

RICOMET 2017

Risk Perception, Communication and Ethics of exposures to Ionising Radiation

Session:

Social and ethical aspects in, and of, long-term exposure situations

Chairs: P. Crouail, M. Van Oudheusden, M.S. Cornu

Session threads

- Lots of concrete recommendations and findings
 - e.g. on what to do in post-accidental situations or to better prepare
- Must therefore also ask:
 - What are we learning?
 - How to communicate?
- But moving beyond communication based on fact finding towards mutual learning and listening
- Acknowledge the complexity of radiation protection: not technical OR social but socio-technical
- Reflective and critical
 - e.g. consider work of scientists and technologists

Vanessa Durand highlights

- PREPARE project (WP3)
- Recommendations and requirements for the management of contaminated foodstuffs
- Broad stakeholder involvement
- Respect stakeholder values
 - E.g. aim is not to promote the acceptability of the accident
 - MPL (maximum permitted levels) useful but questionable
- Optimisation process is more important than numbers
- We can never be fully prepared for a disaster but must anticipate

Liudmila Liutsko highlights

- SHAMISEN project
- Nuclear accidents are not only technical, but deeply psychological and socio-economic
- To learn lessons, look at past experiences, including good experiences
- Very concrete, tangible recommendations
- A broad approach has been taken into account: consider why, how, who?

Azby Brown highlights

- Iitate village: example of how nuclear disaster affects all, the stakeholder community is global
- Important to acknowledge that reactions and responses differ
 - e.g. Identity and lifestyle issues: difficult for some residents to abandon forest-centered lifestyles (picking and eating contaminated mushrooms)
 - e.g. Not everyone wants informed consent
- Big challenge of communication: overseas media tends to focus on negatives without recognizing ongoing efforts
 - How to counter this?
 - How to show complexity?

François Diaz-Maurin highlights

- Insights from SSH:
 - Illusion of information paradigm (U. Felt)
 - Problem in risk management (K. Brown)
- ENTRUST project: Building trust in nuclear waste management through participatory quantitative storytelling
- Aim is to synergize qualitative and quantitative = novel approach
- Does building trust suffice?

Susan Molyneux-Hodgson highlights

- Shifting the focus from publics towards scientific communities themselves
- Synthetic biology and dialogue efforts in UK
- Publics can ask sophisticated questions even without in-depth knowledge of science
 - E.g. How is science governed on a day-to-day basis?
- Radioecology
 - Radioecologists themselves continuously pose questions about the process of knowledge making (reflexive)
- Focus on processes and practices rather than only on factfinding and communication
- STS and “opening up”

Session threads

- Lots of concrete recommendations and findings
 - e.g. on what to do in post-accidental situations or to better prepare
- Must therefore also ask:
 - What are we learning?
 - How to communicate?
- But moving beyond communication based on fact finding towards mutual learning and listening
- Acknowledge the complexity of radiation protection: not technical OR social but socio-technical
- Reflective and critical
 - e.g. consider work of scientists and technologists