

Uvodnik

Otkad bioetika postoji, nijedna zdravstvena kriza nije izazvala takvu globalnu reakciju kao pandemija bolesti COVID-19, tj. globalno širenje virusa SARS-CoV-2, pa je i posve očekivano da joj se posveti temat s bioetičkim tekstovima, a onda posebno i u časopisu koji je bioetički. Koronakriza, barem se tako uobičava kazati, stubokom je promijenila ljudska društva koja nastanjuju globus. Gotovo je sa »starim normalnim«, a nastupa »novo normalno«. Gomila više ne postoji, osim možda na društvenim mrežama, posebice u izoliranim skupinama koje mniju svoju istinu, dok algoritmi ovih virtualnih punktova komunikacije ne dopuštaju da se jedni »zaraze« mnijenjima drugih, tj. omogućavaju da i jedni i drugi nepomućeno uživaju blagodati informacijskog doba. No već se ovdje može postaviti pitanje radi li se o nečemu zaista novome. Čini se da načini funkcioniranja komunikacije, druženja i dosezanja »istine« nisu posve novi, tj. nisu nastupili zajedno s izbijanjem pandemije, samo su neki od njihovih nepoželjnih aspekata postali providniji zbog prisile ograničavanja tradicionalne komunikacije. No malo tko će se složiti i ne bi bilo lako braniti tezu da su se društvene promjene na valu pandemije COVID-19 ticale samo kvantitete, a ne i kvalitete. Tako se, primjerice, barem na našim prostorima, osjetila bitna promjena u prenošenju edukacije i akademskih rasprava na mrežu, pa je slijedom jedne od potonjih i pokrenut ovaj tematski blok.

Tematski blok pred Vama idejno je začet slijedom prvog manjeg mrežnog skupa u okviru ciklusa naslovljenog »U svom vremenu« o pandemiji COVID-19, pokrenutog na inicijativu Centra za integrativnu bioetiku Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu, a posebice naše, u međuvremenu tragično preminule kolegice, Andreje Bubić, kojoj posvećujemo ovaj temat. Naslov temata isti je kao i tog skupa, a on se održao 16. travnja 2021. godine. No, tematski je blok, sadržajno gledano, prvenstveno plod radova s međunarodne radionice »Health and State of Emergency Issues from the Perspective of an Integrative Bioethics«, održane 18. svibnja 2021., dijelom u Znanstvenom centru izvrsnosti za integrativnu bioetiku u Zagrebu, a dijelom mrežno. Radionica je održana u sklopu projekta »Public Health and State of Emergency Issues from the Perspective of an Integrative Bioethics: A Comparison Between Germany and Croatia«. Jedan od rezultata ovih aktivnosti pet je tekstova njemačkih i hrvatskih bioetičara koje imate priliku čitati u *Jahru*.

Autori se u ovom tematu bave različitim aspektima odgovornosti u doba pandemije koronavirusa. Počevši već od toga da je »budimo odgovorni« ili »ostanimo odgovorni«

bilo ispisano gotovo na svim fizičkim i mrežnim punktovima, bioetički je zadatak svakako da propita što odgovornim biti znači. Premda je određenje značenja tog pojma primarno filozofsko pitanje i premda su svi autori zastupljeni u ovom tematu filozofi, oni se ovdje ne bave definiranjem odgovornosti, nego njezino značenje pokušavaju razotkriti u načinu na koji se pojedinim aspektima pandemije pristupalo, pristupa i treba pristupati, a često se nude tek osnove za formiranje odgovora na pitanje o prirodi posebnog svjetla koje je na odgovornost bacila pandemija. Tako se kritički pristupa homonimiji termina 'zdravlje', koja se kao takva posebno otkriva u pogledu diobe na individualno i javno zdravlje, a posebno se postavlja pitanje odgovornosti provoditelja (institucija i pojedinaca) jednoga i drugoga. Propituju se, nadalje, vrline nosilaca javnozdravstvene vlasti i njihova odgovornost u pogledu promicanja povjerenja u društvu. Postojeća paradigma javnog zdravstva također se razmatra s obzirom na prava i mentalno zdravlje djece, pri čemu se ispostavlja da ona nisu uvažavana kao subjekti, nego tek kao objekti istraživanja. Odgovornosti se pristupa i s aspekta bioetičke paradigme odgovornog, što uvijek istovremeno znači i pluriperspektivnog znanja, pa se u tom svjetlu sagledava i sam pojam zdravlja. Tako se u pitanje dovodi politička odgovornost onih koji isključivo epidemiolozima prepuštaju odluke vezane uz suočavanje s koronakrizom. Problemu pandemije se, konačno, strukturalno pristupa detektiranjem neutopijskog pristupa teškoćama koje je ova kriza izrodila, tj. zagovorom utopijskog pristupa koji bi uzeo u obzir nužnost i kontingenciju samog rođenja krize, a onda i pomogao pripisati odgovornost onima čija su djelovanja kumovala njezinu izbijanju.

Za razliku od žustre, nerijetko iracionalne (kvazi-)argumentacije koju se moglo pratiti u medijima, rasprave u ovom bloku pružaju mogućnost mirnog i kritičkog uvida u neke od problema koje nam je pandemija servirala. Također, mislimo da je primarno filozofska nastrojenost ovih radova nešto što može osobito pridonijeti sagledavanju određenih nedoumica i brušenju dubinskog, kako cjelokupnog tako i posebnog, razmatranja pristupa pandemiji COVID-19 odnosno njezinim pojedinim aspektima. To pogotovo vrijedi zato što ovdje čitatelj neće pronaći unisona gledišta, nego i u pojedinim aspektima posve isključujuće pozicije. Zahvaljujući svojoj formulaciji koja nikako nije plitko-ideološka, kao i osnovnoj usmjerenosti integrativne bioetike na dijaloško, pluriperspektivno međuobogaćivanje suprotnih pozicija, radovi skupljeni u ovom bloku ne trebaju biti od pomoći samo čitateljima u formuliranju cjelovitijeg uvida u naslovom naznačenu problematiku, nego i samim autorima u istom zadatku.

Naravno, ovdje su predstavljeni tek fragmenti cjeline mogućeg bioetičkog uvida u problematiku koronakrize, no i oni ocrtavaju nezaobilaznost bioetike u suočavanju s njome, kao i njezine potencijale za formiranje društvenih odnosa kakvi će upravo potpomoći tome da ona rjeđe mora intervenirati. No, dok je njezin zadatak intervenirati, ona je upravo nezaobilazna, prije svega zato što je odlikuje težnja k

cjelovitosti. Tako ni pandemija nije naprosto epidemiološko pitanje, pa joj se i može i treba pristupati iz rakursa različitih znanstvenih i neznanstvenih perspektiva, čijoj integraciji treba težiti kako bi se na pandemijsko pitanje odgovornije odgovorilo. I kao takvo, tj. pluriperspektivno, ono će se trebati rješavati u budućnosti, ako već zakažemo u preveniranju njegova nastupanja.

Editorial

Since the beginning of bioethics, no health crisis has evoked a global reaction like the COVID-19 pandemic, i.e. the global widespread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. It is thus quite expected that an issue of bioethical texts dealing with this very topic be published, especially in a journal of bioethics such as this one. The corona crisis, as it is often called, has fundamentally changed populations across the globe – out with the “old normal” and in with the “new normal”. Crowds no longer exist, except maybe on social media. This is especially the case for isolated groups that fabricate their own truth, while algorithms of virtual communication checkpoints prevent one group from getting “infected” with the opinions of others, i.e. they enable everyone to enjoy the benefits of the digital age, carefree. However, one can ponder, even now, whether this is indeed something new. It would seem as though the ways in which we communicate, socialize, and obtain “the truth” are not entirely new, i.e. they did not appear alongside the pandemic but rather some of their undesirable aspects came to light due to the forced limiting of traditional communication. However, very few would agree with and have difficulties defending the thesis that the social changes brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic affected just quantity, and not quality. For instance, a significant change in the way that education and academic discussions were being conducted online was felt, at least in this region, and it was one of these discussions that inspired the theme of this issue.

The issue before you was initially conceived following a smaller-scale online conference that was part of an online round of conferences titled “U svom vremenu” (“Of its time”). The conference about the COVID-19 pandemic was launched at the initiative of the Centre for Integrative Bioethics at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split and especially at the initiative of our colleague Andreja Bubić who tragically passed away in the meantime. We dedicate this issue to her. The theme of this issue carries the same title as the conference that was held on April 16 2021. However, the issue is primarily made up of texts that stem from “Health and State of

Emergency Issues from the Perspective of an Integrative Bioethics”, an international workshop held partially at the Center of Excellence for Integrative Bioethics in Zagreb and partially online on May 18 2021 as part of the “Public Health and State of Emergency Issues from the Perspective of an Integrative Bioethics: A Comparison Between Germany and Croatia” project. Among the results of these activities are five pieces of text written by German and Croatian bioethicists, which you can read in *Jahr*.

The authors participating in this issue are dealing with various aspects of responsibility during the coronavirus pandemic. Considering that the call for responsibility had already been plastered everywhere physically and online, the task of bioethics was to consider what it meant to be responsible. Although the meaning of this term is primarily a philosophical issue and all featured authors are philosophers, they are not trying to define responsibility but rather to uncover its meaning by looking at how certain aspects of the pandemic were approached, are approached, and should be approached. The authors usually offer the basis for uncovering the nature of the spotlight that has been thrust upon responsibility by the pandemic. This is the case with the critical analysis of the homonymy of the term 'health'. The homonymy as such is especially revealed in terms of the division into individual and public health, with special emphasis being placed on the issue of the responsibility of executors (institutions and individuals) of both aspects. Furthermore, the virtues and responsibility of those in charge of public health are being questioned in terms of promoting trust in society. The existing paradigm of public health is also being discussed regarding children's rights and mental health. It turns out that they aren't considered to be the subjects but rather the objects of research. Responsibility is also being approached from its bioethical paradigm aspect, which always includes pluriperspective knowledge, so health itself is also being considered in that regard. This brings into question the political responsibility of those who gave epidemiologists absolute control over the handling of the corona crisis. The issue of the pandemic is finally being approached from a structural perspective by detecting the nonutopian approach to the difficulties brought about by this pandemic, i.e. by advocating a utopian approach that would take into account the necessity and contingency of the very birth of the crisis and then help ascribe responsibility to those who facilitated its breakout.

Unlike the heated, often irrational (quasi)argument that was present in the media, discussions in this section give us peaceful and critical insight into some of the issues caused by the pandemic. We also believe that the philosophical inclination of these articles is something that greatly contributes to the observation of certain doubts and the deep consideration of the approach to the COVID-19 pandemic, i.e. certain aspects of it. This is especially true because readers won't find aligned

perspectives, but rather completely exclusionary positions in certain aspects. Thanks to its phrasing which is not at all ideologically shallow, as well as the basic focus of integrative bioethics on the dialogical, pluriperspective mutual enrichment of opposing viewpoints, the articles in this issue should help not just the readers form a more complete insight into the titular issue, but also help the authors themselves achieve the same goal.

Of course, only bits and pieces of possible bioethical insight into the corona crisis are presented here. They also portray the necessity of bioethics when it comes to facing it and its potential for forming the type of social relationships that will not require it to intervene as much. However, as long as its task is to intervene, it will remain a necessity, primarily because it is marked by its leniency toward integrity. Just the same, the pandemic is not a purely epidemiological issue, so it can and should be approached from the viewpoints of various scientific and non-scientific perspectives, which we should aim to unify in order to respond more responsibly to the pandemic. The issue being the way that it is, i.e. pluriperspective, it will need to be handled in the future should we fail to stop it from happening in the first place.

