowerPoint presentation about the more than 20 ethics courses in his university. Ethics is taught since 1960 and is today directed to students of philosophy, students of philosophy specialising in ethics, those of a post-graduate program in philosophy, of a BA in Applied Ethics, of an Ethics Doctoral Programme, and it is planned to extend the teaching in a forthcoming MA Program in Bioethics. Courses currently comprise the applied ethics branches of bioethics, ethics of science for students of chemistry, business ethics, ethics in mass media, legal ethics and ecological ethics. Mr. Perov presented his university as being very active in the teaching of ethics and invited other experts to teach there.

I. Shamov, Head, Chair of Propaedeutics of Internal Medicine, Dagestan State Medical Academy, presented textbooks as main study materials, and focussed on some theoretical issues in the teaching of bioethics. He argued that it is not reasonable
to start too early with the teaching of medical ethics since a certain medical knowledge is indispensable. In the ideal case, ethics should be a part of the entire curriculum of the students of medicine. Given the large number of medical students, he considers the teaching of medical ethics to be very important. A specificity of Russia is that, unfortunately, the background of the teacher of bioethics is not necessarily in both ethics and medicine.

A discussion on ethics teaching in Russia followed. Important issues in the discussion were to what extent the teaching experts can decide on the place of the teaching in the students’ curricula. In Russia, this decision is mainly with the ministry. The future job market prospects for students specialising in applied ethics were addressed. So far, however, it is too early to make any judgement on that, the future success is still unclear. The teaching of ethics to top managers and faculty staff was considered exceptional and welcomed because it is a rare case of continuous education programmes in that field. It was suggested that UNESCO should focus in its ethics teaching forms more on the methodology of teaching, questioning thereby to what extent the teaching is interactive. Furthermore, the need for interdisciplinary teachers was stressed and interdisciplinary modules of teaching instead of a one-discipline curriculum recommended. UNESCO, so a conclusion of this discussion, should give a recommendation to the national states on how many hours of ethics teaching should be provided to the students.

**Ethics Teaching in Byelorussia**

After the lunch break, **T. Mishatkina**, Professor, Department of Philosophy and Culturology, National Institute of Higher Education, Belarussian State University, began her presentation by stating her observation that unfortunately, more and more mandatory ethics courses are turned into optional ones. On the other hand, she also stated a growing readiness of faculties to include ethics courses in their curricula. She presented several courses at her university with either a strong focus on applied ethics or concentrating completely on bioethics, environmental ethics or pedagogical ethics. The focus in teaching methodology is on case studies, which she perceives as a very efficient method even for general ethics. Ms. Mishatkina stated the need to educate teachers and members of ethics committees in ethics.

**E. Belyaeva**, Professor, Faculty for Philosophy and Social Sciences, Belarussian State University, addressed the applied ethics components in two ethics courses. She argued that an even larger focus on applied ethics and on modern concepts in ethics would be desirable, but the teachers are often not ready for that and additional hours for more ethics teaching are not granted. Teaching materials are available, but producing new publications takes a great effort. The main purpose of the ethics teaching programs she presented is to enable the student to find his or her own position in ethics and to have basic skills in ethics. The teaching method is lectures and seminars with recently a larger focus on case studies and discussion sessions. She concluded by stating the problem of testing the ethical knowledge of the student, which is not the same as her moral capacity. The examination is written. The amount of lectures in the courses depends on the budget for the course and on the total teaching hours. With sometimes more than 300 students in the course, discussion sessions are not practicable.
A discussion session on ethics teaching in Byelorussia followed. The discussion addressed further the question whether bioethics for researchers in medicine has a special standing in bioethics. This is the case since the future researchers are not in immediate contact with the patient. R. Apressyan clarified that in Russia ethics is actually taught quite often, in 102 universities, usually not mandatory, but the course books are sold, and in private universities, ethics teaching usually has an even stronger standing than in the public universities.

_Ethics Teaching in the Ukraine_

O. Kunderevich, Associate Professor, Chair for Humanities, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, started the session on ethics teaching in the Ukraine. She first addressed the historical background, saying that along with the Perestroika, ethics teaching hours were cut. However, from 1992 on, ethics became a mandatory subject, although in some private universities, ethics is not taught at all. Attempts are made to include more applied ethics. After the independence, ethics teaching was oriented again more towards “traditional” ethics theories. The goal is to reach European standards in teaching, with an orientation more to the German philosophical tradition than to American philosophy. The main goal of teaching is to advise students on how to become experts in bioethics. An increasing number of students are interested in the subject and supervision is given to many dissertations and theses. In addition to the teaching in the university, some roundtables on applied ethics topics are organised in high schools, and a course on pedagogical ethics is taught in an inter-university faculty created by the ministry. The recent political changes in the Ukraine, so Kunderevich, gave new motivation and hope for future ethics teaching activities.

Next, V. Kulinnichenko, Member of the Commission on Bioethics, Vice-President of the Ukrainian Association of Bioethics, Humanitarian Disciplines Department, Kyiv Medical Academy of Post-Graduate Education, presented several courses in applied ethics, among them Medical Ethics and Deontology, Ethics and Deontology of Social Work and Bioethics Aspects of Social Work. The teaching methodology is mainly based on case studies. Besides the teaching and promotion of bioethics, international congresses have been organised and several books and ethical codes published. As for the general situation of ethics teaching in the Ukraine, ethics is taught at 110 universities, but the teaching hours in general are reduced. Mr. Kulinnichenko stated that not enough textbooks are available, and access to Russian textbooks is especially difficult. More textbooks are needed. He also addressed UNESCO by saying that it is important to support also the training of teachers in ethics, and that support is welcome concerning teaching and information material.

S. Vekovshynina, Humanitarian Disciplines Department, Kyiv Medical Academy of Postgraduate Education, President of the Ukrainian Association of Bioethics, presented lectures and discussion topics and the literature used in her course. She then presented the teaching objectives and teaching methodology, stressing in particular many-sided, pluralistic, holistic approaches to teaching and to skills that the student should obtain. Ms. Vekovshynina identified some problems of bioethics in the Ukraine: bioethics is caught in between a bias towards philosophy as a dogma, and subjectivism on the other side. A meta-theory for bioethics is missing that could guide the more applied work. Difficulty with the English language is a problem in using...
teaching material, which are scarce anyway. Most publications, so Vekovshynina, are written by physicians, more is needed by experts with a background in philosophy.

**T. Abolina.** Professor, Kyiv National University, presented ethics teaching at her university, where ethics started in 1972 and is today however rather a part of a more general philosophy component. The goal of this teaching is to raise ethical awareness, enabling the students to develop their own position in ethical issues. The curriculum she had to develop on her own. The students’ assessment is made on grounds of homework, assignments, essays and creative work.

A very interesting part of her presentation, acknowledged by the other participants, was on ethics teaching to 9-10 year old pupils that she initiated. Next year, this program will get a more prominent standing in secondary schools. She also wrote a schoolbook on ethics that is used in these courses.

**Ethics Teaching in Lithuania**

**E. Gefenas,** Chairman, Lithuanian Bioethics Committee, started the presentations on ethics teaching in Lithuania. Courses are given to sixth year medical students, in the form of lectures and seminars, with a focus on interactive components. Students are evaluated on the basis of essays, the topic of which they can choose themselves. Mr. Gefenas also introduced the experts to a cycle of five courses taught at the doctoral level focussing on biological research, bioethics, and philosophy of medicine. His university is starting with a doctoral program on Philosophy and Ethics of Biomedicine.

Mr. Gefenas went on to make several comments on the “Questions that could be addressed in the conference” in the “Preliminary Analysis” that UNESCO provided as input to the meeting. Concerning whether the participants know of any further experts in their countries, he stated that it is a very interesting, challenging and diverse international group of experts here in this meeting. Concerning whether a new generation of bioethics experts is educated, he stated that not even a current generation is present. The future career opportunities for experts in bioethics are low since there are not many jobs. It would be easy to complain about lacking support from universities, but at least bioethics is addressed in more and more departments. Concerning the use of English language, in Lithuania, so Mr. Gefenas, English is increasingly and constantly used. It would be desirable if UNESCO could help in getting access to electronic journals. Concerning international relations, Lithuania has many contacts, however, few only to the countries present in this meeting. If there are specific Eastern or Central European issues in bioethics, Mr. Gefenas argued that increasingly, these issues are the same as in Western Europe. While the level of development might still be different compared to Western Europe, there are no special regional topics or approaches in bioethics. It would be interesting, so Mr. Gefenas, to meet with the participants in the Central European meeting in Budapest, and to know more about that meeting. Finally, the documentation centre in Lithuania is a very interesting development.

**I. Jakusovaite,** Kaunas Medical University, was next to present teaching programs. She presented several ethics courses at her university that are taught to students of four different levels. Before taking the ethics courses, students have already a
background in philosophy, economics, sociology and psychology, which is useful for the level at which ethics can be taught. Concerning a doctoral program on bioethics, Ms. Jakusovaite stated as main problem to balance rightly between perspectives of different disciplines, to manage the different academic backgrounds of students, and to deal with teachers from various different backgrounds. Other courses are given in a training program, with an emphasis on practical skills and where the students need to develop an own research project.

As general problems for bioethics, Ms. Jakusovaite mentioned the attempt to establish an MA program in bioethics, employment for future graduates, the insufficient coordination between experts in Lithuania, an “unethical” distribution of resources in the universities, and the influence of Christian thought on ethics teaching. She said that she appreciated very much the opportunity to meet the colleagues from the represented countries. The future of bioethics, so Ms. Jakusovaite, will depend on the attention of medical doctors to bioethics.

A. Narbekovas, Kaunas Vytautas Magnus University and Vilnius Law University, first addressed the background of bioethics teachers, saying that an interdisciplinary background in both ethics and medicine is necessary. Bioethics research should be based on anthropology. To students of bioethics, a basic knowledge in biology and medicine should be provided. The teaching of bioethics itself should be pluralistic.

He went on to present a course in bioethics that is optional and taught to students of different academic disciplines. A new MA program in “Biolaw” is being established, focussing on philosophy and bioethics, biomedical science, and law.

N. Vasiljeviene, Head, Centre for Applied Ethics, Kaunas, concluded the presentation of teaching programs on the first day of the meeting. She emphasised the closeness of medical ethics and business ethics. The teaching of bioethics should aim at enabling the student to take responsible choices. The challenge of applied ethics is to break down philosophical principles to the applied ethics level. Case studies as teaching method are important. A question at stake is whether European standards in bioethics should be adopted or not. New legislation in her country is causing problems for the teaching of ethics.

A discussion session followed. J. Sàndor first addressed the comments made by Mr. Gefenas, in particular the issue whether there are regional specificities. We are facing difficulty when asking this question, she said, however, there are special points caused by the political transition. When talking about common problems and possible cooperation, a regional approach is maybe useful. L. Lwoff added that we should differentiate between different needs and different teaching approaches. Mr. Gefenas replied that a common approach belongs to that past, and that we should rather look ahead. Mr. Apressyan added that it depends very much on the profession and on cultural issues whether specific regional approaches and reaction are present today. It also depends on past reactions to the political system at that time, such as emigration of different professional disciplines.

Further topics in the discussion were whether Christian Orthodox teaching will become compulsory in the Ukraine, which – so it was clarified – will not be the case; to what extent US bioethics should be a model for bioethics teaching in the countries
here presented; and that bioethics did not start anew, but that also during the Soviet time, bioethics was present and good books on that subject have been published. It was also stressed that in multicultural countries such as Russia, one should not impose teaching based on one religious doctrine only. Concerning the teaching of ethics in high school, a critical statement was made, questioning whether there are teachers who are sufficiently well educated to perform this job in a responsible manner. This discussion concluded the first day.

20th January 2005

Ethics Teaching in Latvia

L. Aberberga-Augskala, Professor, Riga Stradina University, started the second day with a presentation on ethics teaching in Latvia. Bioethics teaching dated back to 1996. Today, it is much influenced by the introduction of the new Credit Point System. Most courses are short programs only since the course is voluntary for the students and their time schedule is intensive. She presented different courses, such as Research Ethics, Professional Ethics in Pharmacy, Medical Ethics. In addition, five more courses are taught by the Humanities Department. A short course is also directed to Ethics Committees, teaching basic principles in ethics trying to bring the knowledge in ethics of the participants to an equally high level. The high public interest in genomics in Latvia is due to a special research project on that issue in her country.

Ethics Teaching in Georgia

T. Kurtanidze, National Health Management Centre, Health Legislation Department, gave a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation about bioethics in Georgia. She presented the national legislation on bioethics, the bodies working on bioethics such as the Georgian Health, Law and Bioethics Society, which is a non-governmental institution, the National Council on Bioethics and then focussed on the teaching of bioethics. Bioethics is taught at the State Medical University and at the State Medical Academy. She presented three courses, the first started in 1997, “Legal and Ethics Issues in Doctor-Patient Relationships”. It is a two-weeks intensive training aimed at raising awareness about bioethics. A second course, “Legislative and Ethical Regulation of Medical Activity” is taught during two days. The objective is to teach legislation that is relevant to the profession. Lectures, case studies and videos are used, a focus is on interactive elements, which is possible with only up to 24 students in the class; brochures on bioethics and law have been developed. A third course in continuous education started in 2003, again, on bioethics and legislation.

A discussion session followed. Mr. Shamov made comments about the teaching of law and ethics together, asked what the differences between both and how to implement ethical principles and laws. Mr. Apressyan agreed that ethics and law should not be confused and stressed the importance of interactive teaching.

Ethics Teaching in Armenia

I. Madoyan, National Center on Bioethics, Institute of Philosophy and Law, talked about general tendencies in teaching ethics in Armenia and focussed on bioethics.
The former Ethics and Aesthetics Department is disappearing, the only bioethics-related course that is remaining is Deontology and it addresses oaths. New optional courses in Ethics in Journalism, and Ethics in International Relations emerged, but in general, ethics became marginalized. Based on individual initiative, some try to educate the public in bioethics via the media. A National Centre for Bioethics has been created. One of its functions is qualifying teachers to teach bioethics.

Mr. Madoyan stated a lack of reading material and textbooks as problem for the teaching of bioethics. A course in bioethics is being established in the Armenian State University, trying to target people who could work in law and ethics later. Another attempt in bioethics teaching is made at the Slavic University, targeting both students and teachers. He expressed his hope for support from UNESCO, stressed the importance of such meetings and proposed a future one in Armenia. A broad interest and awareness of bioethics in Armenia will depend on the future possibilities of teaching more bioethics.

*The Activities of the Council of Europe in Ethics Teaching*

While there is no structured education programme in the Bioethics Department of the Council of Europe, explained L. Lwoff in her presentation, the Council of Europe emphasises the importance of ethics education, as a determining element to ensure proper implementation of ethical principles. The importance of ethics teaching is reflected in the acknowledgement of this issue in several legal instruments of the Council of Europe on that issue. This education shall be directed to the public at large and to the training of students, professionals, and members of ethics committees.

Ms. Lwoff presented the cooperation activities with Eastern and Central European countries, DEBRA, in which training and education of members of research ethics committees plays a role. She continued with two conferences, the European Conference of National Ethics Committees (COMETH) and another conference of the Council of Europe on Bioethics Education. Some pedagogical materials have been developed.

As key points in ethics education, she stated that it is increasingly important for all sectors of society; it is key to professional behaviour and better care of patients; members of research ethics committees should be properly trained, ethics teaching programmes need to be adapted to different target groups; a multidisciplinary approach should be respected; important is who teaches, and that the teaching is of high quality; finally, ethics education should be an interactive process. She stated the need for multinational programmes in ethics education and for international co-operation to set up such programs.

Ms. Lwoff stated that the Council of Europe shares UNESCO’s concerns and agrees with its objectives in bioethics education. The Council of Europe is ready to develop its actions in bioethics education through closer cooperation with countries and other organisations such as UNESCO.

In a brief discussion session, J. Sándor said that she is pleased to see the openness of the Council of Europe to co-operations, to such meetings and to the similar ideas on ethics education that UNESCO has.
The Activities of the UNESCO Chair in Haifa in Ethics Teaching

A. Carmi, UNESCO Chair in Bioethics, The International Center for Health, Law and Ethics, University of Haifa, presented the centre he established many years ago, which today includes 30 people, the UNESCO chair being an important element of it. The centre includes an international library, publishers, and is host to many international conferences each year. There are departments of psychology, ethics, law, and communication in his centre.

Apart from presenting his centre, he also gave a personal statement about the meaning of ethics teaching, the special responsibility of the ethics teacher, the impact the teaching activity has, and the motivations to teach ethics. He stressed that bioethics teachers should have a strong background in ethics. Crucial to him is the distinction between only to teach ethics to the students, or to really educate them in ethics.

Mr. Carmi presented the book on Informed Consent as a first volume in a longer series of books. The second volume will address classroom education, the third ethical dilemmas in psychiatry, the forth will address reproduction. He also introduced the participants to the World Network of Universities and the International Bioethics Advisory Committee. He encouraged the participants to apply for membership in these bodies and for editing a future volume in the series of books on bioethics.

In the following discussion session, J. Sàndor stressed the importance to distinguish between teaching and educating students. However, according to several experts, often the teaching conditions allow only for transmitting information because the groups are too big and sometimes the teachers are not trained well enough, too. L. Lwoff suggested developing a booklet on best teaching conditions. A. Carmi stated that ethics education at the high school level would be desirable. I. Shamov suggested that UNESCO should send a message to the Member States on how many hours of ethics teaching to provide.

General Reflection on the Status of Ethics Teaching

The general discussion started with A. Carmi giving more information about his centre in Haifa. In particular, he talked about the procedures to get a UNESCO chair in bioethics, and possibilities to get funding. He furthermore suggested to the Ukrainian experts to set up an informal committee that could work on ethics for high school students. However, he also sees a danger in promoting ethics education at that level, since teachers might not be trained well enough. He suggested translating the booklet on ethics education in high schools.

J. Sàndor clarified the exact mandate of UNESCO as being in ethics of science and technology, which means that UNESCO can only support ethics teaching activities which fall within that mandate.

A further discussion developed on the issue of a core curriculum. V. Kulinichenko suggested developing a core curriculum. This could be submitted to the ministries to have a stronger argument for more teaching hours. However, given the diverse
different resources and teaching hours, one might just develop a minimal and a maximal syllabus of ethics teaching. Connected to this was the question whether bioethics is best taught as course, as interdisciplinary subject, or in different modules. O. Kunderevich and I. Shamov both gave a list of topics that should be included in a core bioethics curriculum.

The scope of bioethics was discussed, relative to other applied ethics branches that also fall within the mandate of UNESCO. Mr. Perov stated that we should focus more on other branches of applied ethics.

V. Bakshtanovsky questioned the purpose of the meeting, also raising questions about fundamental issues. What is applied ethics, and what is bioethics? What is the relation between applied ethics and theoretical ethics? He sees a danger for the credibility of applied ethics if these fundamental questions are no longer addressed. V. Kulinichenko joined this debate asking about the connection between deontology and ethics. Mr. Gefenas reminded the scope of the meeting and argued that the debate about the links between applied ethics and theoretical ethics are not forgotten but are discussed and furthermore stressed that philosophy is only one source for bioethics.

Many experts expressed their interest in continuing to work with this group, to continue sharing ideas and expertise. They stated openness to cooperation and underlined that international support is welcome. It was suggested to submit to UNESCO proposals about future collaboration after the meeting.

*Further Development of Ethics Teaching: How Can UNESCO Contribute?*

**J. Sándor** started this session by saying that UNESCO addresses the importance of ethics teaching in its normative instruments on bioethics. She then went on with a PowerPoint presentation on how UNESCO could contribute.

The Ethics Education Programme will be the framework and basis for further activities. Among the first steps, the mapping of existing programs, as done in this meeting, is crucial. Following this, the existing program descriptions will be introduced into the GEO database. International cooperation in whatever form should be encouraged. A core curriculum should be developed and UNESCO might initiate a certification for bioethics courses. Finally, UNESCO might be able to raise funds for fellowships.

The implication of this is to focus first on the infrastructure of teaching. Then, mapping of experts, sampling of teaching programs, creating of networks, establishing documentation centres as in Vilnius, and reconsidering the work of the UNESCO chairs in bioethics is crucial. Following this, the next step will be program development, transforming networks into “schools”, disseminating sample collections of teaching programs, establishing further UNESCO chairs and creating an advisory body. Further, educational resources should be developed and a fellowship fund established. An advisory expert committee will help to achieve the objectives of UNESCO. As an example of international collaboration, Ms. Sándor presented the MA program in “Health, Human Rights and Ethics” in Zagreb.
In the following final discussion, Mr. Gefenas stressed that it would be good to have more knowledge about other programs, such as those presented in Budapest in October 2004. It would be interesting to meet these experts, too. He liked the idea of international teaching modules. Mr. Gefenas suggested prioritising future international work, such as by focussing on the ethics of research. As starting point for further international cooperation, exchange over the Internet would be a good starting point.

The debate about a core curriculum continued. Suggestions were made, that UNESCO could provide more information about programs in applied ethics elsewhere, which could among other purposes serve as basis for developing a core curriculum. The development of a core curriculum will, however, not be easy, since at least some different courses need to be developed for different backgrounds of students or different amounts of teaching hours. It was suggested to develop with the help of UNESCO some “generalised forms” that could be a starting point for a core curriculum. A further idea was to identify a really basic core and to develop in addition to this several additional modules that could be combined with this core. UNESCO could also help in generating a list of all topics and how often they are taught in the programs that were presented in this meeting. I. Shamov, however stated some doubts about the possibility of a core curriculum since the applied issues in ethics are diverse and since there are too many differences in the teaching hours.

While the focus here in the meeting was on bioethics, the need to develop further other branches of applied ethics was clearly stated.

Several participants maintained that bureaucracy influences the teaching very much. This hinders them from including further teaching hours and from modifying the curriculum. In that context, UNESCO’s support might be helpful. However, also some statements were made, not to overemphasise the focus on UNESCO and the ministries in order to avoid that in the end, the teachers are confronted with too demanding policies of the ministries. Furthermore, rules, standards and recommendations – while generally welcome – also bear negative sides, so some participants reminded.

As regards the follow-up of this meeting, it was agreed that UNESCO will contact the experts in three weeks with specific questions about the ethics teaching program forms, aiming at updating them in order to introduce them into the UNESCO database on ethics programmes. Furthermore, upon the request of the experts, UNESCO will give some impetus for the development of a core curriculum and provide more information in that context about other existing teaching programs. UNESCO strongly supports the need for core curricula and standards in teaching. As regards future co-operation, an exchange by email and Internet could be a starting point. Further summarizing the main issues of the discussion, the difficulty with acquiring more teaching hours was noted.

J. Sándor closed the meeting by thanking all participants for the extremely lively and enthusiastic participation.