

**Values in challenging times
strategic crisis management in the EU**

Prainsack, Barbara; do Céu Patrão Neves, Maria; Sahlin, Nils Eric; Biller-Andorno, Nikola; Laukyte, Migle; Łuków, Paweł; Nys, Herman; van den Hoven, Jeroen; Mallia, Pierre; More Authors

DOI

[10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100553](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100553)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

The Lancet Regional Health - Europe

Citation (APA)

Prainsack, B., do Céu Patrão Neves, M., Sahlin, N. E., Biller-Andorno, N., Laukyte, M., Łuków, P., Nys, H., van den Hoven, J., Mallia, P., & More Authors (2023). Values in challenging times: strategic crisis management in the EU. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*, 24, Article 100553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100553>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Values in challenging times: strategic crisis management in the EU

Barbara Prainsack,^{a,*} Maria do Céu Patrão Neves,^b Nils-Eric Sahlin,^c Nikola Biller-Andorno,^d Migle Laukyte,^e Paweł Łuków,^f Herman Nys,^g Jeroen van den Hoven,^h Pierre Mallia,ⁱ Fruzsina Molnár-Gábor,^j Thérèse Murphy,^{k,l} Laura Palazzani,^m Tamar Sharon,ⁿ Renata Veselska,^o and Takis Vidalis^p

^aDepartment of Political Science, University of Vienna, Austria

^bFaculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of the Azores, Portugal

^cDepartment of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Lund University, Sweden

^dInstitute of Biomedical Ethics and History of Medicine, University of Zurich, Switzerland

^eLaw Department, Pompeu Fabra University, Spain

^fFaculty of Philosophy, University of Warsaw, Poland

^gCentre for Biomedical Ethics and Law, KU Leuven, Belgium

^hDelft University of Technology, The Netherlands

ⁱBioethics Research Platform, Faculty of Medicine & Surgery, University of Malta, Malta

^jFaculty of Law, Heidelberg University, Germany

^kSchool of Law, Queen's University Belfast, UK

^lRaoul Wallenberg Visiting Chair, Lund University, Sweden

^mDepartment of Law, Economics, Politics and Modern Languages, Lumsa University, Rome, Italy

ⁿDepartment of Ethics and Political Philosophy, Interdisciplinary Hub for Digitalization and Society, Radboud University, The Netherlands

^oDepartments of Medical Ethics and Experimental Biology, Masaryk University, Czech Republic

^pHellenic National Commission for Bioethics and Technoethics, Greece

Crises cause hardships and often existential threats to citizens. They also pose significant challenges to policy makers. Against this backdrop, the European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE) was, next to the Group of Chief Scientific Advisers (GCSA), tasked to produce expert advice on Strategic Crisis Management in the European Union. Their statement was published alongside the Scientific Opinion of the GCSA and an Evidence Review Report by the SAPEA consortium.¹⁻³ The EGE recognises that policy making should be based on sound scientific evidence that identifies the root causes of specific crises and analyses how different groups are affected by them. It highlights the need for public health authorities and political decision-makers to establish suitable opportunities for people from as many groups as possible to share their experiences and perceptions.

The EGE also stresses that all public policies are inevitably shaped by moral values. Making these values explicit is important as it opens these values up to public scrutiny. Doing so can improve communication and make decisions more robust: Policies cannot be defeated simply by bringing value considerations to bear afterwards that were not anticipated in advance. It also

increases legitimacy because stakeholders' values have been taken into account upfront.

One value that is of particular relevance in the context of strategic crisis management is solidarity. When solidarity is used as an analytic lens on how to prioritise scarce resources in our crisis management policies, for example, it can help to make more ethical and—socially and politically—more sustainable decisions. When it is used normatively, solidarity can help us to see (and act) beyond differences between people, and to focus on what we share and what brings us closer. It thus prioritises policy solutions that benefit everyone and particularly the most vulnerable, instead of pitching the needs of different groups in society—or different countries—against each other. In this sense, solidarity goes against the treatment of individual rights and collective goods as a zero-sum game, where one must give for the other one to gain.

Rather than seeing individual rights and collective goods as dichotomous, solidarity reminds us that they are complementary and require each other. People who are afraid to leave their homes due to high infection risk in public places, or because they fear armed conflict or other forms of violence, cannot exercise their individual rights. The same goes for people who cannot heat their homes or buy food. Similarly, lack of respect for individual rights will not lead to desirable forms of living and working together.⁴ Solidarity can bridge individual and collective needs and interests in the deep awareness of



The Lancet Regional Health - Europe 2023;24: 100553

Published Online 22 November 2022
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100553>

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: barbara.prainsack@univie.ac.at (B. Prainsack).

© 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

human interdependence across borders, social groups, and other boundaries.

As useful as solidarity can be in crisis management, it can also be misused. Too often, solidarity is appealed to in purely tokenistic ways by governments. During conflicts, solidarity has been mobilised by political leaders to promote nationalistic or racist goals. During the ongoing pandemic, officials have called on citizens to practise solidarity with others while neglecting to enact it themselves—by failing to provide adequate support to people who were struggling, or by failing to ensure global vaccine equity.

The EGE could have foregrounded many other values in its Statement—such as dignity, justice, or privacy, which all play crucial roles in strategic crisis management, too. The reason that the EGE chose to place emphasis on solidarity was to sketch how it can be used more fruitfully. This includes placing stronger emphasis on institutionalised forms of solidarity, not merely individual action. While interpersonal acts of solidarity between citizens can go a long way in crises, they need to be supported and upheld by institutional efforts. Without this, not only do we lose out on the positive effects of solidarity, but distrust, polarisation, and atomisation are likely to increase. Taking solidarity seriously as a guiding principle for crisis management means directing financial and other resources to solidaristic systems of social and economic support. Solidaristic systems are those to which people contribute to their abilities and from which they receive support as they need it. Societies with lower levels of social and economic inequality are better prepared to respond to most crises.⁵⁻⁷ Governments have a duty to combat poverty, to ensure that everyone receives the economic, social, health-related, and psychological support that they need. When people are economically safe it is also

easier for them to support others, and to comply with crisis management measures.

Contributors

This comment is based upon a Statement by the European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE), which advises the European Commission. As members of the EGE, all authors participated in writing the Statement. The Comment itself was drafted by the first three authors (BP, MdCN, NES), with contributions from all authors. All authors participated in the revisions and approved the final version.

Declaration of interests

All authors are members of the EGE, and many are also members of national bioethics councils. They have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

- 1 European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE), October 2022, Statement on 'Values in times of crisis: Strategic crisis management in the EU', European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Publications Office, 2022. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/79910>
- 2 Group of Chief Scientific Advisors of the European Commission (GCSA). 'Strategic crisis management in the EU', *Scientific Opinion No 13, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg*. 2022.
- 3 Science Advice for Policy by European Academies (SAPEA). 'Strategic crisis management in the European Union', *Evidence Review Report No 11*. 2022.
- 4 Biller-Andorno N, Zeltner T. Individual responsibility and community solidarity - the Swiss health care system. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(23):2193-2197.
- 5 De Schutter O. Global fund for social protection: international solidarity in the service of poverty eradication. Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Olivier De Schutter. Available at: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G21/093/37/PDF/G2109337.pdf?OpenElement>; 2021.
- 6 Marmot M, Allen J, Goldblatt P, Herd E, Morrison J. *Build back fairer: the COVID-19 Marmot review the pandemic, socioeconomic and health inequalities in England*. 2021.
- 7 Mamelund SE. Social inequality—a forgotten factor in pandemic influenza preparedness. *Tidsskrift for Den norske legeförening*. Available at: <https://tidsskriftet.no/2017/05/global-helse/social-inequality-forgotten-factor-pandemic-influenza-preparedness>; 2017.