

Henk ten Have, ed.

Encyclopaedia of Global Bioethics

Springer, 2016

xxxvi + 3030 pp.; 22 figures; 22 tables

A lot has been written on global bioethics since this term had been first used by Van Rensselaer Potter in 1988: beside Potter's book of the same name (with a programmatic subtitle „Building on the Leopold Legacy“),¹ Brunetto Chiarelli published a book *Bioetica globale* (in Italian) in 1993² and launched a journal (1988-1992, *Problemi di bioetica*; thenceforth *Global Bioethics*). In 2001, Michael Fox came out with his book *Global Bioethics for a Humane Society*;³ in 2006, Tristram Engelhardt edited *Global Bioethics: The Collapse of Consensus*,⁴ and in 2009, Green, Donovan, and Jauss edited *Global Bioethics: Issues of Conscience for the Twenty-First Century*,⁵ while Po-wah edited *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on the (Im)Possibility of Global Bioethics*.⁶ In 2012, Amir Muzur and Hans-Martin Sass edited *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics*.⁷ In 2013, Henk ten Have and Bert Gordijn published *Compendium & Atlas of Global Bioethics*.⁸ In 2014, the same authors edited the four-volume *Handbook of*

1 Van Rensselaer Potter, *Global Bioethics: Building on the Leopold Legacy* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1988).

2 Brunetto Chiarelli, *Bioetica globale* (Firenze: Angelo Pontecorboli, 1993).

3 Michael W. Fox, *Bringing Life to Ethics: Global Bioethics for a Humane Society* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).

4 H. Tristram Engelhardt Jr., ed. *Global Bioethics: The Collapse of Consensus* (Salem: M. & M. Scrivener Press, 2006).

5 Ronald M. Green, Aine Donovan, and Steven A. Jauss, eds. *Global Bioethics: Issues of Conscience for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

6 Julia Tao Lai Po-wah, ed., *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on the (Im)Possibility of Global Bioethics* (New York: Springer, 2009).

7 Amir Muzur and Hans-Martin Sass, eds., *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics* (Münster: Lit, 2012).

8 Henk ten Have and Bert Gordijn, *Compendium & Atlas of Global Bioethics* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013).

Global Bioethics,⁹ and in 2015, Germán Solinís edited a book *Global Bioethics: What for?*, published by UNESCO. Now, in 2016, Routledge published *Global Bioethics: An Introduction* by Henk ten Have who, in the same year, also edited Springer's *Encyclopaedia of Global Bioethics* we here would like to present. Obviously, the interest for global bioethics has been quite vivid, particularly in the last fifteen years: as we shall see, however, not every attempt of those global bioethics results global in the original Potterian sense. It seems now to be the right time to agree about the necessity to stop encouraging creating business out of global bioethics: let us stick to the most humane idea(l)s propagated by those who conceived it.

Beside unifying „biomedical ethics“ with environmental ethics, Potter's global bioethics, namely, was also expected to “transcend the dichotomies between science and religion,”¹⁰ obviously creating a new approach to old issues. Actually, Potter related the notion of „globality“ to quite a complex meaning, fusing Aldo Leopold's mystic pantheist „land“ with Alan Gregg's, Norman J. Berrill's, and the Wisconsin natives' notions of the „Earth.“¹¹ Considering Potter's discontent with the treatment he used to receive within the US, „global“ must have been conceived by Potter as a “stretching out” – both in the spiritual and the physical ways.¹²

As we shall see in this review, Henk ten Have's „global,“ on the other hand, does match only one Potter's expectation: to touch the aspects of world crisis (overpopulation, exhaustion of natural resources, etc.) thanks to the choice of the topics that indeed has to be praised (in particular, the inclusion of certain contemporary emerging problems, like commercialism in higher education and scientific research, which are not necessarily related to bioethics, however). High exposition standards which contributors obviously were instructed to follow are also noteworthy.

Let us stroll through only some of the 358 entries. First of all, let us say that, even if the introducing of a broader range of subjects tries to restore the balance, the mainstream-bioethics (biomedically related and treated) topics still do prevail. In some entries („Alternative medicine,“ for instance) even the Georgetown set of four principles is inappropriately applied to analysis. If one wants to present a historical perspective of a bioethical problem, then the authors of the „Animal ethics,“ „Animal rights,“ or „Animal welfare“ entries should consider Ignaz Breggenzer's and Fritz

9 Henk ten Have and Bert Gordijn, eds., *Handbook of Global Bioethics*, 4 vols. (Dordrecht: Springer, 2014).

10 Potter, *Global Bioethics*, 68.

11 Cf. Patty Loew, *Seventh Generation Earth Ethics: Native Voices of Wisconsin* (Madison: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2014); cf. also Amir Muzur and Iva Rinčić, “The real Wisconsin idea: the seven pillars of Van Rensselaer Potter's bioethics,” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 26, No. 4 (2016): 587-596.

12 For a more detailed discussion on Potter's and Jahr's perception of „globality,“ cf.: Amir Muzur and Iva Rinčić, „Two kinds of globality: a comparison of Fritz Jahr and Van Rensselaer Potter's bioethics,“ *Global Bioethics* 26, No. 1 (2015): 23-27.

Jahr's work, and not only Peter Singer's and Tom Regan's, and if one likes to add a global perspective to it (as stated in the Introduction this obviously has been the ambition of the Editor), then some Far-Eastern philosophies might offer interesting insights as well (avoiding, nevertheless, to present only one national – e. g. South-Korean – legislation and practice, like in „Animal welfare“). Can one write on „Anthropocentrism“ or „Biocentrism“ without referring to Fritz Jahr, who expanded Kant's Categorical Imperative onto Animals and Plants? Is it possible to have two entries on death without references to Jankélévitch,¹³ Morin,¹⁴ and Spellman,¹⁵ or the entry on „Suicide“ without the mention of Durkheim¹⁶? Who would pretend to write any serious entry on „Enhancement“ without considering papers and books by Sparrow¹⁷ or Wiseman¹⁸? Harris, Savulescu, and Persson may well be provocative but they certainly have not exhausted the subject. It is true that not all the literature can be covered in one brief entry, but, if one writes for the Encyclopaedia, one has to depart from the classical works. „Applied ethics“ entry is also written primarily under the influence of Beauchamp, Childress, Singer, Callahan, Rawls, and other authors belonging to the same cultural circle, neglecting the contributions of cultures other than European and American (the same is also valid for „Compassion“ or „Empathy“). None of the four entries on euthanasia (Active, Passive, History, International debate) takes into consideration the notable study by Michele Aramini.¹⁹ Some further minor objections: rather than „alternative medicine,“ „complementary medicine“ has long ago become a generally preferred term; to write about the history of AIDS without quoting Mirko Dražen Grmek's pioneer comprehensive monograph seems quite odd, as well as to write about „Stewardship“ without quoting Calvin DeWitt and his practice in Dunn, WI; „developing world“ sounds humiliating when applied to the world outside USA, GB, and EU (as in the entry on „Animal research,“ but also in „Capacity building“). Good examples – certainly not the only ones – of more globally and pluriperspectively analysed issues are the entries on „Assisted suicide,“ „Assisted reproductive technology: artificial insemination,“ and especially „Life: definitions“ (on the other hand, „Assisted reproductive technology: intracytoplasmic sperm injection“ has been presented exclusively from the Roman Catholic perspective). In

13 Vladimir Jankélévitch, *La mort* (Paris: Flammarion, 1966).

14 Edgar Morin, *L'homme et la mors*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Seuil, 1976).

15 William M. Spellman, *A Brief History of Death* (London: Reaktion Books, 2014).

16 Émile Durkheim, *Le suicide: Étude de sociologie*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1967).

17 Cf. Rob Sparrow, „Egalitarianism and moral bioenhancement,“ *American Journal of Bioethics* 14, No. 4 (2014): 20-28.

18 Cf. Harris Wiseman, *The Myth of the Moral Brain: The Limits of Moral Enhancement* (Cambridge/London: The MIT Press, 2016).

19 Michele Aramini, *L'eutanasia: commento giuridico-etico della nuova legge olandese* (Milano: Giuffrè Editore, 2003).

some entries (e.g., „Autonomy“), the authors have tried to introduce the views from other than the Western cultures, but in a very modest and thus inappropriate measure (regardless of quite an abundant literature existing on that matter). Due to a similar unilateral approach, some entries have missed a great opportunity for a potentially highly interesting cross-cultural debate (for instance, on „Benefit and harm“). One of the very rare authors introducing Fritz Jahr (but also V. R. Potter!) is Robin Fiore of the University of Miami („Bioethics: environmental“). To reduce the story on „Bioethics: founders“ to the group convened in Edinboro in 2010, means to ignore the influence of the discovery of Jahr after 1997 and of the destiny of Potter’s global bioethics after 1988: that is precisely what Diego Gracia has done in his entry (even if he does mention Jahr and Potter in the text, Gracia does not list their works in References). Some entries – like „Brain drain,“ „Citizenship,“ „Civil disobedience,“ „Ghost-writing,“ „Hermeneutics,“ „Integrity: professional,“ „Literature,“ and many others – have to do with bioethics as much as with any other discipline (with a very thin relation to medical ethics). On the other hand, some extremely important entries are missing: Blood/Transfusion, Dignity, Permaculture/Restoration Agriculture, Bioethical Imperative, Bridge Bioethics/Global Bioethics, Wrongful Life/Birth, etc. How important for a global approach to a bioethical issue is to have or not to have insight into the literature written in languages other than English, has been proved by the authors of entries „Bioethics: education“ (but also „Education: assessment,“ „Education: goals,“ or „Education: methods“) and „Children and ethics,“ respectively, who obviously have no knowledge on the books *Bioetička edukacija*²⁰ and *Bioetika i dijete*.²¹ Unfortunately, without English translation so far have remained also the studies by Vrčec²² and Kelam,²³ which might have improved the entries on GMO. (If Croatian is a language of just one of the „developing countries,“ maybe the book *Klonen oder nicht klonen?*,²⁴ written in German, might have been included into the list of references by the authors of the two entries on cloning.)

At the moment, Henk ten Have can easily be considered the most prolific author on global bioethics. With his Dutch origin (he studied medicine and philosophy at University of Leiden and worked in Rotterdam, Maastricht, and Nijmegen) and the position of a highly ranked UNESCO official (Director of the Division of Ethics

20 Nada Gosić, *Bioetička edukacija* [Bioethical education; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2005).

21 Ante Čović and Marija Radonić, eds., *Bioetika i dijete* [Bioethics and the child; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2011).

22 Valerije Vrčec, *GMO između prisile i otpora* [GMO between coercion and opposition; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2010).

23 Ivica Kelam, *Genetički modificirani usjevi kao bioetički problem* [Genetically-modified crops as a bioethical problem; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2015).

24 Tobias Krohmer, *Klonen oder nicht klonen? Analyse und Bewertung der bioethischen Argumente zum Thema Klonen* (Münster: Lit, 2007).

of Science and Technology, 2003-2010), ten Have joined Duquesne University in Pittsburgh in 2010 (teaching also at a university in Saudi Arabia). He is Editor-in-Chief of *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, published numerous books in Dutch and English, founded and presided over several associations, and was elected member of Spanish and Dutch national academies.

Henk ten Have himself certainly does understand what a global presentation of a bioethically related issue means: he has proved it with his excellent book *Global Bioethics: An Introduction*.²⁵ However, the approach ten Have has chosen for the *Encyclopaedia of Global Bioethics* (as well as for the *Handbook* from 2014) has had a different result, due to different approaches by most of the contributors. Why did this occur? Henk ten Have has had a real „UNESCO-approach“ to globality: finding a person in one country and considering this country „covered.“ This is far from being adequately informed (and from informing) about one country's intellectual production, but it certainly serves the purpose of its „inclusion“: you have various nations represented and thus you acquire a touch of „globality.“ Of course, such kind of „globality“ is far from THE Globality. Forgive me if I stick to the example I know so well: in Croatia (and I am sure there are some other „non-Western“ countries in the same situation), several schools of bioethical thought have appeared within the last 30 years, and the publishing activity probably is among the most dynamic in the world (let us mention, for example, the 13 issues as yet of *Jahr – European Journal of Bioethics*, and the first books ever on Fritz Jahr²⁶ and Van Rensselaer Potter²⁷). To find out those, certainly relevant pieces of information, you have either to master Croatian language, or you must have collaborators participating in that dynamic development themselves. The list of contributors Henk ten Have has gathered is impressive: hundreds of names from all over the world. A few of them represent real authorities in the field. Some are missing: can you pretend to write on European (even global) perspective of bioethics without including Hans-Martin Sass, for instance? Of course, the network of collaborators is a free choice of the Editor: nevertheless, by choosing less country „delegates“ and more fellow thinkers sharing the ambition of the Editor to present real global aspects of problems, certainly would have made this valuable publication more valuable.

Ten Have obviously has chosen not to have biographical entries, probably to avoid „forgetting“ someone. Nevertheless, there are two persons who could and should be represented in every reference work: Fritz Jahr and Van Rensselaer Potter. The entry

25 Henk ten Have, *Global Bioethics: An Introduction* (Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2016).

26 Iva Rinčić and Amir Muzur, *Fritz Jahr i rađanje europske bioetike* [Fritz Jahr and the emergence of European bioethics; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2012).

27 Amir Muzur and Iva Rinčić, *Van Rensselaer Potter i njegovo mjesto u povijesti bioetike* [Van Rensselaer Potter and his place in the history of bioethics; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2015).

on „International documents“ dedicates space only to the well-known declarations of Nuremberg, Helsinki, UNESCO, WHO, Council of Europe, etc., but not to those signed in Chennai²⁸ in 1997, Gijón²⁹ in 2000, Bucharest³⁰ in 2002, or Rijeka³¹ in 2011, revealing a far too selective approach and ignoring of the less-mainstream initiatives. One more phenomenon has not been touched by the *Encyclopaedia* at all: that is, the emergence of „continental bioethics“ like the European, African, Asian, etc., as well as of the regional ones (the Mediterranean, for instance: on the other hand, there are entries treating „indigenous ethical perspectives“ in South America and Australia, and an entire entry on the “Ubuntu ethics”). Although one might argue that, from a global perspective, the fragmentation of bioethics has less significance, it certainly presents a major philosophical and practical challenge for modern bioethical concepts. It is true, however, that all those topics have recently been covered in Croatian,³² with only a few papers in English. It seems that without serious insight into some of the so-called „minor languages“ like Croatian (but also into some widely-spoken non-English idioms, primarily German, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese), you cannot pretend to approach „Global Bioethics“ seriously any more: because otherwise, the result will be always the same – a variation of the Anglo-American Bioethics, already seen so many times.

Until present, ten Have has had more success in presenting the „global bioethics“ as a „globalised bioethics,“ failing to create new values (a new bioethics) which would emerge from an attempt of bringing closer attitudes from various cultures. It is far less important to have various contributors and entries than to reach (or at least to try to reach) a synthesis within single entries. Otherwise, it is a colourful patchwork that does not allow the emergence of mixed nuances (reminding of Peter Singer’s *Blackwell Companion to Ethics*,³³ where „Indian ethics,“ „Buddhist ethics,“ „Classical Chinese ethics,“ „Jewish ethics,“ etc. are presented, but not a „universal ethics“). Nonetheless, the ten Have’s *Encyclopaedia* represents an enormous advancement with respect to the aggressive, autarchic mainstream bioethics. Even if imperfect, it is

28 Chennai Statement on Bioethics and Recommendations of the Workshop Cum Seminar on Bioethics, 16-19 January, 1997, *Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics* 7 (1997): 34.

29 Marcelo Palacios et al., „Bioethics declaration of Gijón“ (<http://www.sibi.org/en/15-declarations/114-bioethics-declaration-of-gijon.html>).

30 Declaration of the Basic Principles of Bioethics based on the Orthodox Tradition (<http://eiaa.org/archives/1683>).

31 Christian Byk et al., „Rijeka Declaration on the future of bioethics,“ *Indian Journal Medical Ethics* 8, No. 4 (2011): 260; Christian Byk et al., „Rijeka Declaration on the future of bioethics,“ *Synthesis philosophica* 51, No. 1 (2011): 155-156; Ricardo Andrés Roa-Castellanos et al., „Declaración internacional de Rijeka (2011) sobre el futuro de la bioética,“ *Revista de bioética latinoamericana* (Venezuela) 8, No. 1 (2012): 86-103.

32 Iva Rinčić, *Europska bioetika: ideje i institucije* [European Bioethics: ideas and institutions; in Croatian] (Zagreb: Pergamena, 2011); Rinčić and Muzur, *Fritz Jahr i rađanje europske bioetike*.

33 Peter Singer, ed., *A Companion to Ethics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

certainly an “Encyclopaedia of a more global bioethics” than any other bioethical or biomedical-ethical encyclopaedia so far.

Amir Muzur