

OAXTEPEC Declaration: Comments

I am ready to sign but I would like to say my opinion in a fundamental topic that is not considered:

Most of the nowadays problems in climate change, weapons technology, health problems, etcetera beginning in the former time, with myopic linear thinking or ambition of the involuted scientists. Scientists that have the intuition that his own activity is deviated in the wrong way but they have no the courage to be whistleblower to put in the light the ethical faults in the same activity, Science and the scientists are not a "not guilty" or innocent part of the problem. We studied the problem of the technopathogeny since more than three decades. Our conclusion is that the form in that science be done and the form in that technology be done need a deep criticism. A paradigm change My opinion in the declaration must be added clear the necessity of a new paradigm in the form science to be done and the immanent health risks of the technology be studied and prevented, The concept that science is neutral is wrong. Nuclear fission was mostly developed for war (see case Oppenheimer) and secondary was artificially justified for peaceful uses. To day the "scientific" justification of energetic uses of nuclear fission remain a fallacy. The arguments to defend nuclear reactors are good elaborated sofisms. The same to defend the innocuity theory of transgenic plants. Science is not a religion and the dogmatism and pseudo-infallibility of the "method" use for the evaluation in scientific communities must be critically evaluated. I will not repeat the ideas of Feyerabend, his general anarchistic view. I like to propose solutions. In this sense we need to act preventive. but it must be clear in the declaration that a science of the fallibility (as causative research object) of the science and technology must be incorporated to the new paradigm of science and technique in order to prevent and avoid the technologic caused health damage of the human being.

Yours Truly

Guillermo Miguel Eguiazu

Gerne hätte ich zur Liste der Forderungen ergänzt:

Der Staat sollte finanziell in die Lage versetzt werden, die Forschung weitgehend aus öffentlichen Mitteln zu finanzieren und sie so aus dem Einfluss der profitorientierten Unternehmen und Kapitaleigner zu befreien und sie hinsichtlich Aufgabenstellungen und Ergebnisnutzung an der Verantwortung für Umwelt, Mitwelt und Nachwelt der Menschheit orientieren. Dies könnte z.B. dadurch geschehen, dass durch eine Reform des Geldsystems der Strom an Zinsen von den Kapitaleignern umgelenkt wird in die Verfügung der öffentlichen Hand. Zur Zeit fließen allein in Deutschland pro Tag ca. eine Milliarde Euro von den Bürgern an die Kapitaleigner (= 1/6 des Bruttonettoprodukts), dadurch wird die schon weit auseinanderklaffende Schere zwischen Arm und Reich weiter auseinandergetrieben; dort liegt die wesentliche Ursache für Hunger, Arbeitslosigkeit und Terror weltweit, die aber aus einsichtigen Gründen kaum öffentlich angesprochen wird.

Nähere Informationen dazu z.B. bei www.inwo.de. Ich war in den 90er Jahren der Gründer der Ethikschutz-Initiative und des INES-Projekts INESPE und 25 Jahre lang bis jetzt Leiter des gemeinnützigen Vereins VIA MUNDI e.V. Ich bin nicht so geübt in guten englischen Formulierungen und bitte um Verständnis, dass ich auf Deutsch antworte. Mit besten Grüßen

Günter Emde, Germany

The only point I suggest to add to the proposed text of the Declaration of Oaxtepec is the following: See the first of the eight points proposed as "a bundle of measures (that) can be suggested": "Eliminate all weapons of mass destruction, above all nuclear weapons; eliminate (instead of "restrain", as in the proposed text) military forces and arms exports...." All the other seven points are compatible with my proposal, logically and practically. With my best regards,

Marco Antonio Martínez Negrete

I would like to congratulate you and other members of INES on your successful conference and on the eloquent and farsighted declaration which resulted from it. I strongly agree with every work of the declaration, and I would very much like to sign it. Let us work together for the goals that you have named! With warmest greetings,

*John Scales Avery, Ph.D. Associate Professor Emeritus, University of Copenhagen
Contact Person for Denmark, Pugwash Conferences*

Excellent document!!

Hugo C. Perez Rojas, Senior Researcher, Institute of Cybernetics, Mathematics and Physics, Member of the Commission of Scientists, Movimiento Cubano por la Paz y la Soberanía de los Pueblos, Cuba

Thanks for wonderful and successful conference in Oaxtepec/Morelos and Mexico City from February 29 to March 3rd 2008. I and our organization strongly agree with INES declaration Let us work for Science for Peace and sustainability. With best wishes

I thank you for giving this opportunity for signing the declaration: I SIGN IT ENTUSIASTICALLY.

Although, let me add some remarks, which I consider very important, even if they don't change my decision of signing.

1) I no longer believe in "sustainability" as such. "Sustainable development" is becoming a void and formal word, a veil to cover the continuation of wild exploitation. I obviously agree with the objectives cited in the Declaration, no doubt they would be a deep sign of change, but unfortunately I am maturing the belief that they would not be enough for saving the future of the Planet, for stopping and reversing the exploitation which is destroying it. Take into account that the changes in such a complex system may cause dramatic changes that cannot even be foreseen. We cannot know when and how some irreversible threshold is being surpassed. Since long, I think that the word very "DEVELOPMENT" should probably be abandoned, and I am accepting more and more the concept of DECREASE as necessary, in order to reverse the present, mainly economic, basis and logic.

2) A second remark is that not only nuclear disarmament must be achieved, but we should contrast the programs for future developments of "civil" nuclear power. They have no sound basis, other than strong economic and financial interests. The so called Fourth Generation nuclear plants will not be commercially available until 2040. Nuclear technology is so complex that nobody can be sure of the results into three decades, and guarantee that everything will work as they think, and no surprise and obstacle will rise. French failure with fast reactors was emblematic. Nuclear power is no solution (even less economic) to global warming, since even the doubling of nuclear plants working at present (with the substitution of the order ones, and those of East Europe) would reduce less than 5 % CO₂ emissions, with an enormous cost, and other terrible problems (proliferation, wastes, decommissioning, and so on).

3) In my opinion, stronger and more specific criticism and objections should be raised against the involvement of Science in military research, i.e. against the Military-Industrial-Scientific-Complex. In an International Conference on Nuclear Proliferation held in Florence last October, I had the opportunity of discussing with David Krieger the perspective of a petition towards the University of California, for their collaboration with the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory on nuclear weapons.

Thank you for your kind audience, best regards

Angelo Baracca, University of Florence