

Brief introduction to the formation of a scientific spirit for a Social Communicator and Journalist

LUIS FELIPE VALENCIA TAMAYO¹

Article received on April 5, 2017, approved for publication on May 25, 2017

Abstract

The understanding of contemporary reality requires more journalists to help overcome the gap between scientific knowledge and societies. More than an effort to know what happens in science, that understanding of reality is linked to an epistemology that supports the development of research and scientific work. Therefore, this text appears as a brief and pedagogical introduction to the young student of Social Communication and Journalism who, confused, often stays at the gates of philosophical and humanistic debate that there are about science, refraining from participating actively in the epistemological arena and, what it is even worse, eluding responsibility to connect science with the world.

Key words: Epistemology, journalism, scientific journalism, realism, anti-realism, principle of mediocrity.

For several years, the office of journalist and communicator has become more relevant in the contemporary world. Such a role, however, is far to be depth. Importance and depth are words that are shown in the realization of a professional in communication as antinomic terms or inversely proportional, to say it in clear signs of what can be a characterization of our culture.

As it becomes increasingly strange that the professionals are famous and deep at the same time, then the abyss that crosses the considerations about them becomes also greater. The relevance or fame that can have a communicator has been connecting quickly with charisma or grace, a certain donaire or, as it is popularly said, also because of becoming a notoriously famous. At that extent, depth may be more of a defect than the men of earlier times, for today's people need risky characters to say what they think without thinking, to tweet what they come up with without blinking, Decorate with a smile (or an emoticon) the pleasure of your own signature.

1 Luis Felipe Valencia Tamayo, writer, professor of Literature and Humanities at the University of Manizales. Master in Philosophy of Science and Language (University of Caldas), with research interests in art, philosophy, history, languages, literature, and sociology, among others. Email: lufevata@hotmail.com

Sometimes this importance can be harmless. By faking as drivers, hosts, presenters, commentators, columnists or editorialists, their fame on a good number of occasions is established as an irrefutable value of entertainment and the condition by which advertising has triumphed over thought. And in this there is not much problem, although sometimes it can raise the interpretation of an unrest that deserves better remedies. Journalism and the role of the professional communicator, in concrete terms, when assuming a burden in which many issues ended up falling into their hands, has tried to survive by juggling. And it is only to see the agenda by which can be interpreted in the training of a student of some Communication program: a little bit, so that the world is the best space for maneuver.

This, as it has been mentioned, is not really aggravating, although it makes the professionals that are formed be much more vulnerable to what they want to do from different levels, usually the most powerful ones. Nor is it an issue that can be resolved from the specializations that day by day appear from different scenarios. He can do it, of course, but the fundamental point involves the true conviction that a young journalist has to face the world and its complex dynamics in a much deeper way, something that in the contemporary academy happens to be only a matter of a few weeks.

The conviction of which I speak involves life itself, the passion, the desire to revise and question what has been tried to do with the thought itself, from the outside and from the inside. It is not a matter of agenda or of a couple of works; is simply a matter that must consolidate the true search for truth and pleasure itself to try, because that is what humanity has done, try.

The arrival of the twenty-first century brought, at the same time, a series of events for which one could hardly think that there was a conscience. From the social revolutions of the old colonies that have always brought about migrations, and phenomena of violence of a very varied nature, going through the consequences of a real transformation in the forms in which we interact, and arriving at the challenges imposed by nature and a planet that claims its strength and its response after decades of submission. Humanity today is in a state very close to the perplexity before the present and tomorrow. Many have decided to turn a deaf ear to what could be the ear-rings of the voices of the past and now the man seems invited simply to want to swim in extreme conditions, surviving the most crude uncertainties.

If we add to this phenomenon the displacement of the most urgent forces of human thought, that of intellectuals and scientists, we are, somehow, as orphans with honest and integral glances that help us to understand everything that is happening today and, as it is popularly said, everything that comes to us. This displacement - not to mention also - has been linked both to the repercussions of the media and their uses and to the gradual discredit in which the voices of the thinkers were falling after times when what they felt was their support for the Ideologies that underpinned the turmoil and wars of the last two centuries.

As if it were a game in which the teams have members and substitutes, replacing the personalities of thought who played a continuous role in interpreting the world and its ailments, journalists and communicators have come to play, and their positions and statements are now taken as the authorized voices to understand what the world may be. Think only of the fact that it is very difficult to find now a political party in which a serious thinker is found.

What is noticeable is that there has grown the number of advertisers, communicators, press chiefs, journalists, who have come to put on the T-shirt that in good measure came to use the intellectuals of yesteryear. And that only mentioning the case of politics and taking a general example. Particular cases abound in the defined traits of what is done with an account in a social network, with a poster or an advertising campaign.

However, this same fact, paradoxically, is provoking a series of increasingly interesting consequences to analyze, not only from sociology, but from the psychological and historical understanding of what we are. The arrival in the White House of a president like Donald Trump, for example, has generated a series of ruptures with the visions and readings of the world that are tending from these new political horizons of the mass media and the accounts in social networks. Something profitable is coming out of the awkwardness, for sure. Therefore, it is urgent that those who are graduating in careers such as journalism and social communication determine much better their epistemological channels and the paths by which they can carry their thinking. Unprepared, journalists can only end up being spokesmen of how much nonsense is offered as “official voice.” Warned, an awakening to clarity and criticism itself can be refined to account for the renewal of an old conviction: it is worth searching the truth and clarifying what actually happened.

Depth

In the first place, and to give a necessary dose of clarity on this point: all human beings, from all times of history, are largely superficial. In other words, you can also say that everyone is free to be as superficial as he wants. The depths of knowledge and things that we can truly know are so unattainable that it is difficult to measure what it means to be profound. However, we can make an inquiry on this subject to encourage, thus, a formulation of what may be a search for depth as an epistemological horizon.

From the history that mankind is taking to this area of the universe, we have very little time. This short journey, however, turns out to be a complex scenario in which there have been a series of phenomena that, in many different connections, take us along the path of successions, legacies and learnings of what has happened. At that level, there is much to be investigated, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to define what really happened.

We also have as scene of our intrigues the world itself, nature, the environment and the understanding of everything there is. What surrounds us, no matter how much we get used to it, is a panorama from which we can hardly get well if we are asked what is happening there. The detailed review of the picture gives us an opportunity to awaken to an inclement ignorance: what happens in an area of the patio where a universe of insects appears to appear? Why are the behaviors of others how they are? What are the reasons for being of the day, the night, the movement, the light? We can all survive without the answers to questions like these, but the point is that mankind has tried on all fronts to try to deepen the inquiries about it.

I think it is understood that we can all be as superficial as we want. Yes, it is our freedom. But despite the complex universe that silently imposes cognitive challenges, it is feasible to clarify the panorama to give answers that find possibilities to understand and even face the crudeness of the environment. Every time we ask questions about the causes and reasons that lead things to happen the way they are, there is a determination to be satisfied with what is offered as the initial response and with what can be compared in the inquiry that every possibility offers, and yet in the simple exercise, whatever path one takes, a Socratic principle is offered as an initial understanding of depth: "I only know that I know nothing."

Do we really know why the cosmos works the way it does? Do we know why life has the particular "rules" it raises? Do we understand why words, language, the brain, are inserted in discussions, arguments, currents of thought, in the way they show it? All these questions are answered with a healthy "we know only a little". What we do not know is so impressive that just realizing it activates in our minds the simplicity of everything we supposedly know.

And there begins the search for depth. As we go through the different stages of existence and put in place through education, we enter different horizons of knowledge that involve someone who has done a previous job to our benefit. Without Aristotle, without Galileo, without Newton - to mention only three names that easily come to thought - we would not be what we are. And they were aware of the great cognitive vacuum involved in thinking the mystery of the world. Paving the way for new generations to integrate better into what can be that understanding is also part of their legacy. Even their mistakes are a fundamental part of their heritage: a basic way of understanding where things are going and not going.

For all of this, let us concretize that the fact of being profound simply involves a desire to recognize the mystery of the universe and to confront it in order, hopefully, to have better answers than those given by mere intuition. The strength that underlies the characterization of depth lies mainly in giving thought a plane of execution in which, although many ideas appear, not all can be a cognitive interpretation of reality.

This is a principle that has been known for several centuries as "Ockham's Razor" and what it says, in a nutshell, is that if we want to think about reality, we must stop swallowing all ideas - including ours - that come to thought. While this is a principle that provides support for scientific thinking, I am sure that every human being, and more to a journalist, it is very good to accept this procedure prior to any kind of speculation.

The "Ockham Razor" does not close the door to the understanding of the fantastic nor reject the most irreverent ideas that may involve thinking the cosmos and the universe, no, and there may be a misunderstanding of what is this procedural principle. The concept of the "Ockham Razor" is that we must first work on the simplest explanations given to the phenomena and then, if that is the case, go climbing to the habitual invocations of a mind that likes to fantasize a little around words.

To set an example that can be useful as a correlation to any type of disquisition that we can meet, think of common cases in which a missing person, they are all headaches for those

who expect news of their lost loved ones. The mind begins to search for answers and there are all kinds of weaving stories from the simple scenario of mental possibilities. A missing person, for the mind that begins to intrigue, carries hundreds of answers, most of them rarely successful. The "Ockham's Razor" involves bringing the mind closer to the options closest to the very fact of the disappearance and its causes, which implies a methodological work in which serenity and doubt are valuable characteristics. Does it deny the very fact that the causes of the disappearance are fantastic, religious, extraterrestrial, and magical? No, "Ockham's Razor" does not imply this negation, but it does direct the discrimination of causes in an order that, many times, what the mind first gives is skipped. Divine intervention, UFOs, crossing thresholds between multiple universes and things like that is not outside the framework of possibilities, but they are given their place after having demonstrated that the missing person is not in much more "earthly" places. And there begins the search for depth. As we go through the different stages of existence and put in place through education, we enter different horizons of knowledge that involve someone who has done a previous job to our benefit. Without Aristotle, without Galileo, without Newton - to mention only three names that easily come to thought - we would not be what we are. And they were aware of the great cognitive vacuum involved in thinking the mystery of the world. Paving the way for new generations to integrate better into what can be that understanding is also part of their legacy. Even their mistakes are a fundamental part of their heritage: a basic way of understanding where things are going and not going.

For all of this, let us concretize that the fact of being profound, simply involves a desire to recognize the mystery of the universe and to confront it in order, hopefully, to have better answers than those given by mere intuition. The strength that underlies the characterization of depth lies mainly in giving the thought a plane of execution in which, although many ideas appear, not all can be a cognitive interpretation of reality.

One of the recent problems of journalism has been the fact that, because of pure sensationalism, because it is really attractive, offers fantastic, religious or esoteric possibilities, as part of the postulates that can explain the reasons that certain things happen in this world. However, this works of fiction, stories of superheroes, aliens, worlds in which spells and magic powers are fundamental to the development of the plot. The X Files, a TV series of the 1990s in which two detectives faced each other week to week and faced difficult cases that they had to solve, is a good example of how investigations can be landed. It is fiction, we know, but it characterizes the use of "Ockham's Razor" in the exact way in which researcher Dana Scully comes from. For her, clues, the interview of witnesses and suspects involves that the causes of a phenomenon occur within specific conditions of clarification: the conditions of rationality-yes, this is a term to be explained. On the contrary, her companion, Fox Mulder, indicates through his procedures that what he wants to achieve is to involve in his work a series of metaphysical revelations for which only the concept of irrational fits. Fox Mulder, without making use of the "Ockham Razor" principle, does his research beginning with what should be the end. The series, as part of its fictional appeal, privileges Mulder's interpretations as a measure of a script that always leaves the path open to the unknown, beyond as a latent part of the interpretation here.

Facts / Intuitions, feelings, impressions

The previous example has been useful several times to point out the contrasts that there can arise a vision that, we humans, have of things. And there are accentuated, in addition, two visions that, in their contradiction, reveal the confrontation that we can have in the look of the same facts. The symbols, the elements of daily life, the senses of a belief or the same skepticism continually condition the debate about how we live and build something called knowledge.

In this situation, many have called for epistemological anarchy. Myths, religions, doctrines, currents, scientific disciplines, traditions and rituals come to be seen in that call as parts of a setting in which no one has “more reason”, but all approaches are presented as equally “reasonable.” It is not necessary to deny that this type of speculation on the diversity of the world has its attractiveness and, why not to say, until it sounds decent to give a climate of validity to the interpretation of the mysterious world. However, it is difficult to build knowledge or try to approach the truth of who we are and what if we simply let ourselves be attracted by that peculiar call.

On one side are the facts of the world and on the other hand are the interpretations and opinions that we may have about them. I know that much has been said in recent decades about the truth of the facts in a world that seems doomed to the manipulation of the same ones by the politicians and also, with a great sense of guilt, of the mass media. However, falling into the delusion that it is not worth exploring what actually happened because the picture is dark only brings terrible consequences for the validation of knowledge. The validation or not of the facts is imposed as one of the main points in the agenda of all research. And with it I do not only refer to scientific research, but also to journalism and disciplines that, increasingly, appear to be outside the validation of information, such as history.

We can continually present opinions about what we believe the world and reality is, we can show sensitivity for the things that surround daily life - for better or for worse -, as I have pointed out, everything can affect us in different ways - but It does not make the facts or the world, much less reality, behave at our whim. Not even anyone’s craving. It is always easier to say and say things in the world. The difficulty is to extend the horizon of cognitive experience by meticulous inquiry. Perhaps encouraged by the remnants of politicians, many journalists end up inhabited by these same symptoms of sickness related to reality. And there not only rooted professional problems, but pernicious examples of construction of thought and criticism.

This does not mean that what is said of the world, on account of a rigorous and well thought out investigation, is always true. Not at all. This is one of the special features of the construction of knowledge: this construction is unfinished; What is developed does not become absolute truth. Then many would wonder with some dismay, since opinions are not knowledge and since the positions that are consequences of the investigation about reality cannot guarantee the truth, why should these consequences be given priority over opinions? The answer may sound a bit strange, but part of a simple use of our reasoning: because those positions are the best option available.

In order to support us in the way of the construction of knowledge we could be happy with opinions and feelings, “hunches” of all kinds, but the space of scientific theories and knowledge is connected with the invocation of a desire to have better tools to face Our latent ignorance of what is happening. All phenomena can have explanations arising from opinions, intuitions that men, by their hierarchy, position, authority, for example, have imposed as formulas to understand what happens. And socially, many communities have relied on these formulas without blaming them. From fear or laziness, much of the history of mankind has been tied to this approach to knowledge. But the claim of research is part of a very human but sometimes obscured intuition, the idea that we can reframe and better know what happens. We are going to the facts and not to the sensations. Let us study them, let us turn them around, let us doubt what has been presented as an official.

A journalist who only serves as an echo for the opinions of politicians, a journalist who closes himself to the deep investigation and the contrasting of what has been wanted to sell as truth, behaves more like a campaign manager. Than implies to stop being the promoter of the same restlessness by the understanding of the world and is based in the infinite course of the opinions. What it is said is an opinion, is it tied to a sensation, a hunch? Or, on the contrary, what it is said and even what it is heard or read is based on a critical view of the world in which it is worth contrasting what is offered?

As the world does not behave at the whim of anyone’s opinions and will always blush - at least - to those who have simply sold smoke as knowledge, in the long run the truth will show its flashes and will make ridiculous those who simply “say”. It has been a growing feature in the media and in the increasingly widespread use of social networks the effervescence of opinion. It is said much, as in an eagerness to demonstrate that, according to the liberal creeds, everyone has a voice. It is from the simplest to the most complex. Nothing has the minimum filter. About the injury of a player, about a call, about public policies, make predictions about everything that will come; This and that, “virtual urns” are opened to try to define majorities and minorities that say nothing in general terms and, what is even more telling, that they represent nothing in terms of the conditions under which they occur and The current directions of society are legitimized. The only obvious fact here is that the *opinometer* has been turned on; On the other hand, the facts still await many better explorations.

And the sad thing is that when the best explanations of what happens should be taken into account, they are rarely taken into account, and this is because no one is taking the trouble to read the long, judicious documents that have battled against the initial opinions. In this distortion between what happens and what is thought, politicians turn out to be the specialists, passing over the best studies, the patient inquiries, the rigorous tests that speak to the fullness of a scientific spirit that, albeit badly, persists despite the irreverence and outbursts of postmodernism and “afterlife.”

A recent and at the same time very eloquent example, is the position of US President Donald Trump on global warming and research that indicates that the planet is going through one of the most overwhelming moments in its history. With the usual confidence that alone convinces those who only want to hear an opinion, has made of his speech a vision on the facts

of the world. Those who better understand what is happening with the Earth know that the president thinks as a citizen; however, it is precisely when it is felt that the weight of certain opinions on certain facts can lead to disastrous results.

I remember that some professor used to tell me in one of his classes that the opinions of philosophers come and go, they have no problem, their decisions about what to believe and why they do not really have relevance, but that cannot be said of Who with their power make life depend on others. That is where good judgment has to do its own thing, because nobody expects a doctor, an engineer or a president, to simply give an opinion and do what his ignorance commands. Men who enter the world, know it, investigate it, offer a criterion to value it and face difficulties; Those who do not, simply say. There is a wide difference in this, and for this reason a journalist must be more and more aware of what opinion implies (work of sensibility, impressions, intuitions) and the criterion with which a fact can be understood of the investigation, the meticulousness and the counterintuition, inclusively).

Reality and truth

Reality and truth are two terms that we continually face as human beings. We give them by our way of understanding life; We use them as a tool, as a vehicle for the orientation of ideas, as well as when we say “really ...”, “actually ...”; However, thinking about them is no longer so simple and becomes problematic “truth” terms. Epistemology has to do with them and, unlike the rest of the disciplines, touches them with tweezers.

To save us discussions and introductions that could well lead us to many more pages of speech, the journalist must simply assume that reality is there and that it is possible to find the ways by which the truth can be clarified. And it is not that the journalist should avoid becoming a philosopher, not at all, because he is well immersed in these readings, but that put to work with judgment should guide his purposes as a doctor before his patient, as a scientist before the exploration of World around him. The patient is there, his illness can be interpreted and a treatment can be elaborated; for these, the world has certain conditions that can be understood, regularities from which formulas, theories, and laws can be extracted.

To question reality as something “out there” can be a fascinating element in the history of thought and epistemological debate, but in practice it carries terrible consequences. To assume that reality “is there”, which surrounds us and is perceived by our senses, is a fundamental principle of realism, a current that is the basis of the structuring of scientific thought. Can you be anti-realist? Yes, of course, conceptually you can be so many things; However, assume the consequences of the anti-realist determination (that reality is not, that reality is in the mind, that all that is meant of reality is valid because it can not be shown that reality “is there” Etc.) does not allow to clarify the panorama of the construction of the knowledge and the only thing that would have would be an interesting notion for some speculative work that, usually, is developed in good fictions. In fact, in the review of a number of fantastic novels and science fiction are elements that involve such speculations, but also

novels, as objects of reading in this world, in this reality, are products of a practical work also linked to the unfolding of scientific ideas.

Realism, by eluding the very problem of thinking about reality (an unresolved mystery), shows that it is the lucky risk of connecting with what is “out there” and trying to understand it. Not otherwise arise the disciplines. It is difficult to imagine, in practice, an antirealist journalist - well who can be conceived as a character of some postmodern work -, however, the growing ignorance of basic mathematical tools, of theories connected with the understanding of biology, geology, Physics and even astrophysics, makes that character more and more feasible. The continuous effort to make the journalist a humanist has been confused many times in making it part of the most extravagant visions of the world's understanding when, in the very order in which the challenges for our own survival are presented, Such visions should be a matter of personal use, almost of entertainment.

What makes antirealism profitable is the fecund imagination with which knowledge can be impregnated, the unfolding of a spectacular condition by which we also become characteristically human. But such knowledge can not be equated even with that which is regularly offered by scientific experience, yet this experience is an approximation and, it must also be acknowledged, an approximation containing errors. The realistic approach is at the base of the application of brilliant minds such as those of Aristotle, Galileo, Newton or Einstein, and every time mankind has focused its tasks on following them occurs an extraordinary phenomenon that has a double valuation: we learn to see the World with new eyes and, if we want, secondly, we learn from their mistakes to continue vindicating exploration for truth.

Epistemological knowledge

Questions about reality and truth; the dimensions of rationalism, empiricism; The use of deduction, induction, the “Ockham Razor,” the matters of contrasting to which each philosopher and school have given their own nuances; All this is part of what an epistemologist must know and learn to collate. As it has been already pointed out, for a philosopher, it may be very hard to put all possible obstacles to the scientific exploration of the world. To a large extent, that has been the interesting history of philosophy. But it cannot be the same to a journalist.

The rigorousness of the journalist is tied to the handling of small details of his daily training that make it much closer to the very understanding of what happens in the ways of facing reality and truth. If he is a journalist who does not know whether he is realistic or antirealist, who does not understand the signs of a postmodern and relativistic thought, or worse, who does not know how to differentiate a mathematical operation from an argumentation, is a journalist who is lost completely in its epistemology. He is vulnerable to any kind of discourse and prone to believe that sciences and pseudo-sciences are almost the same thing.

Let us not fool ourselves believing that this is just an issue to be resolved for those journalists who think of being scientific disseminators. The lack of a worldview and an epistemology makes all dialogues turn out to be tortuous, both in the exploration of science as in sports,

cultural activity, mass phenomena, among others. Saving proportions, it is like the journalist who is going to interview an author without having read one of his books.

Viewed in this way, epistemology translates into an awareness of what happens behind the scenes in the development of knowledge. This awareness involves the understanding of concepts such as those mentioned above and reading between lines of what implies the endorsement of realism as the basis of cognitive experience. That science is wrong, halfway - indeed less than half-way -, that it can not offer any certainty, and that its postulates are the absolute truth about reality, are but three of the consequences drawn from the Approach to scientific realism. Fortunately, these results allow a continuous construction of knowledge in the opening to debate and criticism that reevaluate the channels through which science runs. The opposite of what can be said from the lands of postmodernity and pseudoscience.

In the history of the development of scientific ideas there are many notions that have been discovered as falsehoods. But this, for the benefit of each generation, is a very gain in the unfolding of knowledge. Today we know many things that our ancestors took as exaggerations and we have technologies that seemed impossible for previous times. To consider them a matter of chance, as it is done from the antirealist thought, cannot be part of a reflection that dignifies the investigation. We must also anticipate that many of our current speculations will be regarded as errors of tomorrow, but therein lies the humility with which the progress of science must be characterized: a development of which no one has the last word and which is always in building. The big question that can be asked, is how willing are all to collaborate?

The enemies of science are not only those who deny it epistemological support - anti-realists, irrationalists, postmodernists - are also those who from different spheres - religious, political and cultural - accuse the development of science of all crimes of humanity, ignoring that, conversely, it is scientific ignorance that brings calamitous results in the presentation of policies, conventions and all kinds of social and human affairs. For example, we have a single planet on which to live and the usual political ignorance of science is what makes it an unviable stakeholder. I am often surprised about how, given the calamities and natural disasters that are not lacking in history, they are asked to speak to scientists after everything has occurred. Are they consulted before any realization? Little, maybe just enough so that everything seems viable. The same thing happens with health, nobody cares to scientifically prevent the vulnerability of your body. Everything comes later, when the pains become raw illnesses. These are irrational ways of acting that affect the lives of individuals and societies by equal. It is there where the beginning of a scientific worldview could be reflected in the life of citizens.

Also, at the same time, it can be reflected in the notion of a simple life. Not only in journalism but in many spheres of life, there are people who still hold that the Earth is the center of the universe and that, we humans have some special destinies to fulfill. In every part of the world, thought becomes even narrower, assuming that its race, its creed, its way of seeing life is superior to that of other regions. It is normal for many journalists to have epistemologically unsustainable positions in which they assume that the place they occupy is the best, that the race that surrounds them is the best and that the state of their society is the best

and can still improve. As these statements can not only be verifiable, but arise from a festive attachment to what surrounds the life of the person who enunciates them, they are only part of the colorful and often egotistical way of seeing things that many men have had from their status as citizens. The comprehension of what happens in the cosmos and in the universe has nothing to do with the fact that we can contemplate it, the wisdom that human existence is due to a series of mysterious circumstances and that even its disappearance would affect what may occur in other places of the unimaginable universe, all this is a fundamental part of an epistemological criterion that guides the way of scientific clarity. That understanding is also a principle worth underlining: the principle of mediocrity.

A latent contamination of our thinking are the intrusions of an ego that likes to feel protagonist of every tale touches. Taking into account the role of opinions, that aspect becomes visible. And there are citizens, journalists, men of all kinds to whom their ego becomes their main wall to better understand reality. Blinded by their own opinions, men habitually see themselves as a work of a superior intelligence that makes their own thinking marked by a path full of light. The principle of mediocrity is what seeks a particular consciousness that defines thinking around the search for laws and regularities that can exist in what we call life. In this sense, the principle of mediocrity is related to "Ockham Razor" and to realism as a fundamental part of what is the very simplicity of scientific development, a simplicity that definitely has in its spirit a noble character, humble, because we are always at the beginning of the understanding, not at the end. That is part of the beautiful consequences of the Copernican revolution.

The principle of mediocrity does not refer to that position that can be taken from leaving things half-way or making them poorly done; On the contrary, it is the awareness that our knowledge is not complete because it surrounds us with the very mystery of what involves this development of something so complex and simple, at the same time, as life is. Good, evil, beauty, ugliness, justice, injustice, happiness and love, arise as unresolved issues within the framework of an acknowledgment that none of it has some transcendent factor in the background. These factors have been added by us as humanity, under different motives and colors, and to understand why we have done so, I could place ourselves in a situation where the output is to feel special. What the principle of mediocrity tells us is that it is much wiser to prevent such temptations and to continue to explore the reasons that make us be like we are with the awareness that we may not get the answers. In this task the laws of nature have been unveiled, however, still very scarce to give the conclusions as closed. You have to keep an open mind to understand that many things happen for no reason.

A journalistic challenge

Much is said about the journalist's work. It is not necessary to hide that, in the midst of the democratization of the societies that have reached in these centuries of history, the massification of the means and the expansion of the journalistic exercise, the critical horizon on the work of those who participate in the media. Much of the accusation lies in the classic difference between objectivity and subjectivity. If some journalist takes the head believing himself as

very objective, it is easy that from some tribune it is cut. If another says that his exercise is more subjective, he cannot expect to survive in the public guillotine. The true challenge of a journalist lies in the understanding of his work as the builder of a better informed, documented society, able to understand what happens and what will happen with a great empathy for humanity and the planet. If in the realization of these purposes he receives accusations, he can at least have the serenity to accept that everything is subject to improvement and that his office is also one that is in the process of being built.

Seen this way, the journalist has in his hands an educational role from which he cannot marginalize himself. From any shore, the communicator claims his longing to always be sensible, objective, truthful, humble and respectful in the understanding of scientific realism. The search for truth and its despair, the conditions of human knowledge, the disenchantment of politics itself and the illusory attachments to politicians, the impulse for a better education and a critical eye on those who restrain it or make it only a business, are aspects that must be in the continuous reflection of those who make journalism. Connected to these are many more, but behind all there is one more important: the understanding of its place as cognoscent subject in the world, in other words, the path of a being with a scientific worldview.

Scientists may feel that the gap between their research and the public is broad: it is the duty of journalists to shorten it continually. It must still be a pity that a good number of people, if not the majority, conceive of the “real” participation in the world of ghosts and curses as the conditions of scientific testing and the knowledge derived from them. In this case, the failure of education has been more than notorious, but in large part is due to the fact that the commitment to a true pedagogical adventure and literacy is much more expensive than keeping people with their good or bad notions about what is happening. The key is that journalists do overcome the obstacles that education itself already has and for which scientists feel, sadly, quite isolated. The adoption of a scientific criterion and a worldview is undoubtedly a question that is a substantial improvement in the way we can all inhabit the planet. With this, the consequences of the postmodern and relativist visions that have tried to put in the same place all sorts of knowledge are left naked and without help; In this way, the light versions, the imprudences, the calamities involved in assuming a world in complete ignorance are diminished. With this they are discredited to the politicians who, with all their assurance and without blushing, make their voters end up believing how much idiocy goes through their heads. But for that to begin at least to be witnessed, it is necessary that the journalist be rigorous with himself and with what feeds his knowledge.

To achieve this, it is necessary to undertake a review of those concepts that have marked the very life of thought and which yield the very benefits of scientific knowledge. Openness to personal discussion, to reflection itself, even to questioning and to doubt, are the motivation to renew the path of understanding that the world needs today. Being able to rethink knowledge and stagnant stories as unquestionable certainties is a fundamental engine of knowledge. Reviewing prejudices and valuing new elements that are involved in the construction of knowledge are, unlike what can be believed, strengths of the epistemological adventure. If there is new information that goes against our rooted opinions and with them awakens a higher valuation of what there is, it is fair to rethink, rearrange as a subject that is part of a

world that is still very good to surprise to generate knowledge. This same requirement must be shared with potential interlocutors.

In his own way, the journalist - with his scientific clarity, with an increasingly clear epistemological approach to his office, based on the lines of realism - should give rise to a continuous reflective spirit that gives priority to the search for a development of science and a lifestyle that supports it. To motivate desires of knowledge and not of resignation, to bring the debate in the best terms and with the most stimulating minds, to favor an opinion more and more rigorous and not severed by the habitual prejudices, are the base of a journalism that reduces the distance between the place where society lives and what the development of science offers as answers.

I know that these desires involve an educational spirit in which all forces should work with a single mentality and here is where difficulties arise. Science still has too many enemies. I would only hope, for the time being, that you, dear reader, were not one of them. But if that is the case, think about whether the answers you have about certain phenomena are better than those provided by scientific development or, if on the contrary, what concerns you is that such development proceeds by an understanding of the world that harms you. The enemies of science are usually human beings who do not much care to think more convenient answers for whatever life and quality of life of people. Unfortunately, in the current state of things, politicians and priests, economic and social groups, fundamentalisms of all kinds, have a fear of being shaken from their positions of power with what science can tell them. And we see it palpable in the panorama of the alleged debate of ideas that is rapidly becoming and degrading in a religious, economic or political matter.

If the media persists in making the main detractors of science as power figures, then society has no future that could dignify the opportunity for more and better generations of men. The challenge, although seems an issue that can be easily solved - because when it comes to awareness, everyone seems to line up quickly to do so - the truth is that it involves a series of shocks that involve the approach to a way of thinking and to act continuously, in coherence with the activation of a fully modern critical spirit, almost of a new Renaissance.

In addition to confronting the same detractors of science, the journalist must sharpen his eyes on the current challenges in the development of communities. Global warming, climate change, diseases, vaccinations, sustainable development, implementation of optimal territorial planning, control and abuse of drugs, medicines, pesticides, reforestation, conservation and care of resources, drinking water quality. Each issue is a place on the agenda of judicious communicators and journalists. And the agenda will continue adding more and more issues to clarify.

A healthy worldview is not only a characteristic of the most refined scientists, it is a duty of thought and citizenship. The journalist, in obtaining the information that guides the information and in the very use of those, confronts himself in his vocation to want a society that can decide better and that has values of scientific thinking that mitigate the risks of falling in the hands of the different fronts that have planted themselves as enemies of science. The epistemological debate is well, it is part of the very roots of philosophy and the humanities; The criticism and the disquisitions among the intellectual currents also manage to make

their bet on a metaphysical question of wide repercussions. Nevertheless, the journalist, in his judgment, makes of his work and of his encounter with the world, one based - hopefully responsible - from the realism.

For this reason, from the media, the press, television, radio, journalists are required who live up to realistic interpretations of what happens. Together with an urgent task of better scientific dissemination, the consolidation of journalism that, in any newsroom, claims the debate with epistemological support goes through one of the strengths in the very formation of the communicators who pass through the classrooms of the programs of Journalism in the world. To shake off the misunderstanding and embark on this interesting adventure that leads to a better reading of the philosophical debate and what scientists are doing today is, more than a detriment, a heritage of humanistic formation.

References

- Alcíbar, M. (2017). ¿Por qué la divulgación científica es la Cenicienta en el Reino de la Ciencia..., y debería dejar de serlo? Blog *La torre de marfil en ruinas*. Disponible en versión online de la revista *Investigación y Ciencia*. <http://www.investigacionyciencia.es/blogs/ciencia-y-sociedad/98/posts/por-qu-la-divulgacin-cientifica-es-la-cenicienta-en-el-reino-de-la-ciencia-y-debera-dejar-de-serlo-15173> (Recuperado el 20 de febrero de 2017).
- Bunge, M. (1985). *Seudociencia e ideología*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Bunge, M. (1996). *Intuición y razón*. Buenos Aires : Editorial Sudamericana.
- Bunge, M. (2006). *A la caza de la realidad: la controversia sobre el realismo*. Traducción de Rafael González del Solar. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Bunge, M. (2010). *Las pseudociencias*. Traducción de Rafael González del Solar; prólogos de Alfonso López Borgoñoz, Cristina Corredor y Rafael González del Solar. Navarra: Laetoli.
- Carter, Ch. (1993). *The X-Files*. [productor serie de televisión]. Ten Thirteen Productions, 20th Television, 20th Century Fox Television.
- Dunbar, R. (1999). *El miedo a la ciencia*. Traductor Miguel Ferrero Melgar. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Feyerabend, P. (2003). *Provocaciones filosóficas*. Introducción, traducción y edición de Ana P. Esteve Fernández. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Maxwell, N. (1984). *From knowledge to wisdom: a revolution in the aims and methods of science*. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Newton, W. H. (1987). *La racionalidad de la ciencia*. Traducción de Marco Aurelio Galmarini. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós.
- Rescher, N. (1993). *La racionalidad: una indagación filosófica sobre la naturaleza y la justificación de la razón*. Traducción de Susana Nuccetelli. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos.
- Rescher, N. (1993). *Los límites de la ciencia*. Traducción de Leonardo Rodríguez Duplá. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos.
- Rescher, N. (1999). *Razón y valores en la era científico-tecnológica*. Compilación e introducción de Wenceslao J. González. Traducción del inglés por Víctor Rodríguez [et al.]. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós, I.C.E. de la Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

Valencia, L. F. (2012). Chesterton y los crímenes milagrosos. Revista *Filo de Palabra*, (Núm. 12), 11-21.

Valencia, L. F. (2016). La naturaleza de la ficción. Revista *Escribanía*. Año 19, Vol. 14, (Núm. 1), 43-50.