

**NANOTECHNOLOGY
AND THE HOPE FOR A
MORE EQUITABLE WORLD:
A MIXED METHODS STUDY**

by

Donald C. Maclurcan

A dissertation submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Technology, Sydney

2010

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this dissertation has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the dissertation has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the dissertation itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the dissertation.

Signature of Student

*“Anyone who believes exponential growth
can go on forever in a finite world
is either a madman or an economist”*

Kenneth Boulding

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest thanks go to my supervisor, Associate Professor James Goodman, who ventured with me into the unknown and guided me so wisely. To my co-supervisor, Associate Professor Mike Ford, and Professor Michael Cortie, both from the Institute for Nanoscale Technology, thank you for your confidence in sponsoring me as a student from outside the sciences and for the valuable direction, insights and opportunities you provided. To my colleagues from the Institute for Nanoscale Technology: Dr Carl Masens, Dr Benjamin Soule de Bas, Dr Burak Cankurtaran and Dr Dakrong Pissuwan, thank you for welcoming me to your ranks, and to my office-companion and mentor Dr David Xu, my heartfelt appreciation. To the staff from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, particularly Associate Professor Paul Ashton, Carolyn Carter and Juleigh Slater, for your guidance and administrative assistance, thank you. Special thanks to Dr Patrick Tooth for your assistance with Endnote™ and Dr Leigh Wood for your help with NVivo. To all the interviewees from Thailand and Australia and Emeritus Professor Tony Moon and Dr Patarapong Intarakumnerd for assisting in the facilitation of this research, thank you for making my ‘field’ experience so valuable. In terms of research, I acknowledge my collaboration with Drs Noela Invernizzi and Guillermo Foladori on the paper: ‘Nanotechnology's Controversial Role for the South’ (Invernizzi, Foladori and Maclurcan, 2008), parts of which I reference in Chapter 4 of this dissertation. Thank you both for adding immense depth to my inquiries. Special thanks to Dr Sue-Anne Wallace, Dr Natalia Radywyl, Joe Fitzgerald and Kate and James Maclurcan for copyediting, proofreading and advising on matters of structure for various parts of my work and to Julie Dardel for assisting with formatting as well as bibliographic and glossarial research. To the Bracken, Coote, Kremer, Inana, Logan, Norton-Knight, Satanyanda and Zehntner families, thank you for caring for me so warmly on my many ‘last’ writing retreats. To my family and friends, particularly Andrew McMillan, Lauren Simpson, Geoff Moore, Wafa Chafic, Suyin Hor, Tori Saint, Mickey Martin, Anna Louis, Jess and Jon Watkins and Jake and Fiona Logos who have long endured my struggles with this work, thank you for your ongoing care and concern. Finally, to my partner, for your patience and ever-loving support, may the memories of tough times fade with the dawning of each dissertation-free day!

PREFACE

This journey began with an upturned brochure in a park. I found it walking home one afternoon, spread open to a page about undergraduate courses in nanotechnology - an area ‘set to revolutionise industrial processes’ - offered at the University of Technology, Sydney. It was at this university that I was finishing a degree in Human Movement Studies. Whilst the brochure’s content made for an interesting read, I remained disinterested in studying science and, once binned, I moved on. Two weeks later, at the end of another fruitless meeting with the University’s careers advisor, I casually asked if they knew anything about nanotechnology. “No, but I think there are people on level 16 doing that stuff”, came the reply. Sure enough, I easily found the newly formed ‘Institute for Nanoscale Technology’ and, upon entering, was greeted by the Associate Director, Mike Ford. I deferentially explained that my background was not in science and that I was merely looking for more information, given my surprise at finding a brochure about the Institute in a park ten kilometres away. I had been in the room less than five minutes when Dr Ford proposed that, given the Institute was looking to ‘branch out’, I write a dissertation looking at nanotechnology’s social implications. I sat stunned. Mike and I had never met, I had little idea what a research degree entailed and I still did not have a clue as to what nanotechnology was, let alone the nature of its social implications! Revisiting the basic research proposal I submitted a week later still brings me a laugh, but the novelty of having an ‘outsider’ in a scientific institute must have blinded everyone to my lack of research experience because, three months later and not yet 21, I sat down in an office vacated by a visiting professor and started to think about nanotechnology.

At this time, I was particularly interested in deepening my academic knowledge of how the world worked so that, one day, I could take my place as a respected leader, addressing global audiences about necessary reforms and how we all must change... As part of my thirst for knowledge, I had been working with The Fred Hollows Foundation, a non-governmental organization whose work in reducing avoidable blindness in the global South had pioneered new technologies and approaches to capacity building. I thus leapt forward with my research, having decided to explore nanotechnology’s potential implications for the South.

Through the PhD journey, I have been able to look, in a broad, exploratory manner, at a largely uncharted area that remains surprisingly understudied. Of real privilege has been the chance to ride at ‘the boundaries’, engaging with the very different approaches of a sociologist and a physicist as my supervisors. Working across faculties, whilst exploring the interdisciplinary field of nanotechnology, has only added to the excitement. Furthermore, the chance to publish a good deal of my work has led to engagement in a number of regional and international policy meetings, deeply enriching the PhD process.

What I have learnt through this experience is the value of ‘process’ and re-formulating thought. My lengthy candidature has been constantly filled with a reflexive building of knowledge, across a very broad base. Similarly, as my understanding and critique of development has deepened, it has become clearer to me that nanotechnology is, at its sociological best, a medium to assess the processes and possible trajectories accompanying technological futures. In an unjust world, where struggles to avoid the co-option and mainstreaming of ideals are ever-present, there would seem to be value in bold creativity, grounded in existing wisdom.

As this phase of the journey ends, I realise I have transformed from someone looking to ‘change the world’ to someone looking to change the way I, and others, view it. I have uncovered a passion for exploring alternatives to the ‘growth’ paradigm and a particular interest in collaborative junctures between feminist, indigenous, peasant, Marxist and ecological thought. I now see ‘the boundaries’ as exciting spaces for new reflexivity, and finally recognise that the greatest resilience to avoiding co-option lies, as it always has, at the periphery.

Donnie Maclurcan

Inana, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables.....	xiv
List of Appendices.....	xvi
Commonly Used Acronyms.....	xvii
Scientific Glossary.....	xix
List of Relevant Publications and Related Chapters.....	xx
List of Relevant Presentations.....	xxii
Abstract.....	xxiv
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Central Questions.....	8
1.3 Aims and Approach.....	12
1.4 General Limitations.....	14
1.4.1 Self-Reflexivity.....	15
1.5 Significance.....	16
1.6 Chapter Outlines.....	17
1.7 Technical Notes.....	17
Chapter 2 Methodology.....	19
2.1 Mixed Methods Methodology.....	19
2.2 Methods.....	22
2.2.1 Literature Review.....	23
2.2.2 Quantitative.....	23
2.2.2.1 National Levels of R&D Engagement.....	24

2.2.2.2	International Research Participation	25
2.2.2.3	International Patenting	27
2.2.3	Qualitative	31
2.2.3.1	Key Informant Interviews	31
2.2.3.2	Thai Nanotechnology Practitioner Surveys	35
2.3	Conclusion	36
Chapter 3	Development, Technology & Inequity	38
3.1	The Creation of Inequity and Establishment of Development Debates	39
3.2	Foundational Approaches	41
3.2.1	Modernisation Theory	42
3.2.1.1	Western Technology and Development	44
3.2.2	Dependency Theory	48
3.2.2.1	State-led, Endogenous Innovation	50
3.2.3	Alternative Development Theory	51
3.2.3.1	The Critique of Technology	52
3.2.3.2	Intermediate, Appropriate Technology	57
3.3	Contemporary Approaches	60
3.3.1	Neo-liberalism	60
3.3.1.1	'Corporate Technologies'	63
3.3.2	Alter-globalisation	70
3.3.2.1	Emerging Technologies and Inequity	73
3.3.3	Mainstream Alternative Development?	84
3.3.3.1	Techno-fixes for Human Development	91
3.3.4	Post-Development	95
3.3.4.1	Technology as Power, within Biophysical Limits	98
3.3.5	Reflexive Development	99

3.3.5.1	Technology and Reflexivity	102
3.4	Conclusion and My Framework for Technological Assessment.....	106
Chapter 4	Nanotechnology, Development and Inequity	110
4.1	Understanding Nanotechnology.....	112
4.2	The State of Play	114
4.3	Interpreting the State of Play: Instrumentalist vs Contextualist Perspectives.....	120
4.4	Innovative Capacity.....	122
4.4.1	Instrumentalist Approaches to Innovative Capacity	123
4.4.2	Contextualist Approaches to Innovative Capacity.....	130
4.5	Technological Appropriateness.....	133
4.5.1	Instrumentalist Approaches to Technological Appropriateness	136
4.5.1.1	Energy and the Environment	140
4.5.1.2	Agriculture	141
4.5.1.3	Water.....	142
4.5.1.4	Healthcare.....	143
4.5.1.5	Construction	144
4.5.2	Contextualist Approaches to Technological Appropriateness.....	145
4.6	Approaches to Governance.....	156
4.6.1	Instrumentalist Approaches to Governance.....	158
4.6.2	Contextualist Approaches to Governance	164
4.1	Conclusion.....	170
Chapter 5	The State of Play	173
5.1	Global Engagement.....	173
5.2	An Exclusive ‘Global’ Nanotechnology Dialogue.....	176
5.3	Early Patent Control and Orientation	179
5.4	Conclusion.....	186

Chapter 6	Understanding Nanotechnology.....	189
6.1	Characteristics.....	189
6.2	Perceptions.....	193
6.3	Near-term Nanotechnology or Molecular Manufacturing?	194
6.4	Conclusion.....	196
Chapter 7	Innovative Capacity.....	198
7.1	Understanding the Nano-Divide and its Constructs.....	198
7.2	The South Left Behind	201
7.3	New Opportunities	211
7.3.1	Availability and Demand of Human Resources	215
7.3.2	Infrastructure	217
7.3.3	International Knowledge.....	217
7.3.4	Research and Development Costs.....	219
7.3.5	Comparative Advantage.....	220
7.3.6	Private Sector Support	220
7.4	Conclusion.....	220
Chapter 8	Technological Appropriateness.....	224
8.1	Benefits for the South.....	224
8.1.1	A New Paradigm.....	225
8.1.1.1	Control	225
8.1.1.2	Consumption and Costs.....	226
8.1.1.3	Universality and Complementarity	226
8.1.1.4	Potential to Unify.....	227
8.1.1.5	A Sustained Revolution.....	228
8.1.2	Areas of Application	229
8.1.3	Nanotechnologies and Appropriateness.....	234

8.2	Contextual Challenges: Old Rhetoric, Old Reality	237
8.2.1	Technical Claims	237
8.2.2	Development Claims.....	240
8.3	Societal Implications	248
8.3.1	Risk	248
8.3.2	Ethical	251
8.3.3	Legal	255
8.3.4	Social.....	257
8.4	Conclusion.....	258
Chapter 9	Approaches to Technological Governance	261
9.1	How to Become ‘Nano-innovators’	261
9.1.1	Planning	262
9.1.2	Resourcing.....	269
9.1.3	Supporting	274
9.2	Ensuring Appropriateness.....	282
9.2.1	Keeping Open to a Balanced Approach	282
9.2.2	Working at the Intersection of Market and Community	283
9.2.3	Building on Equity-Enhancing Resources.....	285
9.3	Responding to Risks.....	287
9.3.1	Appropriate Regulation.....	287
9.3.2	Developing Knowledge about Implications	291
9.3.3	The Public and Nanotechnology.....	294
9.4	Conclusion.....	306
Chapter 10	Conclusions	309
10.1	Review of My Aims and Research Questions	309
10.2	Key Findings.....	311

10.2.1	Understandings	311
10.2.2	Innovative Capacity	312
10.2.3	Technological Appropriateness	314
10.2.4	Approaches to Governance.....	316
10.2.5	Response to My Central Research Question	317
10.3	Limitations and Further Avenues for Research	319
10.4	Implications and Recommendations	322
	NOTES.....	325
	APPENDICES.....	339
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	363

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Physics, Biology and Chemistry Meet in Nanotechnology.....	4
Figure 1.2: Short- and Medium-term Nanotechnology Applications by Category.....	6
Figure 1.3: Products Incorporating Nanotechnology that are Currently in the Market	7
Figure 3.1: Who Decides Future Science? Comparison between Northern and Southern Countries.....	75
Figure 3.2: Share of Bacillus Thuringiensis Patents by Type of Holder.....	78
Figure 3.3: Similar HDI, Different Income and Similar Income, Different HDI.....	86
Figure 5.1: Graphical Representation of Global Nanotechnology, By Country and Level of Activity.....	174
Figure 5.2: Distribution of 1975-2004 Health-related Nanotechnology Patent Activity amongst the Top Seven Holders, by Country	180
Figure 5.3: Distribution of 2004 Health-related Nanotechnology Patent Activity amongst the Top Seven Holders, by Country	181
Figure 5.4: Global Distribution of 1975 – 2004 Health-Related Nanotechnology Patent Share, by Region	182
Figure 5.5: Categorisation of 1975-2004 Health-related Nanotechnology Patents by Specific Utility (Health Condition).....	186
Figure 8.1: Educational Backgrounds of Thai Nanotechnology Practitioners.....	228
Figure 8.2: Areas of Research by Thai Nanotechnology Practitioners.....	242
Figure 9.1: Strategic nanotechnology clusters coordinated by the National Nanotechnology Centre of Thailand.....	276

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Categorisation of National Nanotechnology Activity.....	25
Table 2.2: Classifications and Terms Used For Health-related Nanotechnology Patent Searches.....	28
Table 3.1: Countries with Biotechnology Production or Research Activity.....	68
Table 3.2: Nine Criteria for Democratic Technologies.....	104
Table 3.3: An Assessment Framework for New Technologies.....	105
Table 3.4: Themes and Criteria for Assessing Technological Reflexivity towards a More Equitable World.....	107
Table 4.1: Selected Developing Countries and Their Nanotechnology Activity.....	115
Table 4.2: Global Government Funding for Nanotechnology, 1997-2006.....	116
Table 4.3: Global Nanotechnology Publications by Nationality, 1997-1999.....	117
Table 4.4: Top 20 Patent Assignees, by Country, for Nanotechnology Patents Registered with USPTO, 2003.....	118
Table 4.5: Top Nanotechnology Patent Assignees with the USPTO, by Nationality and Sector, 2005.....	119
Table 4.6: Top 10 Applications of Nanotechnology for Developing Countries, Ranked by Score.....	139
Table 4.7: Principles for Adequate Nanotechnology Oversight.....	166
Table 5.1: Global Distribution of Nanotechnology Activity, by Country and Classification.....	175

Table 5.2: Distribution of 2004 Nanotechnology Conferences or Events, by Host Country.....	177
Table 5.3: Breakdown of Country Representation at Key Nanotechnology Conferences (2003-2005) by Presenter or Attendee	178
Table 5.4: Total Number of Health-related Nanotechnology Patents, by Country (1975-2004).....	179
Table 5.5: Distribution of Health-Related Nanotechnology Patent Activity (1975 – 2004), by Sectors	183
Table 5.6: Top 20 Institutions with Health-Related Nanotechnology Patent Activity (1975 – 2004).....	184
Table 5.7: Categorisation of 1975-2004 Health-related Nanotechnology Patents by General Utility	185
Table 6.1: The Six Fundamental Characteristics of Nanotechnology.....	190
Table 8.1: Potential Applications Resulting from Areas of Research by Thai Nanotechnology Practitioners.....	243
Table 9.1: Three Key Benefits of Clustering for Nano-innovation.....	275
Table 9.2: Guidelines for Respective Contributions to North-South Partnerships.....	280

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Justification of Interviewee Nationalities for My Qualitative Study...	340
Appendix B: Health-related Patent Classifications.....	343
Appendix C: Patent Rules.....	344
Appendix D: Top Ten Nanotechnologies for the Developing World.....	346
Appendix E: World Bank List of Economies (April 2004).....	347
Appendix F: Classification of Countries: DAC List of Aid Recipients, 2003.....	349
Appendix G: Thai Key Informant Details.....	350
Appendix H: Australian Key Informant Details.....	351
Appendix I: Key Informant Biographies (2004).....	352
Appendix J: Informed Consent Forms (English and Thai).....	359
Appendix K: Responses from Thai Nanotechnology Practitioners.....	362

COMMONLY USED ACRONYMS

AFM – atomic force microscope

AMO – atomically modified organism

APEC - Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation

BIOTEC – National Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (Thailand)

DNA - deoxyribonucleic acid

ELSI - ethical, legal and social implications

EPO – European Patent Office

ETC Group - Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration

EPO – European Patent Office

E.U. – European Union

FDA – Food and Drug Administration

GDP – gross domestic product

GM - genetically modified

GMO – genetically modified organism

IP - intellectual property

IPRs – intellectual property rights

JPO – Japanese Patent Office

LDC – least developed country

MDG – millennium development goal

MM – molecular manufacturing

MTEC – National Metal and Materials Technology Centre (Thailand)

NANOTEC – National Nanotechnology Centre (Thailand)

NECTEC - National Electronics and Computer Technology Centre (Thailand)

NGO – non-governmental organisation

NNI – National Nanotechnology Initiative (United States of America)

NSF – National Science Foundation (United States of America)

NSTDA – National Science and Technology Development Agency (Thailand)

OECD – Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

OTOP – One Tambon One Product

RS&RAE – Royal Society and Royal Academy of Engineering

R&D – research and development

STM – scanning tunnelling microscope

TRIPs – Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

U.K. – United Kingdom

U.N. - United Nations

UNCTAD – United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

UNDP – United Nations Development Program

UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

U.S. – United States of America

USPTO – United States Patent and Trademark Office

UTJCB – University of Toronto Joint Centre for Bioethics

WHO – World Health Organisation

WTO – World Trade Organisation

SCIENTIFIC GLOSSARY

Molecular Manufacturing – An anticipated technology based on Richard Feynman’s vision of factories using nanoscale machines to build complex products, including additional nanoscale machines.

Nanometre - One billionth of a meter or 10^{-9} metres.

Nanoparticle - A particle having one or more dimensions of the order of 100 nanometres or less.

Nanoscale - A length scale between 1-100 nanometres and the level of most atoms and some molecules.

Nanotechnology - The understanding and control of matter at dimensions between 1 and 100 nanometers, where unique phenomena enable novel applications.

Nanotube – A structure comprising atoms that form a hollow, nanoscale cylinder.

Quantum Dot - Semiconducting nanocrystals that differ in their ability to absorb and emit energy, based on the size of the crystal.

Quantum Mechanics - A set of scientific principles describing the known behavior of energy and matter that predominate at the atomic and subatomic scales.

Quantum Physics - The branch of physics which studies matter and energy at the level of atoms and other elementary particles, and substitutes probabilistic mechanisms for classical Newtonian ones.

Self-assembly – A method by which atoms or molecules arrange themselves into ordered nanoscale structures by physical or chemical interactions between the units.

LIST OF RELEVANT PUBLICATIONS AND RELATED CHAPTERS

Publication	Related Chapter(s)
Maclurcan, D. (2006), "Molecular Manufacturing and the Developing World: Looking to Nanotechnology for Answers", <i>Nanotechnology Perceptions</i> , vol. 2, no. 1b, pp. 137-41.	1
Maclurcan, D., Ford, M. and Cortie, M. (2004), "The Confusion Surrounding Nanotechnology", <i>Materials Australia</i> , vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 24-25.	1
Maclurcan, D., Ford, M. and Cortie, M. (2004), "Rectifying Nanotechnology Confusion and Redirecting Focus", <i>The Physicist</i> , vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 84-85.	1
Cortie, M., Maclurcan, D., Martin, D. and Ford, D. (2006), "Real World Nanotechnology", <i>Materials Australia</i> , vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 10 – 11.	1
Maclurcan, D. and Phelps, B. (2006), "Not-So-Magic Nano", <i>New Matilda</i> , vol. 87, no. 26, pp. 1-3.	1
Maclurcan, D.C., Ford, M.J., Cortie, M.B. and Ghosh, D., "Medical Nanotechnology and Developing Nations", in <i>Proceedings of the Asia Pacific Nanotechnology Forum</i> (proceedings), World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, pp. 165-72.	4
Invernizzi, N., Foladori, G. and Maclurcan, D.C. (2008), "Nanotechnology's Controversial Role for the South", <i>Science, Technology and Society</i> , vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 123-48.	4
Invernezzi, N., Folladori, G. and D., M. (2007), "The Role of Nanotechnologies in Development and Poverty Alleviation: A Matter of Controversy", <i>Journal of Nanotechnology Online</i> , Available: www.azonano.com/Details.asp?ArticleID=2041 .	4
Maclurcan, D.C. (2005), "Nanotechnology and Developing Countries: Part 1 - What Possibilities", <i>AzoNano Online Journal of Nanotechnology</i> , Available: http://www.azonano.com/Details.asp?ArticleID=1428 .	4

Publication	Related Chapter(s)
Maclurcan, D.C. (2005), "Nanotechnology and Developing Countries: Part 2 - What Realities", <i>AzoNano Online Journal of Nanotechnology</i> , Available: http://www.azonano.com/Details.asp?ArticleID=1429 .	5
Maclurcan, D. (2006), "Nanotechnology and Developing Countries", <i>Science Focus</i> , vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 1-9.	5
Maclurcan, D. (2006), "Nanotechnology in Developing Countries", <i>Iranian Nanotechnology Initiative Newsletter</i> , no. 103, pp. 8-15.	5
Maclurcan, D. (2006), "Nanotechnology in Developing Countries", <i>Iranian Nanotechnology Initiative Newsletter</i> , no. 102, pp. 16-24.	5
Maclurcan, D.C. (2009), "Nanotechnology and the global South: Exploratory Views on Characteristics, Perceptions and Paradigms", in S. Arnaldi, A. Lorenzet and F. Russo (eds), <i>Technoscience in Progress: Managing the Uncertainty of Nanotechnology</i> , IOS Press, Amsterdam, pp. 97-112.	6
Maclurcan, D. (2009), "Southern Roles in Global Nanotechnology Innovation: Perspectives from Thailand and Australia", <i>Journal of Nanoethics</i> , vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 137-56.	7
Maclurcan, D. (2010 - reprint), "Southern Roles in Global Nanotechnology Innovation: Perspectives from Thailand and Australia", in S. E. Cozzens and J. M. Whetmore (eds), <i>The Yearbook of Nanotechnology in Society II: The Challenges of Equity, Equality and Development</i> , Springer, Berlin, pp. 349-378	7

LIST OF RELEVANT PRESENTATIONS

Presentation	Date
“Make prosperity global: A holistic approach beyond quantitative growth” Second Conference on Economic Degrowth, Barcelona, Spain	Mar. 2010
“Nanotechnology and creativity at the edge” Asia-Pacific Science, Technology and Society Network Conference, Queensland Conservatorium, Brisbane, Australia	Nov. 2009
“Design for development” Symposium on Capabilities, Freedoms and Policy Making in the Pacific Region, University of NSW, Sydney, Australia	Nov. 2009
“Nanotechnology and the South: Moving beyond the divides” The Convergence of Conventional Microelectronics and Nanotechnology (Workshop), MINATEC, Grenoble, France	Sept. 2009
“Southern roles in global nanotechnology innovation” 3rd Workshop on Nanoethics, Aarhus, Denmark	Nov. 2008
“Regulating nanotechnology in the global South” NanoRisk™ 08, Paris, France	Oct. 2008
“Nanotechnology from a systems perspective” Global Youth Futures Festival, Sydney, Australia	Aug. 2008
“Nanotechnology and the South: frameworks, risks and concerns” Managing the Uncertainty of Nanotechnologies, University of Padua, Italy	May 2008
“Nanotechnology and the future” Breakfast Club, St Aloysius College, Sydney, Australia	May 2007

Presentation	Date
“Nanotechnology and the global South” Postgraduate Student's Conference, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia	Sept. 2006
“Nanotechnology and health: a comparative study” Second International Workshop on Nano and Healthcare, SASTRA, Thanjavur, India	May 2005
“Global equity in nanotechnology?” Expert Group Meeting, International Centre for Science-United Nations Industrial Development Organization, Trieste, Italy	Feb. 2005
“Nanotechnology at the border” Medicine at the Border, University of Sydney, Australia	Jul. 2004
“Nanotechnology and the health of developing nations” Asia Pacific Nanotechnology Forum 2003, Cairns, Australia	Nov. 2003
“Medical nanotechnology” UTS 5th Annual Postgraduate Conference, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia	Aug. 2003
“Nanotechnology in low income nations” Junior Common Room Research Presentations, St Andrew's College, Sydney, Australia	Aug. 2003
“Social issues in nanotechnology” Future Problem Solving Day, Loreto Normanhurst, Sydney, Australia	Jul. 2003

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation I explore nanotechnology's foreseen implications for the global South by asking: to what extent does nanotechnology offer hope for a more equitable world? Overall, I find that nanotechnology presently offers little hope, based on its failure to demonstrate a reflexive response to the legitimate requirements of equitable development.

My original contribution to knowledge is in placing nanotechnology's emergence within a broad historical and contemporary global context whilst developing and testing an interpretive framework through which to assess relevant claims. Furthermore, I establish greater clarity about the nature of global engagement with nanotechnology research and development and explore a range of perspectives, from within both the South and North, regarding nanotechnology's foreseen implications for global inequity.

Through a review of the secondary literature I identify four key themes around which to question nanotechnology's implications for a more equitable world, namely: understandings, innovative capacity, technological appropriateness and approaches to technological governance. To consider nanotechnology in relation to these themes, I use an exploratory mixed methods approach, consisting of two sequential phases. In order to establish the 'state of play', I first assess quantitative data surrounding national engagement, research participation and nanotechnology patenting. To explore matters more deeply, in the second, largely qualitative phase, I analyse the perspectives of 31 Thai and Australian 'key informants', supported by surveys of 24 Thai nanotechnology practitioners.

Through my research I find that there is agreement about nanotechnology's common characteristics but that, simultaneously, there are substantially different ways in which it is conceptualised. The result is a large variation in opinion surrounding various issues such as the expected entry costs and infrastructural requirements of nanotechnology research and development. Whilst there is evidence of widespread engagement and feasible entry points for some Southern countries into the budding fields of research and development, innovative capacity is shown to be increasingly centralised and

disengaged from ‘the local’, although the emerging gaps are as much South-South as North-South. In terms of appropriateness, nanotechnologies are seen as offering numerous technical advantages, but any associated benefits are set against numerous imponderables relating to risks and implications, as well as economic imperatives that can mean nanotechnologies are oriented away from Southern needs. In terms of governance, Southern approaches are found to largely focus on supporting innovation and managing risk at the expense of meaningful public engagement.

Overall, an increasing concentration of capacity and influence, simplistic hype that obfuscates key criteria of appropriateness and a largely ‘managed’ process of public engagement with predetermined desirable outcomes suggest that nanotechnology is likely to maintain and possibly amplify the inequities stemming from existing forms of technological innovation, such as biotechnology. Furthermore, debates surrounding nanotechnology and development remain so polarised that mainstream reflexive engagement seems unlikely.

However, whilst nanotechnology presently offers little hope for a more equitable world, I conclude that there is interesting new ground to explore at ‘the edge’, such as through ‘open source nanotechnology’ and other equity-driven practices. I argue that such boundary areas may allow nanotechnology to embody a process of ‘reflexive pluralisation’, leading to a more equitable world by revealing paths for innovation that are autonomous yet responsive to external change and opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation - de-linked from national economic growth yet meaningful to people’s lives. The field could then, as Schumacher proposed in 1973, blossom ‘a new orientation of science and technology towards the organic, the gentle, the non-violent, the elegant and the beautiful’.