



Yet another story of networks! Prospects for performing «responsible innovation»

François Thoreau
Saturday, November 5th
4S, Cleveland, OH

Layout

- Public policies in nano: A mandate for Responsible Innovation and «Integration»
- What does it entail to initiate (fruitful) collaboration?
- What can we learn from the institutional setup, in terms of collaborating?

Responsible innovation?

Nanotechnology must be developed in a safe and responsible manner. Ethical principles must be adhered to and potential health, safety or environmental risks scientifically studied, also in order to prepare for possible regulation. Societal impacts need to be examined and taken into account. Dialogue with the public is essential to focus attention on issues of real concern rather than “science fiction” scenarios.

European Commission, 2004

unprecedentedly open and engaging process. The collective goals and specific objectives articulated in the Strategic Plan will support world-class interdisciplinary nanotechnology research, sustain and expand critical infrastructure, train and inspire the next generation of scientists and engineers, and support responsible development and transfer of nanotechnology into commercial applications to benefit the Nation’s economy and the American people.

An Act

To authorize appropriations for nanoscience, nanoengineering, and nanotechnology research, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act”.

(10) ensuring that ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal concerns, including the potential use of nanotechnology in enhancing human intelligence and in developing artificial intelligence which exceeds human capacity, are considered during the development of nanotechnology by—

(C) insofar as possible, integrating research on societal, ethical, and environmental concerns with nanotechnology research and development, and ensuring that advances in nanotechnology bring about improvements in quality of life for all Americans; and

Integration

- Integration?
Action** of integrating: **Combine** one thing with the other so that they become a **whole
- Tentative definition *Transdisciplinary collaboration that aims to integrate the societal dimensions of new and emerging technologies within R&D processes (“into ongoing sociotechnical processes to shape their eventual outcomes”)*
- Part of the agenda of «anticipatory governance», see Barben al., 2008; epistemology of Trading zones and Interactional Expertise; Galison 1997; Collins & Evans 2002; Gorman, al. 2004
- Anyhow: entails cross-disciplinary collaborations (resonates with disciplinarity framing in nano)

Argument

- Prospects for individual collaborations?
- «Argument: if one is to engage with science and technology practitioners, then one should closely examine the **shape of the institutional network** those find themselves embedded in.»
- Why? We encline to think that nanotechnologies have revolutionized the workplace (and the institutional settings) in the first place

The state of the network matters

- «The behaviour of actors, and more generally their definition, changes with the state of the network, which is itself the product of previous actions» (Callon, 1991, pp. 153-154)
- // Institutions in political science and evolutionary economics
- "Techno-economic networks and irreversibility." Pp. 132-165 in A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination, edited by John Law. London: Routledge.)

Two different types of networks


- *Stabilized networks:*
 - low costs of information circulation (shared grounds)
 - (very) competitive environment
 - «states of the world» known *ex ante*, with reasonable predictability
 - expanded networks (far-reaching translations stabilized) whereas cooperation is a strategy to decrease costs or gain power
- *Emerging networks:*
 - high costs of knowledge replication (entails labs, knowl., skills replication)
 - exclusive, rare environment, inner singularity
 - «states of the world», research outcomes eventually written *ex post*
 - rather small network so need to expand it and create chains of translation to «generalize» the knowledge being produced



UCL


**Université
catholique
de Louvain**





* meet the needs = the very basic aim of R&D firms like imec, according to Wolfgang

Roadmap



imec translations


- Defining a business plan for your prototype in a highly competitive environment (neuroprobes: Clinatec, IBM, ...)
- Well-prepared business plan and highly-desirable return on investment
- Open business model vs. Many stabilized options
- Strong hierarchy, division of tasks and labour
- Highly stabilized states of the world and increasingly homogeneous network

UCL

Université
catholique
de Louvain



Photonics optics and experimental diffractive physics



UCL translations

- Assembling networks to have instruments that *will* stabilize (thus perpetuate) the institution
- Very low competitive environment (i. e. programmes d'excellence)
- Limited institutional mandates: mandatory new alliances, but few obligations of results and freedom of means (instruments, careers)
- Destabilized states of the world (but tentative heterogeneity of the network), need to perform translations



Counter-intuitive intermediary conclusion

- Shape of networks matter because it defines what it is you produce (information vs. knowledge)
- The cutting-edge R&D center is the rather stabilized network
- Old Academy is the rather emerging network
- Eventually it shapes the «profiles of action»

Conclusion

- What of networks in nano?
- What of institutions? Need to characterize them
- What of individual collaborations?
Understand practitioners' «profile of action» (Callon, 1991)



Thank you!

fthoreau@ulg.ac.be

- conclusions: on présume que les nanos prennent place dans des réseaux toujours émergents;
- exemple contre-intuitif

- challenge le présupposé que, de par leur nouveauté alléguée (qui reste à démontrer), les nanotechnologies chamboulent l'organisation de la R&D et ne sont le fait que de réseaux émergents
- Ce qui pourtant contredit la littérature sur le financement (pour couvrir d'anciennes activités).
- Tout se passe comme si les nanotechnologies, qu'on annonce comme révolutionnaires (*a new industrial revolution*), commencent par révolutionner les réseaux dans lesquels elles sont développées. Alors que ce discours révolutionnaire a été débusqué depuis quelques années déjà (cf ETC group notamment, voir aussi NanoNina à S.NET), personne semble n'en avoir tiré la conséquence logique; les réseaux qui oeuvrent à l'avènement des nanotechnologies ne sont pas plus radicalement nouveaux que ces dernières.