

Proximity and social research

► Juan María Cuevas Silva

How relevant are the bioethical discourses that have been built to understand life today? When approaches to the origins of bioethics are made, it is curious to find that a reference to the Nuremberg Code of 1947 is done, characterized by focus their concern in scientific research and medical manipulation when a research is done with humans. This code also emphasizes the entirely anthropocentric nature of medical research, speech that lasted several decades, forgetting or ignoring its meaning should be focused on everything that had to do with life. Thus, bioethics, contrary to other disciplines, comes first as an ethical discourse that questions the scientific practices that fall upon the man; he worries about "thinking rationally and compassionately" human actions that are promoted by techno-scientific advances, specifically in the areas of medicine. This caused a discursive system away from the social.

Miguel Kottow, special guest in this issue, argues that "just one aspect to be clarified is the lack of incorporation of the social in bioethical reflection, widening the gap between theory and practice, as well as reducing the actual impact of bioethics on social practices that are above all his concern: clinical medicine, biomedical research, public health." But it is not only socially understood within the rules of ethical and moral game that arise due to the medical-scientific practice, but an understanding of the social as a complex system of phenomena characterized by inter-relational forms and dynamics, where a "proximal bioethics" is

outlined, in which the value of dignity in relationships between living beings with other beings of nature is man's own responsibility, endorsed this view by Germán Vargas approaches and Teresa Arbelaez thoughts. These two argue that "Human beings are the only ones capable of dignity and that is the reason they can not evaluate economic or in a mercantilist way. Far from religious discourse, but ethical instead, it is up to humans make limits centered in not harm the other and to discern and make use of their freedom. More emphatically to establish that should jump from an anthropocentric bioethical discourse to a proximal bioethical discourse, where the neighbor is not just another human being, but the other being, in every sense of dignity.

The bioethical discourse should be questioned on its ideological intentions, must be transmitted from the essence not only of humanity, but also vital, of the natural and ecological, but if and when it has relevance to the real problems of society. It is time for the bioethical discourse land at the reality of life of living beings societies, and even of those who have been considered inert, but without its presence it would not be possible the balance of life in the rest of beings. In this vein, social research finds paradoxes that from the statements of Florencia Santi, put in crisis ethics and biomedical research, especially when such investigations are discussed in "situations of vulnerability

► 009

of beings "and you can not limit the vulnerability that arises from the relationship between humans only, but is a vulnerability for the lives of all beings.

Economic, social and current political processes and systems that generate science, technology and knowledge are presented today as the only parameters to determine the strength or vulnerability of life, especially in human society, which explained by Hernando Barrios in his article, the man is a consumer and prosumer especially in a technological world, contexts in which it is possible to rescue aspects that could face if force became more "reflective consciousness" and if you give "the importance of promoting and create opportunities for linkages between knowledge producers and the rest of society in order to achieve productive dialogue in pursuit of the common good "as Horacio Ferreyra address and Laura Bono.

In these same contexts, techno-scientific and techno-medical advances are significant and prolific, but since the investigation conducted by Monica Rincon and Fabio Garzón must be questioned in regard to its limits and practices, as they are not merely a system to extend life, but must be used towards the patient's life and those around the patient. But this problem can not be focused solely on human life, but also worth take it to other scenarios where life unfolds and where techno-scientific advances threaten the interrelation and interdependence of all living beings. So it is said by Isabel Cornejo and Eduardo Rodriguez: "are involved in the controversy beliefs, questioning issues like the role of God and the sacredness of nature; and also are given economic power struggles when the owning to patent life forms is generated."

The bioethical discourse pays attention to ideologies and paradigmatic mentalities of contemporary and modern society, so that their developments have been submerged by a logic that seeks to reconcile the cultural and social, economic and financial phenomena with the fundamental rights of beings to life, but these speeches

should be grounded and linked with social reality, as not all beings enjoy playing the techno-scientific progress, the amenities that emerge from the economic conditions, the privilege of soil and air pure, among other things, that at the same time allow forge a speech favoring the emergence of a narrative that, according to Omar Parra, "offers the possibility of a bioethical discernment in which moral issues associated merge cognitive reflection and emotional, to fairness and context". In other words, a discursive narrative that is generated and produced within a given social reality. It's not enough to lucubrations and speculative speeches outside the social reality, even less in the discursive narrative of bioethics productions.

Bioethics has an intrinsic value because it reflects on situations affecting specific realities that human subjectivity live, that beings that are considered non-rational faced and that suffer structural systems of nature and ecology. But these discursive narratives become incomprehensible and ineffective elaborations when empathy is not used. Understood this as posed by Cécile Furstenberg, taking Lipps' ideas, "empathy is to live as an own life the experience of the other, which the experience of the memory and the expected is integrated in a present experiencing. " An empathy that considers not only the human intersubjective, but in encouraging the experience with "the other" and "the other", so that anthropocentric momentum is exceeded and the transition to a holistic understanding of life is made. More than a complex and intersubjective game variant of life, is an interdependent game in which humans are privileged, but does not make us more than the other things, not only neighbor on another human being, is also neighbor "what other, "whose care it depends on continuity of life.

Thus, proximity, bioethical discourse, and social research are keystones in this edition. Proximity to the "other " and "the other", a contextual bioethical discourse that responds to the specific social reality and social research to transform the inter- relational practices among vulnerability in which the dignity of life is involved.