We Ponder the Nature of Life

European Colloquium for Philosophy of Life Sciences (EUPhilBio)
Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb
Jordanovac 110 ▪ P.O. box 169 ▪ HR-10000 Zagreb ▪ Croatia
https://www.ffrz.unizg.hr/euphilbio_en/

EUPhilBio Summer School "What Is Life?" – 2026

| SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES |

INTER UNIVERSITY CENTRE DUBROVNIK

Inter University Centre Dubrovnik

Under the Auspices of

FACULTY ▪ of ▪ PHILOSOPHY ▪ and ▪ RELIGIOUS ▪ STUDIES
UNIVERSITY ▪ of ▪ ZAGREB

&

Endorsed by

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY & RESEARCH

P R O G R A M

31 August – 4 September 2026

PROGRAM

Opening Day • 31 August 2026 — Monday

OPENING CEREMONY

16:30 – 16:45 Opening address

THEME • *The Problem of Defining Life*

Central Question: *Can life be defined?*

Chair: Eörs Szathmáry

17:00 – 18:30 INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION: *ON DEFINING LIFE*

after 18:30 | Dinner [1] and free time

Working Day One • 1 September 2026 — Tuesday

THEME • *The Nature of Life – From Definition to Understanding*

Central Question: *If defining life is problematic, what is the best way to understand it?*

Chairs: Arnon Levy (morning session) • Franz Klein (afternoon session)

10:00 – 11:00 **James R. Griesemer**: ***"Undoubtedly, life is a process. A process bound to matter …" (Gánti, 1987, p. 29)*** [2]

11:00 – 11:30 | Discussion [3]

11:30 – 12:30 **Petar Tomev Mitrikeski**: ***Epistemic Problems in Defining Life***

12:30 – 13:00 | Discussion

13:00 – 15:00 | Lunch [3] and free time

15:00 – 16:00 **Daniel J. Nicholson**: **What Is Life?** ***on 'What Is Life?'*** [4]

16:00 – 16:30 | Discussion

16:30 – 17:30 **Petar Tomev Mitrikeski**: ***Ontological Problems in Defining Life***

17:30 – 18:00 | Discussion

after 18:00 | Dinner and free time

Continued on next page

[1] See the *Additional Information* section below for further details.
[2] Lectures are scheduled for 45–60 minutes. If the lecture concludes earlier, the remaining time may be used for discussion.
[3] If the discussion concludes earlier, the remaining time may be used for a short break before the next session begins.
[4] This lecture will be delivered remotely via Zoom.

Working Day Two • 2 September 2026 — Wednesday

THEME • *The Emergence and Evolution of Life*

Central Question: *How does living organization emerge and evolve?*

Chairs: Rachel Allyson Ankeny (morning session) • James R. Griesemer (afternoon session)

10:00 – 11:00	**Mauro Santos**: ***Darwinian Evolution in Autocatalytic Chemical Reaction Systems***
11:00 – 11:30	Discussion
11:30 – 12:30	**Eörs Szathmáry**: ***Growth, Autocatalysis, Replication, Reproduction, Survival and Evolutionary Units: Clearing Up the Mud***
12:30 – 13:00	Discussion
13:00 – 15:00	Lunch and free time
15:00 – 16:00	**Samir Okasha**: ***The Philosophy of Fitness Revisited***
16:00 – 16:30	Discussion
16:30 – 17:30	**Franz Klein**: ***On the Origin of the Meiotic Process***
17:30 – 18:00	Discussion
18:00 – 19:00	**Arnon Levy**: ***What Is an Epidemic?***
19:00 – 19:30	Discussion
after 19:30	Dinner and free time

Working Day Three • 3 September 2026 — Thursday

THEME • *From Understanding Life to Constructing Life*

Central Question: *If we understand life, can we construct it?*

Chairs: Mauro Santos (morning session) • Ned (Nediljko) Budiša (afternoon session)

10:00 – 11:00	**Eörs Szathmáry**: ***Toward Conceptualization and Synthesis of Minimal Life***
11:00 – 11:30	Discussion
11:30 – 12:30	**Ned (Nediljko) Budiša**: ***From Spontaneous Generation to the Expanded Chemoton: A Century-Long Quest to Synthesize and Define Life***
12:30 – 13:00	Discussion
13:00 – 15:00	Lunch and free time
15:00 – 16:00	**Rachel Allyson Ankeny**: ***What Is a Model Organism and Why Does It Matter for Philosophy of Biology?***
16:00 – 16:30	Discussion
16:30 – 17:30	**Rachel Allyson Ankeny**: ***Using a Repertoires Framework to Explore Scientific Change in Contemporary Biology***
17:30 – 18:00	Discussion
after 18:30	Dinner and free time

Continued on next page

Closing Day ▪ 4 September 2026 — Friday

THEME ▪ *Rewriting Life – Philosophical and Human Implications*

Central Question: *If we can rewrite the rules of life, what does that mean for science, humanity, and the future?*

Chair: James R. Griesemer

10:00 – 11:00	***Ned (Nediljko) Budiša*: *Kant and Code Biology – The Genetic Code as an Operational* A Priori**
11:00 – 11:30	Discussion
11:30 – 13:00	OPEN DISCUSSION WITH STUDENTS

Student Moderator: Maxim Schalkwijk

CLOSING CEREMONY

13:00 – 13:10	Closing address
after 13:10	Lunch and free time, farewell

Continued on next page

Lecture Abstracts *(listed in the order of presentation)*

James R. Griesemer

"Undoubtedly, life is a process. A process bound to matter …" (Gánti, 1987, p. 29)

This talk will be a meditation on Gánti's statement and a variety of philosophical perspectives one might take in exploring concepts and phenomena of "life." I begin with the idea of perspective-taking as a strategy, an "approach," to scientific investigation. I will explore ideas related to the six basic approaches to define living matter in the course description. I suggest that the idea of defining "life" is misguided if the aim of definition is to find true, universal, necessary, and sufficient conditions for life. A different perspective is to view this philosophical pursuit as one of characterizing forms of "life" as heuristics—conceptual "compasses"—to "feel … the question 'What is life?'" (Gánti 2000) in ways that make sense of familiar forms of life that also guide "navigations" of unfamiliar phenomena, which would seem life-like if only we change perspectives. The question must remain open to discovery even while we try to pin down the meaning of the concept. Exact sciences, as Gánti conceived them, and theoretical philosophies, as Kant distinguished them, are empirical and defeasible, not canons to be adhered to. In the words of another important book from 1987, Leo Buss said of August Weismann's doctrine of the continuity of the germplasm: "Although most of this theory, including Weismann's theories of inheritance, ultimately proved fictional, the outcome was the finest result to which theory may aspire: the right questions were asked."

•••

Petar Tomev Mitrikeski

Epistemic Problems in Defining Life

The question What is life? remains one of the most challenging problems in contemporary biology and astrobiology. Despite numerous attempts to formulate a scientific definition, no universally accepted account of life has been achieved. This difficulty does not result merely from incomplete empirical knowledge, but from deeper epistemic challenges concerning which properties should be considered fundamental for identifying living systems. This lecture examines how different scientific approaches emphasize distinct aspects of life, including metabolism, organization, information, reproduction, and evolution. Particular attention is given to the problem of whether these properties necessarily coincide or represent independent dimensions of biological systems. Borderline cases such as viruses, artificial living systems, and hypothetical prebiotic systems reveal that cellularity and evolvability can occur separately: viruses display hereditary information and evolutionary potential without cellular autonomy, whereas synthetic cellular systems such as xenobots exhibit biological organization without an established evolutionary lineage. The lecture argues that defining life requires moving beyond single-property approaches toward a multidimensional framework that analyzes how different biological characteristics are related and integrated.

•••

Daniel J. Nicholson

What Is Life? *on 'What Is Life?'*

'What Is Life?' is often referred to as 'Schrödinger's question'. This, of course, is due to his publication of *What Is Life?* in 1944, which is one of the most celebrated scientific works of the twentieth century. However, like most classics, Schrödinger's little book is far more often cited than read. Indeed, one of the first things that one realizes upon actually reading it is that Schrödinger is not even trying to answer the question that he chose as the title of his book. Instead, the question that concerns him is the following: 'What is the source and nature of biological order?'. In this lecture, I will reconstruct the argument that Schrödinger laid out in his book and demonstrate the enormous impact it exerted on our understanding of the cell and of development during the second half of the twentieth century. Specifically, I will show how Schrödinger's emphasis on the rigidity and specificity of the hereditary material (which stemmed from his attempt to explain biological order from physical principles) influenced how molecular biologists conceptualized macromolecules, resulting in a deterministic, engineering view of life that is still popular today—even if it is increasingly at odds with experimental findings. Paradoxically, one of

the most salient consequences of the success of *What Is Life?*—and of the molecular biology revolution that ensued—was precisely the banishment of 'What Is Life?' as a central concern of biological research. As François Jacob famously put it in 1973, "Biologists no longer study life today". Conversely, the growing renewed interest in this question after so many decades of neglect suggests that we are finally on the cusp of overcoming the particular genocentric view of living systems that Schrödinger articulated so compellingly 80 years ago in his *What Is Life?*—or so I will argue.

•••

Petar Tomev Mitrikeski

Ontological Problems in Defining Life

The question What is life? is not only a problem of classification but also a question about the nature of living systems. If the properties commonly associated with life do not always coincide, a deeper ontological question emerges: what kind of phenomenon is life? This lecture explores whether life should be understood as a particular substance, a specific organization of matter, or a dynamic process. Central attention is given to the relationship between two fundamental dimensions of biological existence: cellularity and evolvability. While cellularity provides the basis for autonomous organization, self-maintenance, and biological individuality, evolvability introduces historical continuity and the capacity for Darwinian change. Their partial independence, illustrated by viruses and synthetic cellular systems such as xenobots, challenges traditional views that life can be defined by a single essential property. Drawing on organizational and process-based approaches to biology, the lecture argues that life is best understood as a dynamically organized mode of existence in which cellular autonomy, information processing, and evolutionary continuity become integrated within historically evolving systems.

•••

Mauro Santos

Darwinian Evolution in Autocatalytic Chemical Reaction Systems

Darwinian evolution, based on variation, selection and inheritance, has profoundly impacted our understanding of biological complexity. However, applying these principles to prebiotic chemistry presents both conceptual and experimental challenges. Although some models suggest that basic chemical networks could exhibit evolutionary behaviour, these analogues frequently lack the fidelity and stability necessary for genuine Darwinian evolution. This study aims to critically evaluate the extent to which Darwinian evolution can be meaningfully applied to prebiotic chemistry. To this end, I will explore the conceptual differences between chemical and biological evolution, examine experimental models that attempt to simulate evolutionary behaviour, and discuss the conditions necessary for chemical systems to exhibit self-reproduction and Darwinian evolution. Ultimately, I conclude that, although Darwinian principles offer valuable insights, they must be adapted to account for the unique constraints and mechanisms of prebiotic systems.

•••

Eörs Szathmáry

Growth, Autocatalysis, Replication, Reproduction, Survival and Evolutionary Units: Clearing Up the Mud

Considerable confusion can be found in the (recent) literature about whether Darwinian evolution by natural selection needs some kind of multiplication/reproduction. I shall offer some clarity in these matters partly using formal chemistry, especially cycle stoichiometry as developed by the late Tibor Gánti. We shall also look at how all this relates to different versions of multilevel selection. Replicators are the crucial entities in evolution. The notion of a replicator is far less exact than the weight of its importance. Without identifying and classifying multiplying entities exactly, their dynamics cannot be determined appropriately. Therefore, it is important to decide the nature and characteristics of any multiplying entity, in a detailed and formal way. Replication is basically an autocatalytic process which enables us to rest on the notions of formal chemistry. This statement has major implications. Simple autocatalytic cycle intermediates are considered as non-informational replicators. A consequence of which is that any autocatalytically multiplying entity is a replicator, be it simple or overly complex (even

nests). A stricter definition refers to entities which can inherit acquired changes (informational replicators). Simple autocatalytic molecules (and nests) are excluded from this group.

•••

Samir Okasha

The Philosophy of Fitness Revisited

The "philosophy of fitness" was a disparaging name given to the philosophy of biology in the 1970s by critics who felt that practitioners of this emerging sub-discipline spent too much time analyzing the concept of fitness, to the exclusion of other topics. Despite the critics, the philosophical discussion of fitness has burgeoned since then. Oddly, though, this discussion makes little contact with the technical literature on fitness in evolutionary theory itself, where there are ongoing disagreements over what the "right" definition of fitness and/or the "right" mathematical measure of fitness is, in different contexts, and why. The existence of parallel literatures on a single topic is not uncommon in philosophy of science but is rarely ideal. Better integration is needed. This talk is part of a broader project that revisits the concept of fitness, tries to make sense of the controversies surrounding it, and to integrate the philosophical and biological discussions. The basic idea is to regard "fitness" as a theoretical term in science, and then to use the Ramsey-Carnap-Lewis technique to define it via its theoretical role. However, the situation is complicated by the fact that there is arguably more than one "fitness role". Moreover, in any particular evolutionary model, a given quantity, definable from the model parameters, may realize one of these fitness roles but not others. Taken together, this explains why the fitness concept has caused so much confusion, why the term "fitness" is polysemic in evolutionary biology, and why theorists can disagree about the "right" fitness measure despite the underlying science not being in dispute.

•••

Franz Klein

On the Origin of the Meiotic Process

Meiosis, also known as the "reductional division", is the basis of sexual reproduction. It reverses the process of fertilization, that is, the fusion of germ cells, by separating out 4 complete sets of chromosomes from the fused paternal genomes, creating both genetic diversity between the offspring of one parental configuration and genetic uniformity between the interbreeding members of a population. By organizing animals and plants into different sexes, meiosis shapes the way in which we experience our own existence, as well as other macroscopic life forms. Surprisingly, all branches of the eukaryotic kingdom, no matter how divergent, have been shown to have members with current or past sexual reproduction, showing that LECA, the last eukaryotic common ancestor, already had a refined machinery to reduce the genome. Thus, meiosis belongs to the fundamental innovations that separate the eukaryotic from the prokaryotic world. I will summarize some current speculative ideas concerning the origin of this process. Present-day Asgard archaea are the closest known relatives of the archaeal lineage from which eukaryotes arose. This ancestral host entered into an endosymbiotic association with an alphaproteobacterium, which ultimately gave rise to the mitochondrion. Both the emergence of the eukaryotic nucleus, as well as the evolution of a life cycle that alternates between haploid and diploid phases requiring meiosis, could have been shaped by adaptations to the challenges posed by integrating this chemically aggressive cellular power source that generates reactive oxygen species during aerobic respiration.

•••

Arnon Levy

What Is an Epidemic?

This talk examines what epidemics are, and challenges the widespread preconception – sometimes explicit but often implicit – that they constitute a distinctively biological phenomenon. The assumption that epidemics belong primarily to the domain of biology shapes both theoretical accounts of disease dynamics and the social organization of epidemic response — locating expertise, authority, and explanatory work within the biomedical sciences. I argue that this picture is mistaken in an important way. While epidemics certainly depend on biological substrates — pathogens, hosts, transmission

mechanisms — they are not themselves biological processes. Their characteristic dynamics are partially, but crucially, constituted by social and medical factors: patterns of contact and mobility, healthcare infrastructure, communication systems, political decisions, economic pressures, and the medical interventions that shape who gets sick, who recovers, and how disease spreads through populations. The COVID-19 pandemic illustrates this constitutive role of the social and medical with particular clarity, from the heterogeneity of national trajectories to the shaping power of testing regimes, public health messaging, and vaccine distribution. Recognizing epidemics as socially and medically constituted phenomena has consequences for how we understand the biological domain and its limits. And more broadly, for how we theorize the COVID pandemic in retrospect and for how we approach mitigation and preparedness for future pandemic threats.

•••

Eörs Szathmáry

Toward Conceptualization and Synthesis of Minimal Life

The *de novo* creation of living systems is a long-standing dream of humanity. To realize this dream, we need a clear conceptualization of the goal and the experimental means to put it to practice. We think now time is ripe to make a serious attempt. There is emerging consensus that a minimal living system should be out-of-equilibrium and self-sustaining, have metabolism, an inheritance system, a boundary to keep the constituents together, and that a population of such systems should be able to undergo Darwinian evolution. Our aim is to develop, for the first time, synthetic chemical systems with all of these features. Due to its very nature, MiniLife is standing on two equally strong feet: chemistry and biology. The strongest link between them is autocatalysis, which allows reproduction. Our approach to creating the first artificial chemical living system takes the following steps: (1) Identification of new and development of existing autocatalytic (super)systems that function as chemical (and informational) replicators. (2) Coupling of metabolism with chemical replicators. (3) Coupling of autocatalysis to compartment growth and division. (4) Synthesis of a chemical supersystem comprising all three components (replication, metabolism and compartmentalisation). (5) Demonstrating minimal Darwinian evolution upon subjecting the systems synthesized in 1-3 to out-of-equilibrium selection regimes. (6) Approaching a minimal living system by enhancing the evolvability of the triple systems developed in 4. Success would constitute a landmark achievement in basic science.

•••

Ned (Nediljko) Budiša

From Spontaneous Generation to the Expanded Chemoton: A Century-Long Quest to Synthesize and Define Life

Historically, the Aristotelian view of *spontaneous generation* gave way to the scientific revolution. Key breakthroughs—Lavoisier's chemistry, microscopic discovery, Pasteur's experiments—collectively dismantled *vitalism* and established that life only arises from life (*omne vivum ex ovo*). In this presentation, I trace the conceptual evolution that followed, from the establishment of this "Pasteurian Wall" to the current synthetic turn in biology. I argue that the explicit goal of this modern pursuit is to establish an engineered Xenosphere - a biologically distinct domain isolated from the natural Biosphere. Two primary strategies confront this challenge: Bottom-up approaches (e.g., protocell research) must breach the Pasteurian Wall by assembling life from non-living components. Top-down approaches (e.g., xenobiology) start within the Biosphere but engineer orthogonal chemistry to construct a genetic firewall for evolutionary containment. True synthesis demands both: creating living organization *de novo* while guaranteeing its isolation. However, this ambitious project proceeds without a consensus definition of life, creating a conceptual crisis. To resolve this, I propose a pragmatic engineering framework based on an Expanded Chemoton model, defining life operationally through measurable parameters: metabolic autonomy, informational closure, boundary maintenance, and energy dissipation. I conclude that such conceptual discipline is a practical prerequisite for the field's scientific rigor, ethical governance, and progress. To expand genetic codes, redesign metabolic grammar, or construct alternative lineages is to accept that life's constitutive rules are not fixed by nature but are subject to human revision. This position is neither naïve transhuman triumphalism nor simple technological determinism. It is a *post-natural stance* that recognizes humans as emerging agents within evolution, not as its endpoint.

•••

Rachel Allyson Ankeny

What Is a Model Organism and Why Does It Matter for Philosophy of Biology?

This lecture will explore the concept of a 'model organism' in a range of biological fields and how it has evolved over the past 30-40 years. It will also reflect on key philosophical views on model organisms and their implications more generally for the philosophy of biology and philosophy of science, particularly for how we understand what models do in scientific practices and how philosophy can shed light on the relationships between theories, tools, methods, and practices. I defend an historically shaped understanding of this fundamental concept, and point to ways in which it is likely to change in light of new technologies, methods, and understandings within the biological sciences.

•••

Rachel Allyson Ankeny

Using a Repertoires Framework to Explore Scientific Change in Contemporary Biology

This lecture introduces the repertoires framework (developed by Leonelli and me in 2016) and how it can be used to describe, analyze, and explain the conditions under which scientific communities organize themselves to do research. This framework centers on the idea of a research repertoire, which encompasses well-aligned assemblages of the skills, behaviors, and material, social, and epistemic components that a group may use to practice certain kinds of science, and whose enactment affects the methods and results of research. I argue that this account provides a more accurate and useful alternative to the idea of Kuhnian paradigms for understanding scientific change and illustrate this claim using examples from contemporary biological sciences including coral reef research and toxicology.

•••

Ned (Nediljko) Budiša

***Kant and Code Biology – The Genetic Code as an Operational* A Priori**

I will refine Konrad Lorenz's concept of *'natural transcendentalism'* by making a fundamental distinction between the genetic code and the genome and exploring the philosophical consequences of this distinction. I argue that the genetic code can be understood as a biological *a priori*: an evolution-shaped, universal rule system that determines the possibilities and forms of life before any individual organism comes into existence. While the genome represents a contingent biological "*text*," the genetic code is the necessary "*grammar*" in which all terrestrial life is written. To develop this argument, I integrate Lorenz's evolutionary epistemology, Marcello Barbieri's code biology, Howard Pattee's concept of the epistemic cut, and contemporary work in Xenobiology. The genetic code is thus framed as a phylogenetically installed, operational *a priori* – historically contingent in its origin, yet functionally necessary for life as we know it. Building on this conceptual foundation, I propose that Xenobiology represents the first deliberate scientific attempt to rewrite this inherited *a priori* by engineering new codon assignments, non-canonical amino acid alphabets, and orthogonal central dogmas. This reframes xenobiology not merely as editing biological content (classical biotechnology and genetic engineering), but as altering the very grammatical conditions of life. The philosophical and ethical implications are profound. Rewriting life's fundamental code compels us to revisit Kant's four foundational questions – *What can I know? What should I do? What may I hope? What is the human?* – in a new biological light. Consequently, Xenobiology emerges not only as a scientific frontier but as a post-human inquiry into the future conditions of life itself.

Continued on next page

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

European Colloquium for Philosophy of Life Sciences (EUPhilBio)

The Project	EUPhilBio is an academic initiative of the Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb. The project was awarded to Petar Tomev Mitrikeski (Croatia) and was launched in 2021.
The Core Team	The inaugural EUPhilBio meeting was held in 2022 in collaboration with **Predrag Šustar** (Croatia) and **David Immanuel Dunér** (Sweden). The invited speakers were **Arnon Levy** (Israel) and **Eörs Szathmáry** (Hungary), while **Franz Klein** (Austria) and **Mauro Santos** (Spain) participated as distinguished guests. In 2024, **Daniel J. Nicholson** (United States) joined the initiative. Together, these scholars form the Core Team of EUPhilBio.

EUPhilBio Summer School "What Is Life?" – 2026

Course directors (in alphabetical order)	Associate Professor **Arnon Levy** (Israel) *Hebrew University of Jerusalem* Assistant Professor Petar Tomev Mitrikeski (Croatia) *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies* Professor **Eörs Szathmáry** (Hungary) *HUN-REN Centre for Ecological Research*
Course lecturers (in alphabetical order)	Professor **Rachel Allyson Ankeny** (The Netherlands), *Wageningen University & Research* ▪ Professor **Ned (Nediljko) Budiša** (Canada), *University of Manitoba* ▪ Professor **James R. Griesemer** (USA), *University of California, Davis* ▪ Professor **Franz Klein** (Austria), *University of Vienna, Max Perutz Laboratories* ▪ Associate Professor **Arnon Levy** (Israel), *Hebrew University of Jerusalem* ▪ Assistant Professor **Daniel J. Nicholson** (USA), *George Mason University* ▪ Professor **Samir Okasha** (UK), *University of Bristol* ▪ Dr. **Mauro Santos** (Spain), *Autonomous University of Barcelona* ▪ Professor **Eörs Szathmáry** (Hungary), *HUN-REN Centre for Ecological Research* ▪ Assistant Professor Petar Tomev Mitrikeski (Croatia), *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies*
Students (in order of registration)	**Fuju Liu**, Master in Psychology (Austria), *Central European University* ▪ **Marija Ištvanić** (Croatia), *Catholic University of Croatia* ▪ Dr. **Luka Poslon** (Croatia), *Catholic University of Croatia* ▪ **Barbara Čulo**, univ. bacc. psych. (Croatia), *Catholic University of Croatia* ▪ **Tena Zubčić** (Croatia), *Catholic University of Croatia* ▪ **Barbara Vukas**, bacc. comm. (Croatia), *Catholic University of Croatia* ▪ **Hana Čeligoj** (Slovenia), *University of Ljubljana* ▪ **Ahmed Esmat Elsayed Mohamed**, M. Sc. (Austria), *University of Vienna* ▪ **Domagoj Popović** (Croatia), *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies* ▪ **Petra Caput** (Croatia), *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies* ▪ **Maxim Schalkwijk**, M. Sc. (The Netherlands), *Utrecht University*

Additional Information

VENUE

Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Don Frana Bulića 4, HR-20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia
Tel: +385 20 413 626, 413 627 • Fax: +385 20 413 628 • E-mail: iuc@iuc.hr

ACCOMMODATION

- **Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik**
- **House of Sisters Handmaids of Charity** (Croatian: Samostan Službenica milosrđa)
  Branitelja Dubrovnika 19, HR-20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia
  Tel: +385 20 312 060 • Fax: +385 20 422 926 • E-mail: samostan.dubrovnik@gmail.com

Continued on next page

OTHER INFORMATION

Certificates

All participants will receive a certificate signed by the Course Directors.

Internet Access

Wi-Fi is available throughout the venue. The network name and password are displayed on the classroom doors. Please note that *eduroam* will not be available due to technical issues.

Breakfast, Lunch, Dinner, Refreshments

For participants accommodated on the IUC premises, breakfast is included in the accommodation fee. Those staying elsewhere may also have breakfast at Restaurant Atrium, located on the ground floor of the IUC building, for an additional charge.

Whenever possible, participants are encouraged to have lunch together. For *scholarship recipients*, lunch throughout the course is covered by the IUC, while other participants may arrange their own lunches. In addition to Restaurant Atrium, the IUC recommends local restaurants in the Pile area, such as Restaurant Orhan and Dubravka 1836 Restaurant & Café.

Dinner is left to participants' discretion, allowing them to choose according to their own preferences.

Breaks

Lecturers and students are encouraged to use any breaks between sessions as opportunities for informal academic exchange and networking.

Airport Shuttle Bus

Participants arriving at Dubrovnik Airport may use the official airport shuttle service between the airport and Dubrovnik city. Buses are coordinated with flight arrivals and stop at Ploče Gate (Old Town) and the Main Bus Station (Gruž). Further information, including schedules and tickets, is available on the Platanus Airport Shuttle website.

The City of Dubrovnik

Participants interested in exploring the city can find useful information on Visit Dubrovnik.

Acknowledgements

EUPhilBio gratefully acknowledges the Dean and the Administration of the Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb, for their generous support. Petar Tomev Mitrikeski expresses his sincere gratitude to Arnon Levy, Eörs Szathmáry, and the EUPhilBio Core Team for their valuable contributions to the development of the EUPhilBio initiative and for their continued support. The Course Directors gratefully acknowledge all lecturers for their participation, expertise, and commitment to the success of the School.