

-Center for responsible nanotechnology-

www.crnano.org

last update = November 2004

- Mission (copied from site) “non-profit research/advocacy group; money comes from grants and individual donations”
- Affiliated with WorldCare; www.worldcare.org. WorldCare has its board of directors easily accessible – they include academia, media, businesspeople, and former government workers. Also get their money from grants/donations and had easily accessible financial statement
- Board of directors = academia/environmentalists/activists/businesspeople with government ‘special associates’
 - Board is fairly balanced but it is mostly activists
 - Emphasis on international cooperation – but the international people are entrepreneurs, even though they are ‘social entrepreneurs’
 - Eric Drexler is on this board
- Views(copied from website):

● [Effective use of nanotechnology can benefit everyone.](#)

● [Unwise use of nanotechnology can be very dangerous.](#)

● [Nanofactory technology can be used safely.](#)

● [Preventing nanotechnology is impossible; careful study will be necessary for wise use.](#)

● [Effective use of nanotechnology will require intelligent and prudent](#)

[policy-making.](#)

● [The situation is urgent; nanofactories may be developed within a decade.](#)

This site has several links to educate the public, with some of the specifically meant to educate students on what nanotechnology is. They also have technical papers for free download and a blog. Overall this group focuses on educating the public on what nanotechnology/research advances so this way people can engage in *informed* dialogue about the societal implications of nanotechnology. The people that run the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology are very very open with absolutely everything that they do – this includes their sources of funding, their background, their views, and their goals. They have a Frequently Asked Questions page that very closely resembles the criteria for evaluating resources that we developed in class. This openness makes me trust these people, as does the fact that their views are actually quite similar to the views we seem to be developing in class – that we need to be cautious but optimistic. The founders of this group believe in the development/implementation of smart regulations for nanotechnology – but that research should go forward even though there are some dangers. People in this group believe that nanotechnology can be managed. This site is positive about nanotechnology as a whole but it manages to communicate this to the user in an unbiased fashion and I think that they do a good job of encouraging people to be open-minded who might not otherwise be that way.

-http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grey_goo-

Bill Joy (who co-founded Sun Microsystems) is a saint in a fictitious religion; the Foresight Institute and Silicon Valley are heretics; and nanomachines are going to over-run the world in a 'grey goo' (term coined by Eric Drexler) and humanity will end. The 'religion' is called First Church of the Grey Goo although any idiot can see it is a cult. As it turns out Bill Joy actually is actually extremely accomplished http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill_Joy - yet he mentions the Unabomber as an influence. I included all this in my analysis because it shows that stereotypes do not always hold true – here this guy is advocating the end of the world due to machines but he was also a pioneer in technology. He is respected in his field so that means he is capable of drawing attention to his views and spreading fear to the public. Eric Drexler, who actually originated the term 'grey goo' recently gave an interview: <http://www.nanotechweb.org/articles/society/3/6/1/1> stating that the earth will not be covered in nano "grey goo" because it makes no logical sense to build such machines. This paper was co-written with Chris Phoenix, of the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology – the first source I listed. This proves that despite the fact that there are some very paranoid people out there such as Bill Joy spreading misinformation about nanotechnology to people who actually listen (ie, cult people) there are also people like those at the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology doing a good job correcting them. I googled Bill Joy and out of the huge number of pages I found that had lots of people refuting his claims I really could not find any other than the First Church of the Grey Goo people that agreed with him. To me this means that people out there are rational, at least most of the time. But

with nanotechnology it has been prevalent in science fiction so any public education has to focus on the difference between paranoia and reality, even though science fiction has become reality before so that is difficult.

-The NanoTechnology Group Inc.-

<http://www.thenanotechnologygroup.org/index.cfm?content=1&Menu=1>

The purpose and mission of **The NanoTechnology Group Inc.**, is the facilitation of development of innovative Nano scale Science Education to include subject specific math curriculum targeted for grades preK-20, featuring Interactive Virtual Nano Science Classrooms for Global access and Virtual Interactive Nano Science Laboratories (nano-lab) for experiential learning, along with Massive Online Role-playing Games for Education globally. Resources developed for teachers and students will be added as they become available. As a Solution Based Organization, we continuously post new resources for teachers/students/parents while seeding the ideas into the matrix for implementation. Explore our site and if you resonate with our vision and mission, contact us for discussion of targeted projects for development.

Corporate

bias - nanotechnology is great! They want to nurture nanotechnology businesses big and small and train people to work in these companies.

funding - sure we'll take it all

The education portion of the site seems to be good - but it costs money! They mention an interest in ethics but it is a passing one and it is related to education, not really nanotechnology.

Summary: out of all of these sources the only real unbiased one was the nonprofit group. The other two for-profit profit groups, The NanoTechnology Group Inc. and Bill Joy both had clear agendas, while the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology had the agenda of promoting "safe nanotechnology," can be considered neutral

Maggie

Analysis of sources for midterm report

relative to the other sources, who either promoting mass fear of nanotechnology or promote almost entirely unconditional acceptance of it.