

Etična načela prilagajanja in blaženja
podnebnih sprememb : delo
UNESCO Komisije za etiko v znanosti
in tehnologiji

Dr. Luka Omladič
Univ. v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta
Unesco COMEST

What is Ethics?





- Ethics
- Ethics of Science and Technology
- Bioethics
- Global Ethics Observatory

World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST)



The World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology COMEST* is an advisory body and forum of reflection that was set up by UNESCO in 1998.

Chaired by Mr Rajaona Andriamananjara (Madagascar), the Commission is composed of eighteen leading scholars from scientific, legal, philosophical, cultural and political disciplines from various regions of the world, appointed by the UNESCO Director-General in their individual capacity, along with eleven *ex officio* members representing UNESCO's international science programmes and global science communities.

The Commission is mandated to formulate ethical principles that could provide decision-makers with criteria that extend beyond purely economic considerations.

COMEST works in several areas: environmental ethics, with reference *inter alia* to climate change, biodiversity, water and disaster prevention; the ethics of nanotechnologies along with related new and emerging issues in converging technologies; ethical issues relating to the technologies of the information society; science ethics; and gender issues in ethics of science and technology.

Since its inception in 1998, the functioning of COMEST has been guided by its Statutes adopted by the UNESCO Executive Board at its 154th session.

* Acronym taken from the French name 'Commission mondiale d'éthique des connaissances scientifiques et des technologies'.

[▲ Back to top](#)

RELATED INFORMATION

PAGES

- ▶ COMEST - Home
- ▶ Background
- ▶ Bureau
- ▶ Members
- ▶ Statutes
- ▶ Rules of procedure [PDF, 152 KB]
- ▶ Sessions
- ▶ Reports

EVENTS

- ▶ Ninth Session of COMEST and Twenty-second Session of the International Bioethics Committee (IBC)
Room II, UNESCO Paris, France, 29 September - 1 October 2015

CALL FOR ADVICE

- ▶ Revision of UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Scientific Researchers

PRIZE

- ▶ Avicenna Prize for Ethics in Science

-
-
-
-
-
-
-

DALE JAMIESON

REASON

IN A

DARK

TIME

WHY THE STRUGGLE AGAINST
CLIMATE CHANGE FAILED—
AND WHAT IT MEANS
FOR OUR FUTURE

Background for a Framework of Ethical Principles and Responsibilities for Climate Change
Adaptation. Paris: UNESCO, 2013

- (i) **Avoiding harming people and the environment** by failing to respond to climate change or by responding to it in an ill-considered way;
- (ii) **Fairness**: giving special consideration to the poorest countries and people, given their greater vulnerability and direct exposure to climate change for which they very often are the least responsible;
- (iii) **Equitable access** to actions that enhance capabilities and resilience;
- (iv) **The Intellectual and moral solidarity of humankind** enshrined in UNESCO's constitution;
- (v) **Environmental sustainability**, understood as embracing the protection of biodiversity and the integrity of ecosystems as the very basis of life on Earth; and
- (vi) **Common but differentiated responsibilities** articulated in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (Article 3) and the Rio Declaration on the Environment and Development (Principle 7).

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE: ADAPTATION AND
MITIGATION : UNESCO COMEST Oct. 2015

- **(i) Biological diversity;**
- **(ii) Cultural diversity;**
- **(iii) Interdependence of life on Earth;**
- **(iv) Intellectual and moral solidarity of humankind;**
- **(v) Global justice;**
- **(vi) Resilience;**
- **(vii) Sustainability (frugality, renewable energy, reforestation, water resources);**
- **(viii) Precautionary principle;**
- **(ix) The duty to share scientific knowledge; and**
- **(x) Integrity of scientific research.**

(1) Biological diversity; (2) Cultural diversity

- »Therefore, merely conserving the variety of organisms and species cannot guarantee the survival of entire ecosystems ... The systemic nature of climate change ethics requires actions that keep the equilibrium between ecological complexes in order to maintain, if not to strengthen, the diversity of relationships between organisms and their ecosystems. An imbalance in their relationship can have catastrophic consequences not only for the species that dwell in them but for other ecosystems that are imbedded in the network of relationships to which an ecosystem belongs. The Convention on Biological Diversity exemplified this complexity by elucidating the interactions between terrestrial and marine systems as functional units«

(1)Biological diversity; (2)Cultural diversity

- „In this perspective, the principle of cultural diversity affirms the diverse modes of participation by all nations in climate change mitigation and adaptation. It acknowledges various worldviews of nature and allows these worldviews to propose their own way of addressing the problems of climate change from within their cultural contexts. For example, indigenous philosophies give priority to harmonious relationships with nature wherein humans merely conform to the laws of nature.¹⁵ The principle of cultural diversity gives voice to a more pluralistic framework of worldviews and diversity of practices.“

(3) Interdependence of life on Earth

- »The scope of climate change implicates not only the past and future generations of humans but also the life-support systems that make human life possible. Life forms allowed for the emergence of humans who can care for the environment not only for the sake of human survival but for the benefit of other species as well. The principle of interdependence entails that the survival of one species contributes to the survival of others. Therefore, it is the responsibility of humans who benefit most from others that these be allowed to flourish for the sake of their own existence and not because they are needed for human utility.«

(4)Intellectual and moral solidarity of humankind; (5) Global justice

- »COMEST strongly suggests that all nations should pay attention to the principle of “do no harm”, as this can make a practical difference. This principle reminds countries to care about their greenhouse emissions and their negative impacts on the environment and vulnerable people, especially in the developing world. All nations have ethical duties and a legal responsibility to avoid harming others unnecessarily by avoiding unnecessary activities that aggravate greenhouse gas emissions while at the same time instituting “environmentally friendly” measures to substantially reduce these emissions.«

6) Resilience; (7) Sustainability

- “In many of these contexts, women are more vulnerable to the effects of climate change than men - primarily as they constitute the majority of the world’s poor and are more dependent for their livelihood on natural resources that are threatened by climate change. Furthermore, they face social, economic and political barriers that limit their coping capacity. Women and men in rural areas in developing countries are especially vulnerable when they are highly dependent on local natural resources for their livelihood.It is thus important to identify gender-sensitive strategies to respond to the environmental and humanitarian crises caused by climate change.”

6) Resilience; (7) Sustainability

- »Frugality as a practical principle balances the levels of consumption and production so that wastes are reduced to a minimum while the extraction of resources is limited to the replenishing capacity of nature. Ecological footprints are then reduced so that ecological niches are not extended beyond their carrying capacities. Technological innovations that follow the principle of frugality induce proportionality between the production costs and the financial capacity of consumers. Frugality does not mean sacrificing one's needs. It requires a discernment of the distinctions between needs and wants. Wants are simplified so that others may live simply according to their needs.«

(8)Precautionary principle

- »COMEST's working definition of the precautionary principle (PP) in its 2005 Report states that **“When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm”**²⁹. Instances of moral unacceptability were identified as follows: “threatening to human life or health, or serious and effectively irreversible, or inequitable to present generations, or imposed without adequate consideration of the human rights of those affected.”

(8)Precautionary principle

- »What has been stated above indicates that both adaptation and mitigation are linked to precaution, as they are both relevant in minimizing the harm of climate change. **Climate change adaptation and mitigation are preemptive measures** against threats to human life and the environment that entails systems complexity and unquantifiable scientific uncertainty and thus both adaptation and mitigation fall under the purview of the precautionary principle.«

(9) The duty to share scientific knowledge;
(10) Integrity of scientific research

- »Climate science also faces some specific challenges to its claim of integrity - because of its societal importance, climate science and climate scientists are under constant public scrutiny to reveal internal procedures, communications among scientists and the level of consensus in scientific community. **The society can expect climate scientists to follow the highest standards of scientific and research integrity, but it also has a duty to protect the integrity of climate scientists when they are criticized for economic, ideological or other non-scientific reasons.**«

The Serengeti strategy: How special interests try to intimidate scientists, and how best to fight back

© The Author(s) 2015
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0096340214563674
<http://thebulletin.sagepub.com>



Michael E. Mann



Photo credit: Brocken Inaglory.

Abstract

Much as lions on the Serengeti seek out vulnerable zebras at the edge of a herd, special interests faced with adverse scientific evidence often target individual scientists rather than take on an entire scientific field at once. Part of the reasoning behind this approach is that it is easier to bring down individuals than an entire group of scientists, and it still serves the larger aim: to dismiss, obscure, and misrepresent well-established science and its implications. In addition, such highly visible tactics create an atmosphere of intimidation that discourages other scientists from conveying their research's implications to the public. This "Serengeti strategy" is often employed wherever there is a strong and widespread consensus among the world's scientists about the underlying cold, hard facts of a field, whether the subject be evolution, ozone depletion, the environmental impacts of DDT, the health effects of smoking, or human-caused climate change. The goal is to attack those researchers whose findings are inconvenient, rather than debate the findings themselves. This article draws upon the author's own experience to examine the "Serengeti strategy," and offers possible countermeasures to such orchestrated campaigns. It examines what responses by scientists have been most successful, and how to combat the doubt-sowing that industry has done regarding the science behind climate change and other fields.