

here the original text, version Sept. 2001

Klaus Ammann, [klaus.ammann@ips.unibe.ch](mailto:klaus.ammann@ips.unibe.ch)

see [www.botanischergarten.ch](http://www.botanischergarten.ch)

## The role of science in the application of the Precautionary Approach

*The thesis of this contribution is to demonstrate, that a static use of a sole, generally accepted definition of the PA will be extremely difficult, it does not meet the real needs of a Principle as an important legislative tool introduced in many important conventions with the goal to protect biodiversity.*

*The way out will be a more discursive model, a model which allows for adaptation to local conditions and which enforces solution oriented procedures.*

Discussions around the PA are usually concentrating on definitions. PA definitions are plentiful, they depend on the scientific and social background of their authors, they all are containing elements of truth and error. One of the basic problems of PA is that there is no such thing as an overall definition, the application of PA depends always heavily on the context. In my view it is of no use to solve the problems in the application of PA by achieving a generally accepted definition, since it is difficult to sharply define a principle where uncertainty is the main element. Terms and concepts like uncertainty always depend heavily on the scientific, social, cultural and economic background of people.

Problems in the application of the Precautionary Approach (PA) also have many other roots: the two most important ones are:

- The lack of knowledge of how the PA has been first defined and where it is coming from.
- The PA is too closely related to factual knowledge alone.

These two reasons also are the subtitles of the last two chapters of this contribution.

Let us first have a look at the most important definitions of the PA:

### **The roots of the precautionary approach and environmental debates**

We have to realize that the PA has been first introduced in the Convention of the Biological Diversity. It was there an nearly uncontested, meaningful "principle", based on facts of a deteriorating environment, an environment which obviously suffers from human activity of all kinds: There is pollution of the air, the soil, in some restricted regions even the forests suffered to a degree which was alarming. Heavy metal pollution is a reality, dioxine contamination just as well, although we have to admit that in the beginning environmentalists were exaggerating often, but it helped to bring the issue on the table. Due to the early times of exaggeration we do have a credibility gap in Europe related to the dying forest syndrome, whether we like it or not: the forests just refused to die... There was a time in the seventies where environmental debates in Europe where derailing. I think this happened when activists started to use deontic knowledge (how things ought to be) by mixing it up with factual knowledge.

But in the constructing period of the CBD there was no doubt that factual knowledge had to predominate in order to trigger some decisions.

It is true that some elements of the PA contained already other kinds of knowledge right from the beginning, but the real nucleus of the PA was always factual. Environmentalists soon brought up deontic knowledge (of how things ought to be in future), and very soon also some instrumental knowledge was developed on how to solve the environmental problems targeted. It was kind of a peaceful debate, where everybody was optimistic to solve the problems within a few years or, at the most, decades.

And then a lady known to all of us changed all this: Rachel Carson's Silent Spring showed us all that long term effects could harm birdlife seriously: The DDT shock even made us forget the good sides of this particular pesticide, namely that it saved according to official WHO statistics hundreds of millions of peoples life by killing Anopheles.

Gradually, environmentalists started to realize that ecological problems are so called 'wicked' problems, which are not readily solved and remedy is difficult to find.

I still remember those difficult days of endless debates about flux, modelling, circulation ecology, interdisciplinary or even transdisciplinary collaboration as the best way to solve research problems and to swiftly find solutions for environmental problems. In the end we all realized that what we called interdisciplinary or even transdisciplinary research too soon just degenerated into multidisciplinary structures, structures which were unavoidable, since research money was limited and had to be divided up logically).

Interdisciplinary work would have at least required some mutual understanding and eventual reaction to what the research partner does, and transdisciplinary work should include a planning phase in order to fix a common research goal and then try to get the necessary disciplinary groups to work together and, in the end, produce something which would be an amalgamate of all research activities – a dream I personally still nurture but today begin to understand why it is so very difficult to achieve.

This is all complicated further when we try to expand inter(trans)disciplinary work beyond natural sciences, including social sciences such as sociology, history, philosophy etc. When you do this you inevitably run into the trap of statistical debates and – I call it 'factualization' of the research work of all disciplines included. This is of course a dead end and will never ever lead to solutions with a broad consensus, which will also become politically important.

The discussion about PA is too closely related to factual knowledge alone

This now seems to be a paradoxical headline after the paragraphs above. I am convinced that the moment we put factual knowledge into the proper proportion to all other kinds of knowledge and try to analyze this in a true systems approach, we will hit through the gordic knot easily.

We must realize that the problems in the discussion about the PA are 'wicked problems', which means that linear planning will resolve nothing. This is why it is virtually impossible to resolve the problematics of how much ignorance related to factual knowledge is necessary to apply the PA.

### **How can we come from the knowledge to the action ?**

Some years ago the introduction of genetically engineered crops into the environment or to handle LMO's in international trade would have all been seen as tame problems to be solved with some sessions among executives, hand over the plan to professional PR people and they would have solved everything within a few months. It would have just been a matter of presenting some comprehensive scientific data and the solution would be nearly automatically defined.

But unfortunately, planning problems in the field of green biotechnology have now evolved into wicked problems with complex structures and no obvious causal chains. This applies also to the PA. These problems cannot be determined totally in a quantitative and scientific way, there are no solutions existing in the sense of definitive and objective answers alone.

Unfortunately, wicked problems have been treated mainly in two directions:  
Through formalised (linear) methods which are suitable only for the solution of tame problems.

Often solutions have been found empirically, with trial and error acceptable solutions can be found, gifted planners or regulators often develop good intuition taking into account also socio-economic factors. But deplorably, too often the systems approach working properly for tame problems ends in a fiasco when tackling wicked problems.

### **Systems approach of the first and second generation**

Much hope has been placed in the systems approach of the first generation, which certainly had its merits (Nasa missions, toll bridges, defence systems, designing a super crop etc.). Planning goals were "clearly" defined and all decisions were oriented towards these goals.

In general it can be said that the systems approach of the first generation has been followed by an era of disappointment, since it has not yielded what was expected of it: A number of large and complex projects such as urban renewal, improving the environment, tackling the nutrition problems of mankind etc. can only be considered as failures or partial failures such as the "green revolution".

The main reason is the fact, that the classic paradigm of (rational) Science and Technology is not applicable to the problems of open ecological and/or societal systems. It is very important to realise, that problems in biotechnology are not solely problems of science, but also problems of society. This does not mean that risk assessment should not be science based, on the contrary. It would be a big mistake to assume that the involvement of open structures in ecology and human society would give cheap excuses to deviate from the path of science, when it comes to questions of safety and regulation. Or, even worse, to abuse scientific language in order to achieve an ideologically stamped agenda as certain members of the newly grown (protest or biotech) industry are doing.

Professional management tools which are based on a systems approach of the second generation should not be mixed up with "Future workshops" with their frequent and inconsiderate use of pin walls when activist groups start their "planning". Rarely those actions have led to sustainable results, too often future-workshops (German "Zukunftswerkstätten") start with a fulminate brain storming and lots of enthusiasm and later on the participants go home to live their normal lives and they tend to forget about their big decisions taken earlier. If the workshops would be properly carried through after Müllert and Jungk, results would be certainly better.

We should also see the difference to "Collaborative Learning Workshops", which can be very delightful and thus also successful in the heads and consequently their subsequent decisions, but rarely such events achieve sustainable results either. It is exactly lacking the process of collaborative decision making. It is important to avoid a misunderstanding: Decision making is not in its basic structure a democratic process, it is a process where people genuinely involved are participating. To be even more explicit: Partners taking part in the decision making process should have their own and genuine interest in the cause, this avoids the danger of manipulation through clever PR, through populist and, even worse, fundamentalistic argumentation.

Consensus conferences and also citizens conferences are extremely helpful in cases of conflicts in the Public, but here again it is difficult to see that processes criticised will be changed to the better and negative trends are definitively turned around. Lets face the difficulties: How on earth can you expect a citizens group to learn about the complexity of solutions necessary within a few days of intensive briefing ?

Another kind of internal consensus conference is designed by the promoters of the "Syntegrity approach", which brings together corporate people in order to analyse internal dynamics and processes and to discern negative effects.

Despite the fact that there is a lot of effort becoming evident to design new planning and management methods negative results are predominant and are in fact part of a planning crisis, stemming from the seventies and which is still continuing today.

### **What is the "Systems approach of the second generation" ?**

Still, it is primarily the paradox of rationality which has been severely underestimated in the systems approach of the first generation.

The more questions we are asking the more answers are possible and vice versa.

Limitations of technological solutions are always hidden in the open ecological and social systems: Just compare the infamous case of DDT sprayings in the past. Constraints in possible secondary effects in ecology should be examined carefully: This is well demonstrated in the case of the Monarch larvae being killed by Bt-Mais-Pollen, the result of a highly sophisticated laboratory study where press interpretation got way out of proportion – even though the author himself warned about this. Would one have asked the farmers, they would have been able to say that feeding time do rarely overlap with pollination and that the plants the Monarchs are feeding upon are fiercely fought by them as a weed with herbicides.

In order to tackle with wicked problems you need to go through an extensive process of argumentation, also called objectification, not to be mixed up with an "objective approach" to the problem.

There is rational planning, but there is no way to start to be rational, one should always start a step earlier, since there are important trends and facts which will make straightforward rational thinking and acting in solving wicked problems useless. It is not the theory component, but rather the political component of the knowledge, which determines the vector of the action. This is the zero step so important in the publications of Horst Rittel. This is also the basis of the understanding of the term „Symmetry of Ignorance“.

As an example: The fact, that experts can be wrong and farmers know better in certain situations in agriculture because they are better observers out in the field. After all, agriculture is especially well suited to the systems approach of the second generation.

The knowledge needed in wicked planning problems is not concentrated in a single head. It is absolutely essential to let all partners be involved in the problem solution process, which includes part of the population (mainly farmers organisations and consumer organisations), the Governmental Regulators, the Non-Governmental Organisations, the Life Science Companies and the Scientists. There is no monopoly of knowledge, no one can decide alone on the PA. Having illustrated the difficulties in solving wicked problems, we need a new approach in problem solving, in order to avoid the pitfalls of ignoring bottom up feedback's.

You only can keep to this rule if you are also following another important rule: All partners in the planning process have to avoid hidden agendas, which is certainly eased by a minimum amount of respect paid to each other partner. Nobody should be criticised for speaking up in its own interest. It is wrong to perpetuate reciprocal accusations of 'abuse of the PA for conducting a trade war' or denigrating the PA for reasons of global unhindered trade for ones own advantage.

It is obvious in these times of growing difficulties in communicating biotech products, specially in agriculture, that all partners still have a lot of homework to do.

The Biotech Companies are populated with people who are convinced about their own products, since they now precisely about safety standards and regulatory processes. So far

so good, but these people live in a World of euphemisms and perfection, they develop with time a lack of understanding criticism from outside.

The scientists often are naïve enough to stick to factual, instrumental and explanatory knowledge alone. Many miss a very important point as Hannah Arendt put it: One of the most noble tasks of scientists is to make out of facts Public opinion.

The regulators should find ways and means to cope up with the growing speed of new developments. One of the main reasons why things in Europe turn sour is the fact that European regulation is way behind the one of the United States. On the other hand, this is an excellent occasion to see more clearly the geographical differences in the regulation.

Some of the NGO's have developed into powerful protest industries and are not interested in a thorough scientific analysis, since this could blur populist argumentation, which they need to keep up in order to get more donors, which are in fact their shareholders.

The Public is often lost between the two camps and, surprisingly enough, only a minority feels the need for better education, whatever this would mean according to the two camps described above.

### **How to Solve Wicked Problems in Biotechnology and the Environment**

What we need in such cases is an action oriented approach. Risk Assessment and Management must be seen as a planning strategy of the second generation in developing a professional framework for decision making.

Strategies have to be developed to recognise the consequences of our doing on one side, and to specify our knowledge on the other side. This knowledge has to be gained step by step and case by case: If we want to clearly distinguish our present state of knowledge (or ignorance as you wish) from appropriate decisions to be made not based on our views and opinions, we need to go through the following steps.

*What is the problem ?*

*What do we want ?*

*What are the alternatives ?*

*How do we compare them ?*

*How can we reach the solution ?*

All participants need to keep in mind that there are various types of planning knowledge (arranged according to the 5 questions asked above):

Examples given here are lumped together as simple keyword-illustrations, taken out of their context in real planning examples, they cannot be regarded as an example of a realistic situation, this would be exactly the task of a planning process of the second generation.

**Factual knowledge** is the knowledge of what actually happens (quantitative data or empirical, observational data).

Gene flow species by species / region by region / facts about insect resistance in agriculture.

**Deontic Knowledge**, the very important knowledge of what ought to be.

The knowledge about new crops which enhance agricultural production / new agricultural techniques to avoid erosion / new biological approaches to fight insect pests, imports should be segregated for Europe etc.

**Explanatory Knowledge** explains why things are so or why certain effects will happen. Here already you start to determine the direction of the solution.

The way Bt proteins are acting on specific pest and beneficial insects / what are the main reasons of unwelcome erosion effects / mechanisms of vertical gene flow / mechanisms of resistance development.

**Instrumental knowledge** on how to steer certain processes, on how to achieve certain goals, knowledge which needs to be balanced against regulation and safety.

The way how to build Bt and other genes into crops and how to stabilise them / how to avoid vertical gene flow / how to avoid unwelcome soil erosion / how to avoid early upcoming pest resistance.

**Conceptual knowledge** which would allow to avoid conflicts before they pop up. This is the knowledge about complex situations, taking into account all previous kinds of knowledge and also weighting them against arguments coming from open ecological and societal systems. Concepts about transgenic crops compatible to the ideas of a sustainable agriculture.

You need to go through an extensive process of argumentation, also called objectification, not to be mixed up with an "objective approach" to the problem. The hopes of this process are:

*to forget less, to raise the right issue*

*to look at the planning process as a sequence of events*

*to stimulate doubt by raising questions, to avoid short-sighted explicitness*

*to control the delegation of judgement: Experts have no absolute power, scientific knowledge is always limited.*

**There is no scientific planning.**

Solving practical problems as to develop sustainable transgenic crops cannot be dealt with by "scientification of planning". Dealing with wicked problems is always political because of its deontic premises (means that you have to involve knowledge what ought to be). Science only generates factual, instrumental and in the best case explanatory knowledge.

The planner (here the regulator who must take decisions in PA) is not primarily an expert, but a "mid-wife of problem solving, a teacher more than a doctor. Moderate optimism and careful, seasoned respectlessness, casting doubt is a virtue, not a disadvantage of an action plan manager.

The planning process of wicked problems has to be understood as an argumentative process, it should be seen as a venture (or even adventure) within a conspirative framework, where one cannot anticipate all the consequences of plans.

Systems methods of the second generation are trying to make this deliberation explicit, to support it and to find means in order to make this process more powerful and to get it under better control for all participants.

## **Outlook**

It is beyond logic and present day knowledge to predict some surprising outcomes in genetic engineering debates designed as above. Still there are some dreams and hints, which should be placed at the end of this contribution:

**"Precision Biotechnology"** could lead to a better design of crop seeds in future. Precision biotechnology would mean that a bag of seeds contains a great variety of different kinds of seeds related to resistance against many pest insects on one side, but all having a precisely designed genome for the product quality to be sold after harvest. Genomic research offers a great future and will greatly speed up modern breeding and add considerably to its precision. Here we also find the key of reintroducing some old concepts of getting modern agriculture closer to biodiversity again.

**Organic farming** needs in future go together with modern breeding methods including genetic engineering. This is in the eyes of the authors an absolute need but also a very

difficult thing to achieve, since the transgenic crops of the first generation are either not made for the strategies of organic farming or even worse, they work against such visionary strategies.

Maybe we need some newly designed products which will fit to terms like

### **Organo- Transgenic Crops and Organic Precision Biotechnology ?**

This vision would of course break up the present day harsh debate on the PA, we would at last have the possibility to develop a balanced approach to difficult PA decisions, which needs as a basis a balanced approach to risk assessment, including different kinds of knowledge just as described above.

Under these auspices we will have at least a chance to make a breakthrough in the presentday PA debate – but if we continue to fight about factual knowledge alone, little hope I can envisage to solve these problems, problems which have an international impact and need to be treated according to the latest insights in management and the systems approach.

### **Literature**

Ammann K., Y. Jacot and P. Rufener 1996: Field release of transgenic crops in Switzerland, an ecological risk assessment of vertical gene flow. In: Elisabeth Schulte und Othmar Käppeli (Hrs.) Gentechnisch veränderte krankheits- und schädlingsresistente Nutzpflanzen. Eine Option für die Landwirtschaft ? Schwerpunktprogramm Biotechnologie, Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung, Fachstelle BATS. S. 193-252. Gutachten BATS, Fachstelle für Biosicherheit und Abschätzung von Technikfolgen des Schwerpunktprogrammes Biotechnologie, Basel, S. 101 - 157.  
Siehe auch Internet <http://www.bats.ch/data/english/k3titel.htm>

Ammann K. 1999  
Pollen Mediated Gene Transfer, a Holistic view  
International Crop Protection Symposium, Jerusalem

Ammann K. 1999  
Development of biotechnology and its consequences for agriculture and rural areas  
In: Towards a spatial development strategy for the European continent. Perspectives of evolution of rural areas in Europe. European regional planning No. 62, Council of Europe, p. 25-28

Ammann K., Rufener Al Mazyad P. und Jacot Y. 1999  
Konzept und praktische Lösungsansätze zur ökologischen Begleitforschung. BATS Report 4/6.  
auch in: Nachhaltige Landwirtschaft und Grüne Gentechnik. Kriterien für Pflanzenzüchtung und Pflanzenproduktion unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Potentials moderner Biotechnologie, 157 pp. BATS, Basel

Ammann K. , Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen und G. Kjellson (Eds.) 1999  
Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel, 260 p.

Ammann K. 1999  
Setting the Scene II, XI  
in: Ammann K. , Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen und G. Kjellson (Eds.) 1999  
Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel, 260 p.

Ammann K. and B. Papazov Ammann 1999:  
Where do we come from, where do we go from here ? p. 199 – 204 in: Ammann K. , Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen und G.Kjellson (Eds.) 1999 Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and

science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel

Ammann K., Jacot Y., G. Kjellson and V. Simonsen 1999  
Final summary of the conference, p. 237 – 240, in: Ammann K., Yolande J., V. Simonsen und G. Kjellson (Eds.) 1999, Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel

Ammann K. ‚Debate‘, a moderated electronic biotech news network, apply through klaus.ammann@ips.unibe.ch

Bryant, J. and S. Leather 1992: Removal of deletable marker genes from transgenic plants: needless sophistication or social necessity ? TIBTECH 10(8), p.274-275.

Crawley M.J., R.S.Hails, D.Kohn and J.Buxton 1993: Ecology of transgenic oilseed rape in natural habitats. Nature Vol 363, No. 6430, 17 June, p.620-623. See also comments of Peter Kareiva in same Vol. p. 580.

Daele van der W., Pühler A. und Sukopp H.  
Grüne Gentechnik im Widerstreit. Modell einer partizipativen Technikfolgenabschätzung zum Einsatz transgener herbizidresistenter Pflanzen. VCH Weinheim

Dale Ph. 1992: Spread of Engineered Genes to Wild Relatives. Plant Physiol. Vol. 100, p.13-15.

Eigen M. 1988: Perspektiven der Wissenschaft. Jenseits von Ideologien und Wunschdenken. DVA, 288 S.

Fritzsche A.F. 1986: Wie sicher leben wir ? Risikobeurteilung und -bewältigung in unserer Gesellschaft. Verlag TÜV Rheinland, 1-614.

Gressel J. and Kleifeld Y. 1994. Can wild species become problem weeds because of herbicide resistance? *Brachypodium distachyon*: a case study. Crop protection, 13 (8): p.563-566.

Jacot, Y. und K. Ammann 1999:  
Gene flow between selected Swiss Crops and related weeds. Risk assessment for the field Releases of GMO's in Switzerland 99 – 108, in: Ammann K., Y. Jacot, V. Simonsen und G. Kjellson (Eds.) 1999, Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel

Jasieniuk M. and B.D.Maxwell 1994: Population genetics and the evolution of herbicide resistance in weeds. *Phytoprotection* 75 (Suppl.) p.25-35. (Proc. Herbicide Resistance Workshop - Edmonton 1993).

Lamberti F., J.M.Waller and N.A. Van der Graff 1982: Durable Resistance in Crops. Plenum Press New York and London, p.1-454.

Leisinger K. 1991: Gentechnik für die Dritte Welt ? Birkhäuser Verlag, 1-174.

Mohr H. Biologische Erkenntnis. Teubner Studienbücher Biologie, 1-222.

Niraj Verma 1998, Similarities, Connections and Systems. The Search for a New Rationality for Planning and Management. Lexington Books, 159 S.

Papazov Ammann B. und K.Ammann 1993: Wissenschaft und Menschsein. Festschrift Zoller, *Dissertationes Botanicae* Bd. 196, p.1-18.

Popper K. 1994: Objektive Erkenntnis, ein evolutionärer Entwurf. Campe Paperback.

Raamsdonk L.W.D. 1993: Wild and cultivated plants: the parallelism between evolution and domestication. *Evolutionary Trends in Plants* Vol. 7(2), p.73-84.

Raybould A. and A. Gray 1994: Will hybrids of genetically modified crops invade natural communities ? *TREE* Vol. 9, No. 3, March 1994, p.85-88.

Rittel Horst 1992: Planen, Entwerfen, Design - Ausgewählte Schriften zu Theorie und Methodik (Reuter W. Hrsg.). Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Rufener Al Mazyad, P. und K. Ammann 1999:  
Biogeographical assay and Natural Gene Flow, p. 95 – 98 in: Ammann K., Y.Jacot, V. Simonsen und Gösta Kjellson (Eds.) 1999, Methods for Risk Assessment of Transgenic Plants III. Ecological risks and prospects of

transgenic plants, where do we go from here ? A dialogue between biotech industry and science. Proceedings of the Bern International Conference, 28.-31. January 1998, Berne, Switzerland. Birkhäuser, Basel

Sukopp U. und H.Sukopp 1993: Das Modell der Einführung und Einbürgerung nicht einheimischer Arten - Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion über die Freisetzung gentechnisch veränderter Arten. Gaia 2 (1993), no. 5, p.267-288.

Theisen H. 1991: Bio- und Gentechnologie - Eine politische Herausforderung. Kohlhammer 1-193.

Vollmer G. Evolutionäre Erkenntnistheorie, 4. Aufl. S.Hirzel Verlag Stuttgart, 1-222.

Wilber Ken, 1986: Die drei Augen der Erkenntnis, Koesel, München, p.10.

Wrubel R.P., S.Krimsky and R.E.Wetzler 1992: Field Testing Transgenic Plants. an analysis of the US Department of Agriculture's environmental assessments. BioScience Vol. 42, No.4, p.280-288.