

Stem Cell Cultures: Exploring the Social and Cultural Background to European Debates about Human Embryonic Stem Cells

ESF/SCH Exploratory workshop

Scientific Report

Brigitte Nerlich
University of Nottingham

Martin Döring
University of Hamburg



May 5, 2006

Purpose of the Document

This document contains the final scientific report of the ESF/SCH exploratory workshop *Stem cell cultures*

Workshop Web Site

The workshop web site can be located at:
<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/igbis/stemcellnetwork/>

Acknowledgements

The organisers of this workshop would like to acknowledge the help they received from Valérie Allspach-Kiechel (European Science Foundation), Alice Phillips, Patricia Hulme, Jonathan Brenton and Stuart Levene (Institute for the Study of Genetics, Biorisks and Society, University of Nottingham).

Table of contents

Executive Summary

Scope and Objectives	4
The Context for the Workshop	4-5
Focus on Interdisciplinary and Cultural Comparison	5-6
Location	6
Web Site	6-7
Continuation	7
References	7-8

Scientific Content of the Event

Science, regulation and ethics	9
Media and rhetoric	9
From metaphors to metaphysics	10
Rhetoric, politics and ethics	11
Stem cell scandal	12

Assessment of Results

Expected Outcome of the Workshop	14
Real Outcome of the Workshop	14
Planning of Future Activities	14-15

Final Program

16-18

Final List of Participants

Speakers	19
Non-Speakers	20

Statistical Information

Country	21
Sex	21
Position	21

Executive Summary

Scope and Objectives

The aim of the workshop was to provide insights into the diversity of knowledge and understanding of research involving human embryonic stem cells (heSCs) in a variety of European countries and new European member states in order to reveal how different social groups and the mass media use cultural tools to assess the implications of this new technology.

The main research questions that participants engaged in were:

- How are heSCs culturally framed (in terms of images, stereotypes, narratives, metaphors and fictions) in the news media and in fiction in the different European countries?
- Which hopes/expectations and fears/anxieties are associated with heSCs in the different countries?
- Are there convergences and divergences of ethical values and beliefs across Europe, what are they and how are they used in various media and by different social groups, including scientists and policy makers?
- Are there areas of disagreement and consensus across and between media, stakeholders and countries and what are they?

The objective was to explore cultural similarities and differences in at least a selection of European countries which would provide a useful starting point for well-grounded international discussions about the use and value of heSCs in research and for the treatment of diseases. It is only on the basis of such knowledge that one can attempt to make recommendations about ways in which heSC science and public policy may be developed that take cultural factors into account. As research into recent controversies, such as genetically modified food, has shown, policy makers tend to ignore cultural attitudes at their peril.

The papers that emerged from this workshop added an important comparative and cultural dimension to debates taking place at national and European levels on both bioethics and public policy, which are normally largely confined to issues of law and government (see also e.g. Kirejczyk, 1999). Furthermore, they substantiated a demand stated in the report 'Stem Cell Research at European Level': "Europe needs to develop an ethical, legal and regulatory framework for stem cell research and therapy respecting cultural pluralism and based on identification of areas of consensus".

A long-term benefit of the workshop is to consolidate and expand existing networks of excellence in which the social, cultural, religious and ethical implications of stem cell research are studied all over Europe.

The Context for the Workshop

The workshop focused on cultural differences in stem cell discourses, especially discourses about heSCs across Europe. The importance of studying such differences which impinge on the ethics and politics of heSC research were highlighted by three events that happened coincidentally just before and after the

workshop. Most notable was the impact of the scandal surrounding the South Korean stem cell researcher Hwang Woo-Suk on the research community and the public world-wide as well as on the researchers that came to the workshop (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hwang_Woo-Suk). It triggered a discussion of the merits and ethics of heSC research and of the pressures under which researchers in this field work – pressures that can stem from individual expectations of glory, social expectations of medical treatment or political and cultural expectations of winning national or global acclaim. The “Hwang-Case” demonstrated that heSC research might be global but that heSC ethics is not (see Wilmut, 2006). There were quite pronounced differences in debates surrounding various ethical issues in the Korean and the Western European press for example – this was reported and discussed by the participants of the workshop. Furthermore, two days before the start of the workshop Ian Wilmut – the ‘creator’ of Dolly the sheep – had appeared before an employment tribunal, as he had apparently not given sufficient credit to lab workers involved in the creation of Dolly – many participants brought newspapers with them reporting on this case (see e.g. newspaper reports on May 11 in *The Guardian* and *The Scotsman*). Finally, a day after the workshop, reports appeared in the press that the European Union had still not been able to reach agreement on heSC research funding, that is to say: EU research ministers had failed to find a majority opinion on how heSC research should be funded under the Seventh EU Research Framework Programme 2007-2013 (FP7). This resulted in an agreement among member states that the EU would continue a ‘passive’ approach to funding. Moreover, a need for a pan-European cloning policy was expressed as many governments across Europe are under pressure to allow the creation of in vitro embryos for research, including cloning.

These developments that ‘framed’ the workshop clearly show that research using heSCs is still a contested topic which requires continued in-depth analysis of “ethical cultures” and cultural framings which the workshop set out to do. Therefore, the original intention of the workshop, to bring together scholars from a wide variety of European countries and a wide variety of academic disciplines in order to explore cultural attitudes to heSC research, seems to have been highly justified.

Focus on Interdisciplinary and Cultural Comparison

The workshop mainly responded to three developments relating to heSC research: The controversy over heSCs which has been raging since 2000/2001; the controversy over a Europe-wide regulatory framework regarding such research; and the Hwang Woo-Suk scandal that highlighted the fragility of global and local ethical frameworks regarding egg-donation, therapeutic cloning and scientific integrity.

The controversy over heSCs came to a head in the years 2000 and 2001, after the UK allowed research using heSCs within strict legal limits, whereas the then German president Johannes Rau – for example – called for more caution and restraint in this field of biomedical research.

In response to this debate, the European Commission published a report, “Stem cell research at European level”, in which it stated that “Europe needs to develop an ethical, legal and regulatory framework for stem cell research and therapy respecting cultural pluralism and based on identification of areas of consensus” (Joliff-Botrel/Matthiessen, 2001: 4). The European Commission report also highlighted the need for public consultation and information, but added: “Informing the public is not enough. We need to learn to listen to concerns

expressed and to respect the diversity of ethical values and beliefs, which characterize Europe." (p. 12; see also Nielsen, 2001: "Too many cultural differences?").

In response to this call for action the workshop brought together researchers from a wide variety of academic disciplines – focusing on those disciplines that could inform the socio/cultural debate:

- Cell Biology, Immunology, Media Studies, Journalism, Linguistics, Sociology, Philosophy, Politics, Theology, Law, Health Studies, Nursing and Psychology

It also brought together researchers from a wide variety of European countries and one researcher from the US, where regulations of and cultural attitudes towards research using heSCs vary widely. The European countries represented were

- UK, France, Italy, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Romania, and indirectly, as some researchers worked and lived in several European countries at once: Finland and Poland – the ESF representative came from Iceland

It emerged that:

- In the European media heSC research is mostly framed by the similar imagery, stereotypes, narratives, metaphors and fictions.
- The way arguments for and against heSC research are framed does not differ significantly across Europe.
- Hopes/expectations (the potential to heal cardiovascular disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease etc.) and fears/anxieties (questions regarding the beginning/sanctity of human life, the violation of human dignity, the cloning of humans, the misuse of women as egg donors, etc.) converge considerably.
- Ethical values and beliefs are mainly framed by references to theological or scientific convictions which generate the necessary but not sufficient background for the emergence of "ethical cultures".
- "Ethical cultures" often run contrary to "national cultures" and regulatory regimes;
- Considerable differences exist in the regulatory and legal frameworks on a national level.
- "Ethical cultures" represent the minimal consensus on a European level.

Location

The workshop took place at the Nottingham College for School Leadership on the Jubilee Campus of the University of Nottingham, UK.

Web site

The workshop web site can be located at

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/igbis/stemcellnetwork/>

There you can find the abstracts of the workshop as well as the Power Point presentations (access to the Power Point presentations is password protected due to copyright protected material). Please contact the organisers Brigitte Nerlich

(Brigitte.Nerlich@nottingham.ac.uk) or Martin Döring (Doering@metaphorik.de) if you have further questions.

Continuation

Those attending the meeting felt that the workshop had filled a gap in the ever-expanding field of research into the social and ethical implications of heSC research by focusing on cultural narratives and cultural differences.

We will therefore send, as soon as possible, an expression of interest letter to Oxford University Press (who had already expressed some interest in our venture) for a book provisionally entitled *Exploring stem cell cultures in Europe: Towards a culturally valid bioethics*.

Martin Döring and Brigitte Nerlich will attempt to organise a second workshop based on the insights achieved at the first workshop and including even more participants from European countries and new member states. The second workshop would take place at the earliest in 2008 as by then the whole socio-cultural-legal-media and science background to heSC research will have changed profoundly if it follows the current trend. Unlike the first workshop that focused on mapping the current state of cultural differences this workshop would focus on the dynamics of change in the heSC debate. This would be of particular interest to Dr Nerlich, as it would link back up with her past interests in

- the history of science and
- diachronic linguistics, especially semantic and conceptual change.

Moreover, this links up with Dr Döring's interest in the

- linguistic framing and shifts in language-use concerning ethical issues and the development of "ethical cultures" in biotechnology and
- the cultural background of institutional and policy change in the area of biomedical issues (see Döring/Nerlich, 2004).

The workshop would therefore focus on scientific, cultural, policy and institutional change and the narratives that structure and represent these developments. It would examine such changes but also continuities in a wide variety of European contexts (social, legal, philosophical, religious, regulatory and popular) within countries and across countries.

Meanwhile, Dr. Nerlich and Dr. Döring have established a password protected forum on the previously mentioned website which enables the participants of the workshop to exchange ideas, information and discuss possibilities of co-operation. This forum will also function as a virtual meeting point for the planned financed network of excellence for which funding will be sought and which will be launched during the second workshop in 2008.

References

- Joliff-Botrel, G./Matthiessen, L. (2001): Stem cell research at European level, 13-14 September 2001, Brussels, Meeting report:
<http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/quality-of-life/stemcells/pdf/report-meeting-13-14sept2001.pdf>
- Döring, M./ Nerlich, B. (2004): Die metaphorisch-mediale Modellierung von ‚Stammzellen-Kulturen‘ in der deutschen und britischen Presseberichterstattung, in: Zeitschrift für Biopolitik 2, 17-29
- Kirejczyk, M. (1999): Parliamentary cultures and human embryos: The Dutch and British debates compared, in: Social Studies of Science 29/6, 889-912.
- Nielsen, L. (2001): What can law and regulation do to ensure responsible development? In: Proceedings: Stem cells: Therapies for the future, Brussels

2001: http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/quality-of-life/stemcells/pro_nielsen_en.html#7

Wilmut, I. (2006). Book review of: *Stem Cell Now: From the Experiment That Shook the World to the New Politics of Life*, by Christopher Thomas Scott. In: *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 17 February, 2006.

Scientific Content of the Event

The issues discussed at the workshop can be grouped under the following general headings.

- Science, regulation and ethics
- Media and rhetoric
- From metaphors to metaphysics (and science politics)
- Rhetoric, politics and ethics
- Stem cell scandal – science, ethics, rhetoric: A case study

Science, regulation and ethics

Two introductory papers provided overviews of stem cell science and issues of ethics and regulation. **Stephen Minger** provided a detailed insight into the issues of science, ethics and therapeutic potential of human stem cells focusing on the UK experience. He pointed out that there has been significant interest in the therapeutic and scientific potential of human embryonic stem (ES) cells since they were first isolated in 1998. If human ES cells could be differentiated into suitable cell types, stem cells might be used in cell replacement therapies for degenerative diseases such as Type I diabetes and Parkinson's disease, or to repopulate the heart following myocardial damage. However, he also stressed that there is a significant shortage of high quality human ES cell lines and few research groups have experience in the propagation and manipulation of these cells. It is thus essential for the development of human stem cell technology, and the larger goal of cellular replacement therapy for human disease, that additional human cell lines are generated. He explained that the tightly regulated yet permissive scientific environment in the UK for human stem cell research, coupled with the UK government's commitment to the establishment of a centralised stem cell bank and substantial research funding for stem cell biology and translational research, creates an environment that is conducive for the UK to be a leading player in the field of human regenerative medicine. **Rhodri Jones** explored a different aspect of stem cell science: the use of fetal stem cells. He explained how they were used in the past and how they could be used in the future. He asked whether we should harvest these cells to use in transplantation and explained that this has indeed been undertaken and there have been some successful stem cell transplants performed using this tissue source. However, he highlighted that there are ethical constraints and the work is very controversial. Fetal tissue must be obtained from terminations of pregnancy and to ensure that the tissue is not abnormal in any way; these terminations must be for 'social' reasons. Interestingly, he highlighted that this is not always a constraint to the use of fetal tissue in therapeutic procedures.

Media and rhetoric

Several papers addressed national and Europe wide reactions by the media to the heSC controversy and some papers discussed strategies used by the media more generally. **Lorenzo Beltrame** and **Silvia Giovanetti** showed how the political, ethical and scientific definitions of human beings were used in the Italian stem cells debate. In particular they focused on how the connotations of the concept of *human embryo* (individual or cluster of cells) were linked with ethical principles, therapeutic needs, arguments about the social role of science, and controversies surrounding the political tools used to regulate stem cell research. They reconstructed interpretative repertoires and rhetorical strategies used by the actors involved in the debate to define boundaries between science, ethics and politics. **Martin Döring** explored the way in which metaphors can influence the scientific and public debate, by comparing and contrasting the coverage of the stem cell debate in *Süddeutsche Zeitung/Die Zeit* (Germany) and *The*

Guardian/Observer (UK) between 2000 and 2004. He showed that most of the metaphors used in the press coverage are based on variations of Europe-wide if not globally used conceptual metaphors which shape national and European stem cell cultures. **Brigitte Nerlich** examined how the metaphor of 'crossing the Rubicon' was argumentatively exploited by the German media after having been prominently used by President Rau in a speech *Wird alles gut? – Für einen Fortschritt nach menschlichem Maß* (Will everything turn out well? For progress befitting humanity). She explained how from then on, it was adapted and changed by various participants to support or reject arguments for or against the use of embryonic stem cells in biomedical research. She was surprised to find that compared to Germany, the Rubicon metaphor had much less of a 'life' in the UK and in France for example. **Carine Vassy** explored media representations of stem cell research or the lack thereof in France, focusing on a period between 2004 and 2006 for her analysis. In 2004, the French government passed a bioethics law that prohibited reproductive and therapeutic cloning of human beings. Since then, licenses to work on human embryonic stem cells have been given to a few teams of biologists. Her paper examined how *Le Figaro* and *Le Monde*, two respectable French newspapers, a centre right and a centre left oriented, have presented stem cell research to their readers from March 2004 to February 2006. Most article focused on international and/or positive aspects of stem cell research. This under-representation of critical perspectives is surprising, given the critical arguments that have been put forward in various books and reports. Carine Vassy compared her results to Williams and Kitzinger's work on what constitutes a more balanced flow of information about research on embryos in the UK. **Jenny Kitzinger** stressed that controversies about biotechnologies often centre not so much on present scientific facts as on speculations about risks and benefits in the future. She examined how competing visions of Utopia or Dystopia are defended through the use of diverse vocabularies, metaphors, associations and appeals to authority and how these rhetorical processes play out in the debate about embryo stem cell research in UK national press and TV news media. Her findings show how predictions from those in favour of embryo stem cell research are supported by both hype and by anti-hype, by inconsistent appeals to the technologies' innovative status and by the selective deconstruction of concepts such as 'potential' and 'hope'. The debate also mobilises binary oppositions around reason versus emotion, science versus religion and fact versus fiction. **Clare Williams** and **Steven Wainwright** tried to identify the rhetorical strategies used to assert competing ethical positions around embryonic stem cell research. They stressed that the role of visual representation is the key here. It does not follow the usual pattern whereby, in the abortion debate, those 'on the side' of the fetus display its image while those who are 'pro-choice' shy away from this. They found that in the stem cell debate the pattern is inverted, highlighting the role of technologies of visualisation in defining what counts as human. The media analysis shows how both sides in the dispute mobilise metaphors and use personification to recruit support; and how they promote different ideas about the embryo's significance, size and social embeddedness and present competing narratives about its origins, destiny and 'death'. An ethnography of two stem cell laboratories in the UK explored the ethical dimensions of stem cell science, focusing on two key issues: what individual scientists themselves view as ethical sources of human embryos and stem cells; and their perceptions of human embryos and stem cells. Williams and Wainwright argue that the notion of 'ethical boundary-work' is a productive way of analysing both these examples of laboratory practice and media reporting of ethical debates. Finally, **Iina Hellsten** and **Loet Leydesdorff** studied the various meanings of the words "stem cell" in different contexts of research, applications, and policy debates. Their particular focus was on metaphors (that highlight similarity) and diaphors (that highlight a difference) as tools of intermediation that channel meanings across different arenas in the communication of science.

From metaphors to metaphysics (and science politics)

In a paper that linked various topics, **Christoph Rehmann-Sutter** stressed that politics without critical metaphysics is a blind search for opportunities. In order to substantiate this thesis, he focused on an analysis of the implications of the implicit metaphysical assumption underlying stem cell politics is a proposal advocated by Rudolf Jaenisch, William Hurlbut and others to create methods for altering nuclear transfer (ANT) by interrupting the function of a gene called Cdx 2 in a donor somatic cell. Embryos without a functioning Cdx 2 gene are unable to implant into a uterus and will therefore not develop beyond the blastocyst stage. ES cells can be obtained from such embryos but the development of a child is genetically impossible. Advocates of this method assume that it could lead to “controversy-free” ES cells because the embryos lack the potentiality to grow into a mature fetus and a child. The key strategy for making further development impossible is to alter the genome of the embryo, not the outer circumstances, like, for instance, legally ruling out transfer into the uterus or imposing a rule to stop development at blastocyst stage by adding a chemical agent like formaline to the medium. Rehmann-Sutter asked: But why is genomic alteration expected to silence ethical objections whereas alteration of the circumstances that are equally necessary for development is not? Why does this expectation even override concerns about added risk due to the side effects of a double genetic intervention into the chromosomes of these cells? One hypothesis, which can explain this, refers to an underlying genomic metaphysics. If one assumes that the genome contains a ‘program’ for development (a metaphor widely used in media coverage of various genome projects), the conclusion that a destruction of this program will also eliminate the ethically relevant ‘potentiality’ of the embryo is logical. If, however, such a program metaphysics is not taken for granted and alternative, probably scientifically more plausible ontological accounts based on a systemic and contextual reading are considered, the conclusion is arbitrary and hence also politically highly questionable. Rehmann-Sutter therefore concluded that this strategy of legitimizing stem cell research is based on strong (but hidden) metaphysical assumptions, and is therefore doomed to fail.

Rhetoric, politics and ethics

Herbert Gottweis brought rhetoric to bear on the study of policy-making, focusing on policy scenographies as determining possible modes of argumentation, of what can be said, and what cannot be said. He pointed out significant differences between the regulations of stem cell research in the United Kingdom and in South Korea as related to the operation of differing models of staging stem cell politics. He used his approach to explain the collapse of the Korean model of regulating stem cell research in the wake of the Hwang Woo-suk scandal. He argued that it was not the incidence of scientific fraud per se that had caused political crisis, but also the adopted policy scenography and its capacity to deal with destabilization. This contrasts with the much more robust UK model.

Lene Koch gave a detailed insight into Denmark’s stem cell policy which has positioned itself in the middle, between the more liberal policies of UK, Sweden and Belgium and the more restrictive policies of Germany, Norway and the USA. This means that although embryonic stem cell research is possible and flourishing, a number of activities are (still) illegal, but constantly challenged by a liberal alliance of stem cell researchers and politicians. She presented a snapshot of life in the IVF-SC interface (based on ethnographic field work) to illustrate how Danish stem cell culture is being shaped in this moral landscape. **Teresa Kulawik** in turn focused on the stem cell debate in Sweden which stands out in its biomedical policy through remarkably liberal, lenient regulations, which, in European comparison, are closest to those of Great Britain. Sweden's legislation

allows for the use of so-called "spare" human embryos, resulting from IVF procedures, for research purpose, pre-implantation genetic diagnosis, and egg donation. In 2005 the creation of –human embryos for research purposes and so-called therapeutic cloning have been legalized. She explained that, surprisingly, this policy-making process provoked only a moderate amount of controversy. She argued that the Swedish model is based on a productivist paradigm, the institutional and discursive parameters of which have not been decisively extended through its "new politics." In this way, elitist policy-making structures within environmental and technology policies have remained intact. Sweden's heritage of utilitarian ethics and pragmatic legal tradition and its assertions make it even more difficult for leftist or feminist to formulate a critical stance. Therefore, the only anti-embryo research position taken in the political arena was by the Christian Democratic Party. **Teodora Manea** provided valuable insights into the public discourse about stem cells in Romania, characterized by conformism and non-transparency. She stressed that even though stem cell research does take place in Romania, little attention is paid to its ethical consequences. The attention of public opinion is absorbed by socio-economic difficulties, unemployment, inflation, the ongoing reform process and unfortunate politics. A possible explanation for this may reside in Romania's communist past that has seriously affected the capacity for ethical reflection. While conformism can be noticed on the political and legal level, non-transparency is rather the result of a poor tradition in the communication between the involved institutions and the society. Moreover, Romanian philosophy has hardly helped in shaping the public opinion regarding stem cell issues, as it pays little interest to the practical problems. Finally, **Tamara Hervey** explained, from a detailed legal point of view, that there have been many European Parliament resolutions calling for the prohibition, at EU level, of any type of human cloning. In particular, there have been repeated exhortations that, in order to safeguard human dignity, the Commission and the Council must intervene to prevent the UK government enacting a law which would permit "therapeutic cloning". However, in April 2003, Philippe Busquin, EU Commissioner for Research, presenting a Commission report on human embryonic stem cell research, stated that the report was not "about establishing EU legislation on ethical questions. Regulating on ethical matters is the competence of Member States". The Commission has also asserted that the principle of subsidiarity demands that the Commission leave the "prerogatives to legislate on matters of ethics to the Member States themselves" and consequently the Commission is unable to "impose any constraints on the freedom of states to lay down the conditions under which they wish to regulate research". Tamara Hervey's paper therefore considered the legal position with respect to the EU's governance of stem cell research and asked: Who is right here: the Commission or Parliament? Is it correct, legally speaking, to assert that "regulating" on the ethics of stem cell research "is the competence of Member States"? Does this mean that the EU has no legal powers to influence the governance of stem cell research, including its ethical dimension, within its borders?

Stem cell scandal – science, ethics and rhetoric: A case study

Debates over the donation of oocytes and embryos for stem cell and cloning research are under way in many countries of the world. The events surrounding the research of Woo Suk Hwang, in South Korea have highlighted some of the consequences of inadequate regulation and supervision and spurred international debates about the ethics of egg donation. In particular, the South Korea case illustrated the ever-present tension between the interests of the public as a whole in finding new cures and the rights of individual donors, which were, by many accounts, not well respected in the South Korean case. **Hub Zwart** studied the case of the Korean stem cell researcher Woo Suk Hwang in detail and he debate it sparked off. Was it an ethical violation to use eggs donated by researchers

belonging to his team? Or did it rather emphasize the difference in moral culture between East and West? In the fall of 2005, Hwang also had to face the first questions concerning the validity of his results. A committee was established and in January 2006 it published its devastating results. In my presentation I will review the way in which Hwang's research was represented in the world's leading scientific journals, *Nature* and *Science*. It is an interesting and complicated case, for various reasons. On the one hand, the experiment raised a whole set of ethical issues, such as: (a) the ethics of therapeutic cloning and human stem cell research; (2) the donation of eggs by collaborators (issues of bodily integrity and autonomy); (3) issues of fraud in research; (4) issues of science communication; (5) globalization of bioethics and cultural differences between East and West. But the Korean case also displays the intimate ways in which epistemological and ethical issues are interconnected. It is impossible to address the ethical issues without reflecting on these epistemological dimensions as well. How are scientific facts being produced in this type of research? How is their validity determined? How are they communicated and disseminated? What is the role of time pressures and international competition? In a joint paper **Megan Allyse** and **Brigitte Nerlich** responded to Hub Zwart's talk *A Korean Tale: Epistemology and Ethics in the Hwang case*, with Brigitte Nerlich focusing on the metaphorical framing of the 'race' to achieve scientific glory in the field of therapeutic cloning and Megan Allyse focusing on issues of international and cross-cultural ethics.

Assessment of Results

Expected Outcome of the Workshop

There are two expected outcomes of the workshop:

A collection of cultural/comparative results:

- a sound characterisation and inventory of framing devices (imagery, stereotypes, narratives, metaphors and fictions) used in the national news media and policy documents;
- an inventory of convergences and divergences concerning hopes/expectations and fears/anxieties connected to research using heSCs;
- a description of convergences and divergences of basic ingredients of national regulatory and legal regimes;
- the detection of “ethical cultures” which run contrary to “national cultures” and regulatory regimes and
- an account of “ethical cultures” which might represent a minimal consensus on a European level.

Planning of future activities in the field:

- Publish the proceedings of the workshop.
- Organise a second workshop with an emphasis on the dynamics of semantic, policy and institutional change.
- Launch a network of excellence.

Real Outcome of the Workshop

Assessing the cultural framing devices in the field of heSCs was a hard problem to deal with in the interdisciplinary framework of the workshop. In this context, the general focus on the news media and the framing devices used by them proved to be useful, as it provided a relatively unified methodological and theoretical framework which put the emphasis on an analysis at the micro level.

On the other hand the focus on hopes/expectations and fears/anxieties associated with heSC research broadened the scope of analysis beyond media accounts to include other documents such as policy reports, political statements or data taken from fieldwork. These two perspectives enabled the participants of the workshop to collaborate in uncovering “ethical cultures” within “national cultures” and bioethical, philosophical, regulatory and legal regimes. This also assured the comparability of the results and a consistent description of “ethical cultures” within the European framework which may yield a map of areas of minimal consensus - a consensus that, participants stressed, should however not 'drown out' controversy and continued debate.

Planning of Future Activities

The workshop provided results and new insights into debates over heSC research which have not been compared so far. The participants therefore agreed that it is useful to continue and broaden this type of research and create a network of excellence, coordinated by Brigitte Nerlich and Martin Döring.

A selection of presentations will be published – probably with Oxford University Press – by Brigitte Nerlich and Martin Döring while all Power Point presentations are available on a password protected webpage which will also function as the forum for the coordination of a network of excellence and for the organisation of a second workshop.

Participants agreed that a second workshop would be useful that would include more scholars working in the same area of research from an even wider range of European countries and possible new member states and that would put the

emphasis on studying scientific, cultural, conceptual and semantic change, shifts in policies, regulations and institutions, and changes in science-society relations inside European nations and across them.

Final Programme

The workshop programme covered two days. Each day had a similar structure. However, the first day started by introducing the scientific background to stem cell research, whereas the second day focused completely on cultural/comparative aspects of stem cell cultures in Europe. The programme, together with related background material can be found at:

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/igbis/stemcellnetwork/>

Friday 10 March 2006

Evening *Arrival*

Saturday 11 March 2006

09.30 *Registration and coffee*

10.00 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
Gisli Pálsson (University of Iceland) (Standing Committee
for the Humanities)

10.15 **Opening address and welcome by Martin Döring and**
Brigitte Nerlich

Stem cell science

10.30 **Stephen Minger** (Stem Cell Biology Laboratory, King's College,
London) (US)
*Science, ethics and therapeutic potential of human stem cells –
The UK Experience*

11.00 **Rhodri Jones** (Immunology, Nottingham) (UK)
*The science, ethics and therapeutic potential of human fetal
stem cells*

Stem cells from a comparative perspective

11.30 **Brigitte Nerlich** (IGBiS, Nottingham) (DE)
*Metaphors and arguments around the Rubicon: The stem cell
debate in Germany, the UK and France*

12.00 **Clare Williams** and **Steven Wainwright** (Kings College, London) (UK)
*Envisaging the embryo in stem cell research: Media reporting
and scientists' views of the ethical debates*

12.30 *Lunch*

Stem cells in law and politics

13.30 **Tamara Hervey** (Law, Nottingham) (UK)
*Constructing competence: The legal discourse on ES cell
regulation in the European Union*

- 14.00 **Herbert Gottweis** (Political Sciences, Vienna) (AT)
Performing Regulation: Comparing Stem Cell Politics in South Korea and in the United Kingdom
- 14.30 **Christoph Rehmann-Sutter** (Ethics in the biosciences, Basel) (CH)
Genomic metaphysics and strategies of legitimacy in stem cell politics
- Stem cells in the media**
- 15.00 **Lorenzo Beltrame** and **Silvia Giovanetti** (Department of Sociology and Social Research, Trento and Department of Sociology, Padova) (IT)
Stem cells as scientific, ethical and political objects: The Italian stem cell debate
- 15.30 **Martin Döring** (Romance Languages, Hamburg) (DE)
Metaphors and media: How metaphors structure the stem cell debate in Germany and the UK
- 16.00 *Coffee followed by **discussion of results achieved so far***
- 19.00 *Dinner and Bar discussion*

Sunday 12 March 2006

Stem cells in Europe

- 09.30 **Carine Vassy** (CRESP, Paris) (FR)
Media representations of stem cell research: The French debate
- 10.00 **Christine Hauskeller** (ESRC-Centre for Genomics in Society, Exeter) (DE)
*Who is afraid of stem cell research? Freedom, dignity, risk of abuse: The ethical debate in Germany **[this talk was cancelled at short notice]***
- 10.30 *Coffee*
- 11.00 **Teresa Kulawik** (Politics, University College of South Stockholm) (SE)
Translating ethics into facts: The stem cell debate in Sweden
- 11.30 **Lene Koch** (Institute of Public Health, Copenhagen) (DK)
Stem cells in a moral landscape

Stem cells and public discourse

- 12.00 **Teodora Manea** (Philosophy, Iasi) (RO)
Conformism and non-transparency: The public discourse about stem cells in Romania
- 12.30 **Iina Hellsten** (Nederlands Instituut voor Wetenschappelijke Informatiediensten, Amsterdam) (FI)

Metaphors and diaphors in the stem-cell debate

13.0 *Lunch*

Stem cells and public discourse

14.00 **Jenny Kitzinger** (School of Media, Journalism and Cultural Studies, Cardiff) (UK)
Forecasting science futures: Legitimising hope and calming fears in the embryo stem cell debate

15.00 **Hub Zwart** (Centre for Society and Genomics, Nijmegen) (NL)
A Korean Tale: Epistemology and ethics in the Hwang Case

15.30 Response to **Hub Zwart's** paper by **Megan Allyse** (IGBiS) (US) and **Brigitte Nerlich** (IGBiS) (DE)
Crossing an ethical Rubicon and its repercussions on stem cell research in Europe: The case of Hwang Woo-Suk

16.00 Coffee and Round-table discussion lead by **Martin Döring** and **Brigitte Nerlich**, to discuss success of the workshop, publication strategy and future collaborations and events

Departure

Final List of Participants

Speakers

Megan Allyse
Institute for the Study of Genetics,
Biorisks and Society
Law and Social Sciences Building, West
Wing
University of Nottingham
University Park
Nottingham NG7 2RD
UK
Lqxma4@nottingham.ac.uk

Lorenzo Beltrame
University of Trento
Dept of Sociology and Social Research
Viaverdi 26
38100 Trento
Italy
E-mail:
lorenzo.beltrame@soc.unitn.it

Martin Döring
GKSS Research Centre Geesthacht
Institute for Coastal Research
Building 38
Max-Planck-Straße 1
D-21502 Geesthacht
Germany
E-Mail: doering@metaphorik.de

Silvia Giovanetti
University of Padova
Department of Sociology
Via S. Canziano, 8
I-35122 Padova
Italy
E-mail: see Beltrame

Herbert Gottweis
University of Vienna
Neues Institutsgebäude
Universitätsstr. 7
A-1010 Wien
E-mail: herbert.gottweis@univie.ac.at

Christine Hauskeller
University of Exeter
ESRC Center for Genomics in Society
Amory Building
Exeter, EX4 4RJ
UK
E-mail: c.hauskeller@exeter.ac.uk

Iina Hellsten
Nederlands Instituut voor
Wetenschappelijke Informatiediensten
Joan Muyskenweg 25
PO Box 95110
1090 HC Amsterdam
The Netherlands
E-mail: iina.hellsten@niwi.knaw.nl

Tamara Hervey
School of Law
Law and Social Sciences Building
University Park
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, NG7 2 RD
UK
E-mail:
tamara.hervey@nottingham.ac.uk

Rhodri Jones
Department of Immunology
Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham,
NG7 2UH
UK
E-mail: d.r.e.jones@nottingham.ac.uk

Jenny Kitzinger
School of Media, Journalism and
Cultural Studies
Bute Building
Cardiff University
King Edward VII Avenue
Cardiff, CF10 3NB
UK
E-mail: kitzinger@cardiff.ac.uk

Lene Koch
Institute of Public Health
University of Copenhagen
Department of Health Services
Research
Blegdamsvej
Build. 42
DK 2200 Copenhagen
Denmark
E-mail: Koch@pubhealth.ku.dk

Teresa Kulawik
Dept. for Gender Studies
University College of South Stockholm
14189 Huddinge
Sweden
teresa.kulawik @sh.se

Teodora Manea
Institute for Philosophy
Al.L.Cuza
University of Iasi
Bd. Carol I Nr. 11
700 506 Iasi
Romania
E-mail: teo.manea@gmx.de

Stephen Minger
Director, Stem Cell Biology Laboratory
Wolfson Centre for Age-Related
Diseases
King's College London
London SE1 1UL UK
E-mail: stephen.minger@kcl.ac.uk

Brigitte Nerlich
Institute for the Study of Genetics,
Biorisks and Society
Law and Social Sciences Building, West
Wing
University of Nottingham
University Park
Nottingham NG7 2RD
UK
E-mail:
brigitte.nerlich@nottingham.ac.uk

Christoph Rehmann-Sutter
Arbeitsstelle für Ethik in den
Biowissenschaften
Universität Basel
Schoenbeinstr. 20
CH-4056 Basel/Switzerland
christoph.rehmann-sutter@unibas.ch

Carine Vassy
Université Paris 13,
CRESP-INSERM,
74 rue Marcel Cachin,
93017 Bobigny cedex,
France
E-mail: c.vassy@iname.com

Steven Wainwright
The Florence Nightingale School of
Nursing and Midwifery, King's College
London, James Clerk Maxwell Building,
57 Waterloo Road,
London, SE1 8WA
E-mail: steven.wainwright@kcl.ac.uk

Clare Williams
The Florence Nightingale School of
Nursing and Midwifery
King's College London
James Clerk Maxwell Building
57 Waterloo Road
London, SE1 8WA, UK
E-mail:
clare.m.williams@blueyonder.co.uk

Hub Zwart
Director of the Centre for Society and
Genomics
Faculty of Science, Mathematics and
Computing Science
Department of Philosophy and Science
Studies
P.O. Box 9010
NL-6500 GL Nijmegen
The Netherlands
E-mail: haezwart@sci.kun.nl

Non Speakers

Gisli Palsson
Department of Anthropology
Faculty of Social Science
University of Iceland
Oddi
101 Reykjavík
Iceland
E-mail: gpals@hi.is

Maria Miranda Suarez
Spanish National Research Council
Institute for Philosophy
Department of Science, Technology
and Society
25, Pinar St.
28006 Madrid
E-mail: mjmirand@hotmail.com

Statistical Information

Country:

Nationality:

Austria: 1
Denmark: 1
Finland: 1
France: 1
Germany: 3
Iceland: 1
Italy: 2
The Netherlands: 1
Romania: 1
Spain: 1
Sweden: 1
Switzerland: 1
UK: 4
USA: 2

Residence

Austria: 1
Denmark: 1
France: 1
Germany: 1
Iceland: 1
Italy: 2
The Netherlands: 2
Romania: 1
Spain: 1
Sweden: 1
Switzerland: 1
UK: 9

Sex:

Woman: 13
Men: 9

Positions:

Academics: 22