

**“Greening Humanity”: Science, Innovation, Ethics and the  
Green Economy**

***Athens, Oct 14 -15 - 16 2010***

***An International Conference Sponsored by the Eugenides Foundation***

Titles and Abstracts

**Prof Nicholas Askounes Ashford – Panel Member Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October and Session 3  
16<sup>th</sup> October**

“Challenges to Global Economic Governance: Addressing Myopia, Fragmentation, and Complexity”

Transformation of the industrial state to sustainable development must include access to essential goods and services; adequate health, safety, and environment; and meaningful, rewarding employment and earning capacity of the world’s people. Not only technological innovation, but also organizational, institutional, and societal innovation are essential. Re-conceptualization of the meaning of development and growth and the reconfiguration of international governance institutions and legal systems such as the WTO, the Industrial Labour Organisation, and the UNEP/UNDP needs serious consideration. While governance is primarily in the hands of nations, neither those nations nor international institutions operate effectively as long as a fragmented approach characterizes our attempts at achieving sustainable development.

“Industrial Transformation and Environmental Justice”

Environmental justice in its fullest manifestation is concerned with justice as fairness in the Rawlsian sense regarding detriments to health, safety, and the environment. Thus, not only is the continuance of existing burdens to poor people, communities, workers, and consumers unjustified, but failure to direct innovation and industrial transformations to benefit the least advantaged is ethically suspect. Wishful thinking about greening the economy creating jobs in the aggregate and faith in trickle-down mechanisms for improvement need to give way to more deliberate policies to improve economic welfare, environment and worker health, and earning capacity of those people and nations at the bottom. A good beginning would be to view poverty and deprivation as the causes of recessions, not the other way around.

## **Prof Inez De Beaufort - Panel Member Session 1 15<sup>th</sup> October**

“The FUTURE: finity, fragility and

THE FUTURE: challenges, changes, concepts and bioethics”

A question to be discussed

How to deal with the tension between the responsibilities for our own individual lifestyles and choices (live the responsible lifestyle in terms of food prints, travelling, etc.) and the responsibility to change governments, companies and international organizations ( the NaturalResourceCharter.org approach). One runs the risk in the first case to become what Paul Collier in The Plundered Planet calls a romantic. Is it romantics who start the debates and then realists take over? If concentrating on the second approach: does that justify eating fish and meat, and flying around the world? I’m intrigued by the theme of setting individual moral examples and the quite high demands of living by them, and influencing of policymakers, and where the twain meet...

## **Prof Spyridon Flogaitis – Chair and Panel Member Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October**

“Global Administrative Law”

Only 30 years ago, administrative law was considered as the most provincial branch of law. Administrative law was traditionally seen as the law of the State and was indeed at the service of a nation-centered approach of law. In the meantime, many things changed. Comparative administrative law started gradually developing in the ‘70s and European administrative law came into the scene in the ‘80s, followed by international administrative law. Contemporary international needs, especially in the fields of terrorism, human trafficking, money laundering, protection of the environment, etc., lead international organizations and states to take action and produce law in the area of administrative law, and gradually, the provincial administrative law became one of the most international branches of law of our times. Global administrative law is the recognition and the outcome of this long process. It developed especially thanks to international environmental protection law. It produces principles and rules of global importance and application, useful for the globalization of standards for the rule of law, transparency, global economic governance and democratic accountability.

## **Ms Teresa Hitchcock – Panel Member Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October**

"Global Economic Governance - Science, Innovation and Green Economy: A Climate Change Lawyer's Perspective"

My perspective is that of a climate change lawyer at a firm keenly involved in promoting sustainable development. There is a considerable goodwill in society but governments need to take the world as they find it. The key is leading by example and providing appropriate incentives, so that it will be clear that reputational and commercial benefits will follow from pursuing ethical development. With respect to the development of green technology, it is likely

that developing economies will see it in their own interests to have strong laws for environmental protection and also strong intellectual property laws. While there are risks of false claims being made in respect of sustainable development, laws on verification may provide a tool to promote justice by providing strong reputational incentives towards good behaviour.

### **Dr Maria Kokozidou – Panel Member Session 1 15<sup>th</sup> October**

“Actual Trends in Applied Medicine”

While the aged population increases rapidly, the percentage of patients with aging diseases such as end-stage renal, metabolic and cardiovascular disease increases. This increases the need for more information on the challenge of “new” disease stages we are faced with and the requirement of innovative therapeutic applications, which will effectively serve the patient and the society in total. Having the era of the human genome sequencing successfully behind us, gene translation and regulation becomes a major issue. The usage of *in vitro* and *in vivo* models, where innovative science will be applied before being adopted for human therapy, is greatly desired. To do the split between ethics and research requirements successfully is a daily achievement since researchers are daily confronted with new questions arising. Animal models that will simulate human disease the closest possible are required more than ever in the history of medical research and development. The old, but always cutting edge, trend of striving after a tailor made to patient need/requirement, medicine gets closer and closer especially for cardiovascular medicine. Artificial organs made with the patient’s cellular property are already available today. Nevertheless cost effectiveness is in question for research, later on for insurance covering its costs and always the big question, where will the limits be set on its clinical application.

### **Prof Sir Peter Lachmann – Keynote Speaker Session 1 15<sup>th</sup> October**

"Religion - An Evolutionary Adaptation"

Darwin was, rightly, concerned that evolution by natural selection would be seen as standing opposed to religion. However, the proposition to be defended here is that this concern was misplaced and that religion arose as an evolutionary adaptation to meet a peculiarly human need: to maintain important aspects of human behaviour, that vary among different groups of humans, sufficiently constant over a sufficiently large number of individuals and over a sufficiently large span of time that natural selection, working on cultural evolution, can act upon them. It follows that ethics (as enshrined in religious prescription) form the building blocks of cultural evolution and themselves evolve. As humans have gone from being an endangered to an endangering species long standing ethical paradigms will need to change.

## **Prof Elpidophoros Lambriniadis – Panel Member Session 1 15<sup>th</sup> October**

### **“Personhood in an Age of Biotechnology”**

As Orthodox Christians, when we refer to the human person, we imagine something far more significant than biological, physiological or chemical processes. According to the Orthodox Church, a human person is someone who has progressed from the image of God to the likeness of God. In other words, a person is someone who seeks to reflect the mode of existence of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. As such, the individual is called to enter into communion with God as well as with the rest of creation. Therefore, personhood is fully realized when one participates in the Eucharist, as the Body and Blood of Christ unite each of us with our creator and with all those who partake in the feast of feasts. With such a view of the personhood, biological, social and psychological disorders can never limit one's status as a human person. Indeed, such disorders may well limit someone's ability to comprehend and desire a harmonious life in the world, but they cannot completely abolish personhood.

According to the Orthodox Church, we cease to be persons when we die spiritually – something that occurs when we become enclosed in self-centeredness and refuse to love God and neighbour. Our approach to the human person may appear a little too austere to those who are interested in an unfettered application of biotechnology. However, this does not mean that the Orthodox approach prohibits the use of biotechnology when trying to overcome various challenges to health and life. We do not perceive biotechnology as inherently sinful, nor do we believe that medical and scientific progress should be avoided or confined. What is, I propose, important is to be aware of the motivating factors behind the use of biotechnology in each specific instance. In this way, we can “avoid doing good through evil” and consequently feel certain that the use of biotechnology will not be turned into a measure for the misuse or abuse of the human person.

## **Dr Christos Pitelis – Panel Member Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October**

### **“Global Governance and Economic Sustainability”**

The commentary will address the nature of and constraints to economic sustainability, as well as the type of global governance that fosters sustainable global value and wealth creation.

## **Prof Herakles Polemarchakis – Keynote Speaker Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October**

### **“Economic Policy in a Market Economy” Maria Arvaniti and H. M. Polemarchakis**

In almost every economy with (environmental) externalities, every market equilibrium can be Pareto improved by a package of anonymous commodity taxes that causes prices to adjust and markets to re-clear at different levels of production and consumption. This constrained suboptimality of market allocations might provide a rationale for economic policy: it shows that policy makers should look for good tax packages that help everybody, rather than thinking that

taxes must inevitably be bad for some. The demonstration that competitive equilibria in economies with externalities are constrained suboptimal makes an important methodological point. Tax intervention is often said to be counterproductive because market equilibrium cannot be Pareto improved by anonymous taxes. Since externalities are ubiquitous, such a view is untenable. Tax intervention may be counterproductive because the fiscal authority does not know enough about the of tastes and technologies to set the right taxes and subsidies, but not because there are no beneficial taxes and subsidies.

## **Prof Sir John Sulston – Public Lecture Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> October and Chair Session 4 16<sup>th</sup> October**

### **“The University’s Essential Role in Greening Humanity”**

First and foremost we think of universities as institutions for research and education. But they are, or should be, so much more. Universities have a special and irreplaceable role in securing the future for people. The following comments are couched in terms of science, both because I am a scientist and because in science we see sharply certain dilemmas, but the arguments apply equally to all strands of academic activity. There are many different motives both for doing and for funding science, not quite the same thing, and we shall consider both. Irrespective of motivation, scientific research frequently gives rise to goods and services that are novel and valuable; this process has latterly come to be known as innovation. Indeed, many regard innovation as the sole purpose of science. However, taking a short term view of innovation is counterproductive because the greatest advances arise from unexpected findings. Furthermore, science stands in its own right as a cultural driver, which challenges and reshapes our perception of the human condition and of the universe around us. Through both innovation and understanding, science continually betters the human condition. But there is another side to the coin. Of late there has arisen a careless assumption that all innovation is good, and it is spoken of politically as the one goal that science and technology must strive for. This fits with free market philosophy, and compares favourably with stagnation from hidebound subservience to unchanging doctrines. But the free market, a wonderful servant on the small scale, is a dangerous master on the global scale. Driven by economic competition, innovation is proceeding at a frenzied pace, making us more and more successful to the point where we are damaging the earth and threatening our own survival. It is increasingly evident that our only enemy is ourselves. Too many people, consuming too many resources, in a world which, far from being made more equal by globalisation, is more unequal than ever. We are failing to face up to our responsibility as the transcendentally thinking, and therefore most powerful, organism of the earth. The situation is unbalanced in terms of human good. We forget that the pressure is an artefact of crude economic systems. We're not actually short of time at all. The earth still has a few billion years to go if we let it. Endless competition with one another for ever faster innovation is a false goal, and a dangerous one. The important thing is to understand, and to get the innovation right. In order to ‘get it right’, and so be sustainably successful, global society

has a need to balance different interests. Transnational NGOs are essential to that balance, and the universities have the potential to be the most important NGOs of all, accommodating and nurturing diverse goals, finding ways to do research that is not financially profitable, and keeping alive the flame of thought as they have done down the years. To act simply as businesses is not enough. The greater role of the universities is to give humanity the chance to survive and gloriously thrive.

### **Prof Yanis Varoufakis – Keynote Speaker Session 2 15<sup>th</sup> October**

“The Value of Nothing *What, if anything, can we do to prove A. Smith wrong?*”

Over the past 300 years, humanity has succeeded in pulling itself up by its bootstraps and creating the technology that allowed it a glimpse of a future liberated from want. More recently, however, the same path has led us to the edge of a precipice from which we are staring into a hideous abyss. While it is heartening to think that science can fashion a solution, the economics and politics of it all leave little room for hope. This paper suggests that, unlike science which can offer solutions, economics is an unsafe counsel and a terrible friend of those interested in "greening humanity". Since the days of Adam Smith, economic theory has struggled to understand *value* and *improvement* within the same 'model' of a market economy. Tragically, we endeavoured to solve the conundrum pseudo-scientifically; that is, by bleaching out of our models any notion of value that is irreducible to a combination of measurable variables. As a result, our economic theories (both neoliberal and otherwise) became as toxic as Goldman Sachs' derivatives (even though, just like Goldman profited inexorably, we too, as economists, acquired oodles of discursive power). The problem is that humanity must now urgently reform its economic institutions in order to harness the best science to the cause of arresting our collective descent into the aforementioned abyss. This paper argues that our task requires a readiness: (a) to set *all* economic theory aside, (b) to retrieve value as a concept separate from price, and (c) to strive for a massive technological project (e.g. a combination of the Manhattan, the Apollo and the Human Genome programs) the purpose of which ought to be the creation of an escape route back from an abyss of our own making.