Ethics in Responsible Governance of S&T; a global perspective



Miltos Ladikas 4th Doctoral Conference on technology Assessment Universidade Nova de Lisboa 26 June2014

Why Ethics?

- Cornerstone of Responsibility
- Guiding Policy Principle
- Vague but Powerful Tool
- Shaped by Culture, Norms, Current Affairs
- Too Important to Leave to Experts

GEST Partners

- University of Central Lancashire, Centre for Professional Ethics, United Kingdom
- Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute for Technology Assessment and System Analysis, Germany
- RATHENAU Institute, The Netherlands
- Chinese Academy of Science and Technology for Development, Ministry of Science and Technology, PR China
- Research and Information System for Developing Countries, India

Objectives

- Explore the state-of-the-art in the debates on ethics in S&T in the three regions with a focus on interdependent scientific developments.
- Explore the social determinants of policymaking in the three regions in terms of public perceptions of risks and benefits, and lay morality.
- Instigate a best practice system of ethics analysis that can be applied equally well in each of the three regions.
- Promote and support a global debate on the issue of the ethical and social implications of scientific and technological developments with a view to informing national policies.
- Create a high-level policy advisory network of experts from Europe, China and India in order to promote concrete collaboration in the area amongst the three regions.

Our view of S&T ethics

S&T ethics refers to a common public platform for deliberation and discussion of S&T issues that:

- Is an expression of the dominant values in society
- Is based on lay perceptions of right and wrong
- Informs policy making

Incorporation of Ethics in S&T Policy



Focus

- Values Systems
- Common Analytical Framework
- Ethics Institutionalisation
- Public Perceptions and Public Engagement
- Case Studies: Food, Nano, SynBio
- Mainstreaming Socio-Ethical Issues in S&T
- Global Dialogue and Regional Recommendations (Institutional structures, Decision making processes)

Values in the three regions



Common Analytical Framework

- Innovation discourse
- Risk discourse
- Power and control discourse
- *Reflective ethics* discourse
- Public/lay discourse

Ethics Institutionalization

- Europe: High (NECs, QUANGOs, Prof. Associations)
- China: Medium (Guidelines, Associations, Adhoc Groups)
- India: Low (within existing Advisory Structures)

Public Perceptions

- Europe: knowledgeable, ambivalent, cautionary, prominent
- China: less knowledgeable, positive, showing roots of ambivalence
- India: Uncertain, lack of data, positive

Public Engagement

- Europe: High (organised, influential)
- China: Medium (spontaneous, influential)
- India: Medium (organised, vocal)

Mainstreaming Ethics

Challenges:

- Is there a common global Ethics?
- Should we strive for one?
- Is Europe open for it?
- Is there a need for common institutional structures?

The Role of TA

- Established international presence
- Widespread need for structured independent advice
- pTA particularly attractive for newcomers
- Unique multidisciplinary undertaking
- Natural RRI component

Next Steps on Global Ethics

- Establish common global deliberation platforms on social determinants of S&T
- Instigate capacity building programmes for common structures on ethics policy advisory
- Promote the development of common S&T social impact indicators
- Develop comparative systematic public perceptions databases
- Promote common templates of public engagement
- Develop common risk-assessment paradigms in S&T

Thank You!

Miltos.Ladikas@KIT.EDU