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Abstract
Research in the Spanish-speaking world possesses a considerable degree of dependence on the forms and approaches originating in the United States. While it shouldn't necessarily be considered negative to pay attention to the United States, it is both negative and alarming to "give in to" the United States and renounce the "traditional" approaches and styles of the Latin and European world. Even worse is to present the research under the "sovereignty" of the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) which, no matter how much it tries to come across as a scientific institution, is dependent upon a corporation: Thomson Reuters. In this event, it's doubtful that knowledge in communication and journalism can be trusted to the market, no matter how democratic it claims to be.
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1. Introduction: Transgression of “Orthodoxy”
Goodbye to the prevailing rigid rules to be able to publish a university research article. I risk that the new “Sanhedrins” of science accuse me of whatever they please: endogamy, arrogance, a lack of rigorousness, of journalistic style (which is the most ridiculous and anti-academic accusation made by some evaluators)¹ Goodbye to the rush to publish to accumulate merits -did the idea of patience being the mother of

¹ There are experts who, when dealing with the "Criteria for the acceptance of manuscripts" in scientific journals, establish as one of the positive aspects in their self-presentation: "good writing (clarity, brevity, precision), good organization (logical coherence) and good presentation of material". It's possible that we academic journalists have many defects but our journalistic style is undoubtedly that which best complies with the previous requisites. See: Delgado-López-Cózar, Emilio and Ruiz-Pérez, Rafael and Jiménez-Contreras, E. The Edition of Scientific Journals: Directrices, Criterios y Modelos de Evaluación., 2007, at: http://www.fecyt.es/fecyt/docs/tmp/550433876.pdf, pp. 200, consulted, 5/8/2014. It's not exactly a style that we are able to use in the media but it does move away from the over-elaborate exhibition of supposedly scientific words.
science recede into history? - Goodbye to publishing technical articles full of formalities and functionalist quantifications that are called social sciences and humanities, that are called science, when on many occasions it's simply an inferiority complex before other "hard" sciences, searching for the hallmarks of an allegedly scientific identity.

Goodbye to the servile and dependent "science" introjected even by prominent Spanish and Latin-American colleagues. Goodbye to the paper for journal made in JCR signed by various authors when in reality only one of them have written it so that later the others are obliged to write another to consummate the idea of "I'll scratch your back if you scratch mine", such that a snowball effect of false investigative character is formed, full of dispensable topics that in large part distance the university from society without taking interest in the university students or that the experts themselves would debate or broaden their knowledge of the topic. The only real purpose of this is to create an official committee which decides who climbs the rungs of the academic world and which candidates deserve to get to the top without knowing the authors nor how the research was carried out nor in what the research really consists. Quite simply, the committee is based on and relies upon papers that place them ahead of the rest and award added value specifically to those who arrive with the JCR “seal”2. What is the JCR? Something valuable, undoubtedly, but it shouldn't be accepted without further scrutiny for this reason. It’s something that has been mythologized by the academic world when in reality it is a macro-commercial emporium that issues certificates of academic quality or indicates academic impotence. Numerous professors in the United States appear to worship these three letters, having turned them into a kind of Temple of Delphi. Other colleagues of theirs in other parts of the planet -beginning in Spain- have been infected by the JCR ecstasy despite that -possessing a strong resume and an important name in Spain and other countries- they are slighted by academics from the United States who treat them similar to doctorate students- and

---

2 This paper will be worthless to deliver more quality to my resume in Spain- my country. Just the opposite, it could be damaging as: how could someone be so brazen to publish his reflections, analysis, studies and research in the same journal that he directs? It is supposed that I'm a kind of dishonest subject; I possess the presumption of guilt, rather than of innocence, because “blind” or identified pairs or trios haven’t evaluated me. This journal isn't even JCR, for now. Nevertheless, isn't it logical that a researcher or a team of researchers would make their works known in their journal? No, because they have the presumption of guilt, they are allegedly guilty of academic corruption, so to speak. Any researcher who acts in this fashion is suspected of influence peddling.
often times not to the extent of *similar to* - when they are on an academic visit to a US university\(^3\).

I have published -that I can remember- in two JCR journals and I've evaluated articles for JCR journals but that doesn't lead me to disregard the value of the book, as, for example, the *jotacerristas*, because currently in Spain one can reach the highest peak of the academic stratum without having systematized the knowledge of a specialization or academic discipline but with a good book. No reviewers in twos or threes conducted by supposed and mysterious eminences? The review of an article by experts is highly recommendable and is, the least worst option, according to Delgado-López-Cózar, Ruiz-Pérez y Jiménez-Contreras (2006):

> The scientific peer review system has long been considered the cornerstone of valid and quality scientific publication. Despite the faults that have been evidenced (it's slow, costly, a waste of time to the scientific community, subjective, prone to bias, permits abuses, is incapable of detecting fraud, plagiarism and duplicate publication, it cannot guarantee the external validity of the works), in large part, it is considered that, similar as occurs in democracy, it is the least bad of the two systems. \(^4\)

But it's necessary that transparent criteria be embraced. To begin with, it's not advisable to have the "sergeant" evaluate the "field marshal", the "plumber" the "electrician", the "corporal" the "sergeant", the "child" the "adolescent" or the "adolescent" the "adult" without it meaning a disregard of the opinion of one another. But it turns out that equality is not to be confused with equity and the *democratitis* derived from weak postmodern thought perhaps may be equating the senate with senescence and senior with Alzheimer and placing all the curricula in the same field. In these cases -and to my teachers Schopenhauer (2012: 92-93) and Nietzsche (1999: 202-203) I turn- the victors are generally those of the greatest number, that is to say, the least suitable –with regard to knowledge- not with regard to ability to draft a perfectly "zippered" electoral list for

\(^3\) I won't reveal my information sources to affirm this with the purpose of not implicating them and because I don't have their permission but they come from both Spain and the United States.

an election. Without a doubt, there are brilliant minds that are exceptionally young that should be taken into account but the most unerring knowledge usually comes with age. I repeat: usually. A researcher who is active and lucid with ten, twenty, thirty or more years of experience, will be able to write well or less well but is never unprintable, on the contrary, even his approaches and way of reasoning and analyzing are extremely useful to us.

I hope that I'm expressing myself well with these similes. Besides, how can I succeed in banishing the philias and phobias, or emotions that stymie reason and sometimes confuse political and ideological sentiments with science? Sentiments that furthermore, are later projected to the sciences? More clearly and/or more specifically, how can we trust the scientific neutrality of a journal that is published by a university or an institution affiliated with economic, political, or religious lobbies even if it is recognized as a prestigious institution? How can we trust a corporation such as JCR that as we will see, stems from a situation emanating from the New World Order of the market?

Let it be clear that I am always thinking about social sciences and, within them, about communication in general and journalism in particular (a science exists that studies it: \(\text{http://periodistica.es/}\)). This is to say, it goes beyond a simple profession as it was before. A book allows the articulation of theoretical or theoretical-practical thinking, or even a pure and simple praxis. But who evaluates them? University students, citizens, the readers of a publisher, I can't remember having known authors in communication and journalism renowned for their papers but rather for their books. Sometimes a paper is little more than a kind of entertainment. The paper is the chamber orchestra, the book is the symphonic orchestra and a symphony requires a much better organization of the elements and an incomparably greater degree of work.

I am alluding to books that come to light in established companies. It is said that the writer and journalist Francisco Umbral was once asked why he was such a seducer of women and he responded that he had to seduce more publishers than women. In any case, the subject of "prestigious" publishers in science is relative because there are topics –more so in some fields of knowledge than others- that can only appear in very specific publishing houses or with institutional publishers because the market rejects this kind of topic. Now, it should be made clear that I rebuff desktop publishing and one paying for a book with his/her own money. An element of revision and competence
with regard to this subject must always exist, as, in effect, at present anyone can publish a book, paint, or compose music, etc. What has happened in communication and journalism is that, in Spain, they've put us in the same boat and mixed and compared us with other “paper” disciplines and that's when the "JCR syndrome" emerged with such force.

Here, in this heretical paper, I'm going to question the apparently unquestionable, and use it as a structural methodology. My underlying theoretical foundations will be facilitated by two eminent colleagues whose analysis has been taken not from a paper (for which I apologize) but from two journalistic articles originating in two leading Spanish newspapers (again I apologize that they are not The New York Times nor The Washington Post but El País and El Mundo). These articles are also not in English, but in Spanish! I don't have a good command of English, but rather, English has a good command of me. This is getting ugly. Perhaps you should stop reading this right now. My paper isn't a paper. Really, it's therefore nothing. It's a scientific fraud.

At the beginning of 2014, distinguished higher-ups at Caixabank got in touch with me. They had selected me so that I would in turn select future interns destined for North America. When I informed them that my command of the English language didn't reach this extent, they kindly thanked me for my honesty and said goodbye.

My admired colleague Robert McChesney confesses without shame that he is unfamiliar with the output of my specialization in Spanish, a specialization that he shares (media structures, systems of communication, the politics of communication and media manipulations derived from the structures of financial-corporate-political-media power). In reference to the political economy of communication, in an interview with Nuria Almirón and Ana I. Segovia (2008) he affirmed:

We have maybe a few dozen, we could say, active academics that work with the subject of the political economy in the United States, in North America, including Canada. I mean to say English-speaking. I don't know enough about the situation in México (...). I don't know enough about the situation in the rest of Europe. As I only work in English, I don't know about the cases in Spain, Italy, France or Germany but I am familiar with the British case and I don't perceive a distinction between British and US researchers, or British and
Canadian. Within the framework of the political economy, I think it's very similar on both sides of the Atlantic.

Nevertheless, I do immerse myself in some of his works in English and in Spanish along with those of other researchers from the United States\(^5\). Of course! The thing is that they're more important than us. They're from the country of the JCR. How can someone publish in a JCR journal without citing a reference in English, whether it be necessary or not? Why on Earth wouldn't it be necessary? Citing in English, at least in Spain, is an added value. I repeat: an added value but not necessary because it's not conceived that it wouldn't be necessary in our dependent research. McChesney can affirm without blushing that which can be deduced by his previous words: in his specialization only the material that is published in English really interests him. Who censures him for that? Nevertheless, in Spain, we reprimand those who fail to follow Anglophone works and are correct in doing so because science is universal. The problem is that we don't exactly do it for this reason but as a result of appeasement, dependence, shame and a lack of dignity.

Despite all of this, I'm sure that McChesney and I would understand each perfectly well in the event that I one day personally meet him. I don't refer to the language but the concepts related to our field of study. I should study English a great deal more to be able to communicate well or decently well with Dr. McChesney but all will come with time and meanwhile, I don't believe that anything substantial will occur with regard to my own development.

Caixabank -the bank that originally set out for me to choose the students for scholarships in North America- is a shareholder of El Pais because it's a shareholder of the group that drives it: Prisa\(^6\). It's also a shareholder of the multinational oil company Repsol\(^7\), amongst many other companies. The Carso Group, belonging to the Mexican

---

\(^5\) McChesney's astounding resume is approximately 200 pages long. To those of us who study media structures, a now classic text written with Herman, who, in a way ties into Bagdikian and his famous Media Monopoly has been of special interest is: Herman, Edward S. & McChesney, Robert W. (1997): The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism, London and Washington, Cassell. His collaborations with Chomsky and Ralph Nader are also especially interesting.


\(^7\) See: [http://www.expansion.com/2012/03/09/empresas/energia/1331282897.html?a=98e1e90b655a60820ada8835f144e91&t=1335163627](http://www.expansion.com/2012/03/09/empresas/energia/1331282897.html?a=98e1e90b655a60820ada8835f144e91&t=1335163627), April, 2012.
Carlos Slim, is another shareholder of *El País*\(^8\) and of *The New York Times*\(^9\). *El Mundo* belongs to the automotive multinational Fiat, which is also tied to the arms industry (Reig, 2011a)\(^10\). *The Washington Post* belongs to Amazon (Jeffrey Preston Bezos) who in the beginning sold books -a cultural industry after all, like the newspaper itself- but with time it has begun to sell many other products outside the realm of journalism (CDs, DVD’s, toys, electronics, clothes, food, etc.)\(^11\). For sure, all are respected newspapers, they themselves say it to themselves and journalists and professors from all over confirm it. I don't say otherwise, I only offer real facts when I write this, in May 2014. But I will throw out a question and will do so on more than one occasion: are the journalists of those four newspapers really free when it comes to investigating and writing? And I answer: no. Even the famous *Watergate* was a mutually journalistic-political maneuver to ruin president Nixon. It's a well-known fact: in the United States you can criticize the president but not Coca Cola or Nike, just ask some reporters at CBS\(^12\). A president can receive blows like all politicians (what an amazingly deceptive strategy of the system), but large companies are the essence of the homeland, sensitive like rose petals.

The news –as concluded by what some authors have said now for a long time (Merrill, Lee, Friedlander, 1992) in dealing with, for example, investigative journalism in a very

---


\(^10\) Another problem arises here so that my paper would be of quality and reference, worthy of appearing in an indexed journal or even the JCR, the Olympus of indexed journals, the super-index. How many times can I cite myself? If it's more than maybe three or four times my article loses quality. Not only do I dare to publish it in the journal that I myself direct but, also, I criticize myself on numerous occasions! It's the height of dishonesty and shamelessness! And nobody has evaluated me! I haven't had reviewers! I've cooked it up and eaten it all by myself! Alone! I haven't prepared it with a team, as is so valued in these times although Freud, for example, declared that the great works are woven in solitude. What on earth! I've cited a book instead of a paper! I'm lost! And, what kind of writing is this? What science is this? No, it's an essay, or better, a pamphlet, a libel. It doesn't have journalistic style, it's tavern style. How dare I present something in this manner, an individual as important as myself with three six-year recognized research periods and almost twenty-five years in the university?


US focused line- are public entities. Nevertheless, the public sector creates fewer jobs in comparison to private industry, which is dependent upon billions of people. Therefore, journalism is not practiced in function with public interests but of private interests, and power is identified/confused with The White House. It's fascinating but public entities are not completely foolish and they are “taking revenge” by little by little abandoning the journalists and journalism altogether for which their credibility -I say this with all the pain of my heart because I am a journalist- has been extraordinarily diminished in the last 25 years both here and there. It is for this reason¹³, and not the presence of new technologies that receptors have taken refuge to avoid such impotence and so much misinformation.

To meet the criteria of these times of globalization and dependence this text is also published in English. To do so, I've turned to a US citizen, Jeffrey Trench, researcher at the University of Seville (Spain), a restless man, an admirer of his country who is also worried about it which defines him as a truly patriotic citizen. I give him my thanks.

He who has the technology also has the language. For this reason less Spanish will be spoken despite what is asserted out there. What language will the Hispanics in the United States, of second, third and following generations born in the USA speak? Spanish? No, English. It's logical. And, in the long run, what's the use of speaking Spanish, which is primarily used within the family? Better English directly. The Chinese and the Germans understand each other above all in English, along with the Arabs, it's easier than their own languages. Let it be known that to me all of this is scientifically fascinating, I congratulate the protagonists and authors of globalization for such an impassioned, mysterious and attractive world that they are creating.

2. Hypothesis

The previous section has placed us on the trail of a problem and out of the problem comes a hypothesis. In an academic act, my colleague at the University of Seville, Dr. Juan Rey, expert in the analysis of advertising messages, asserted that hypotheses can be made in the form of a question. The detected problem leads me to key questions: what is behind the initials JCR? Can I get closer to their significance from a structural

¹³ The mistrust in journalism was clear in the United States when in 2004 The state of the media in 2004, published by The Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ) was unveiled. For other areas, such as Japan, read: http://espanol.ipedigital.com/2012/11/27/confianza-de-japoneses-en-medios-de-comunicacion-cae-a-mimnimo-historico/.
perspective? And others emanating from this: What is happening to the research and investigation in Spain? Perhaps it has allowed itself to be "colonized" in excess by ideological tendencies and it's missing something essential found in research in the social sciences- a non-conformist critical, creative and transgressive stance? Perhaps we believe that only the so-called applied research is science? Perhaps that which questions the supposed defenders of a supposed applied research is not applicable?

3. **Structural method**

I've just expressed in the hypothesis that it's of interest to me to know something about what's behind the initials JCR. The structural method of research precisely seeks what is behind and underlies the events. There are very superficial opinions that are generally closer to the market ideology than the scientific method that identify a structural focus with Marxism. No, the structural focus includes and has elements of Marxism along with the Frankfurt School, but it goes much further and touches upon wide-ranging views that are extremely complex. The structural focus isn't a concept of the right or the left, it's the methodology of the articulation of elements in their most complex phase. I won't pause to cite the ideas of the illustrious names from this method because I've already done so (Reig, 2010b, Reig, 2011b). I'm going to deal with the subject in brevity and by focusing on examples "of the average citizen".

When Miquel Rodrigo Alsina and Miguel Beltrán (in Reig, 2010) refer to positivism and thought or the critical methodology following Neuman (1994) they demonstrate, in my opinion, how one school is not incompatible with another. Positivism seeks empirical evidence but on a systematic theoretical base; the critical school seeks to get to the bottom of the ideological hegemonic interests that are hidden behind the discourse. Why would they be opposed? No, both are in the interior of the structural focus where the Everything articulated is the base concept, an Everything that comes from the journalistic question (that's in the lead of the news): Why- which is also the starting point of philosophy and science which, lest we not forget, evolve from philosophy.

This leads us to agree with Marvin Harris (2000) when he states: "Our work as scientists [and I would add as citizens, and as journalists] consists in discovering order in that which is presented as disordered". But the structural focus of which I speak pursues the
order of Everything through a complex study of history. Complex is to say interdisciplinary, the barriers in science-arts are useless. We are getting into the Complex Philosophy of History and in it is science- Everything.

An educational example of the structural method was provided to us when the History Channel dared to broadcast a documentary titled The History of the World in 2 hours, which were not even two hours but an hour and a half14. It was pointed out in the documentary that our history is 13.7 billion years old, meaning, from the Big Bang to the present and that "everything is connected". That connection brings us to the Everything which is the priority task that the social sciences and the humanities should address or continue addressing to offer society an applicable science which seeks the most profound casuistry.

The aim of the structural focus is to ensure that people don't fall victim to naivety when it comes to understanding what is happening around them. I will provide two significant anecdotes that can better explain what I have just asserted. A student at Florida International University (FIU, Miami, USA) that I gave classes to in Seville was surprised when she realized that the news segments on Spanish television were not constantly interrupted to show advertising. She asked me how this was possible and I responded that, amongst other things, they don't want the viewer to think that journalism has a lot of dependency on advertising so that it wouldn't give the impression that journalists were completely subjected to advertising in their work. The student didn't understand this very well as she had already accepted that advertising wasn't going to disturb the freedom of expression of the journalist, meaning, the student had uncritically absorbed what may be a US hegemonic discourse.

The other anecdote comes from the cinema. In the movie JFK (1991), by Oliver Stone, we have the famous sequence in which Donald Sutherland -who embodies real-life character Leroy Fletcher Prouty- explains to the intrepid prosecutor Jim Garrison – interpreted by Kevin Costner- how Power works, by means of the coordination of the elements: politics, large arms companies, finance, war, State terrorism, mass media, justice, manipulation, espionage... After the long monologue by Sutherland-in that

14 See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yIT3QuD5wdM and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vfpw3mwjLLk, the second link includes a stupid puritan warning that the documentary is not suitable for children under 15, using pilgrim arguments such as that the text includes violence and vulgar language.
Stone inserts symbols of power like the Washington Monument near the Pentagon— the district attorney is stunned and exclames something like "I didn't know he was so dangerous -referring to JFK- to the power structure".

So, that a student at FIU, some 22 years old, would be clueless is understandable, with a bit of effort. In addition, that another young US university student in a debate would ask the protagonist of the series The Newsroom why the United States is the best country in the world, in the face of the incredulity of the central character (journalist and news anchor) who, when pressured by the moderator of the debate, responds with such convincing nature that he makes the girl look ridiculous. But that a district attorney wouldn't know how history unfolds and, within it, how Power is managed, is more troubling if we are talking about a country that, in the end, arose from the hand of enlightened men who were even readers of Karl Marx, such as Abraham Lincoln. In what university was JFK's district attorney educated? Perhaps in one that defends the JCR system tooth and nail as the best in the world?

Pre-Socratic philosophers were already using a structural focus without knowing it or calling it as such. The Higgs boson particle only demonstrates the atomic theories of Democritus, Empedocles, Anaxagoras, Epicurus or Leucippus, amongst others, when all of them decided to explain their environment not through myths but rather through deductive reasoning (Matilde del Pino, 1999). There is no real or essential understanding of anything without the structural method.

In my case, for this article I have limited myself to its use in an incipient way, "surfing" the Web, looking for ties that would take me one way or the other starting with the initials JCR. It has been the most empirical part of this work, based on a small

---

15 A link in English with Spanish subtitles: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYSj0k2aY-s](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYSj0k2aY-s).


17 My theoretical “blind” (perhaps too blind, and deaf) evaluators would have objected that I make value judgments and opinions in my article. Therefore, it isn't acceptable to be published, following such academic orthodoxy, which condemns veteran researchers in social sciences and in journalism and communication not to present by creating or interpreting, as if we were from other fields of knowledge. Using this reason, much of Paleontological Science, lets say an example, is not really scientific as it is dedicated to interpreting and speculating from a fragment of a mandible or some other human or hominid fragment. As much as that bone fragment "speaks", to some or to a large extent, what it did when it was alive remains purely speculative.
foundation or points of departure and in some of the fruits that almost 25 years of teaching and research in Structures of Information have provided. Clearly the structural focus -as I've maintained- is much deeper and complex and would take us much further in our inquiries but that depth was not the objective of the present work.

4. Results
I've now become familiar with seeing the "Results" and "Proposals" sections in these articles but they are relatively new to me. It was not like this when, in the 80's and 90's of the last century I immersed myself in Spanish doctoral theses. I began to find said sections in the theses and generally speaking in research works from Latin America and it was then that I understood that this derived from the US dynamic. I don't mind adapting to this dynamic and I likewise didn't prohibit it from the Latin American students working to get their doctorate that used it in the theses that I directed, but I must detail two conditions: 1. The results of a research project go from the first letter of the title until the last letter of the references. 2. The proposals are included in the conclusions or at least should be. What does a researcher propose -above all- to those who wish to hear him? The content of the conclusions. In this work there won't be proposals but rather conclusions and we're going to present now- really, I've been doing so since I began to redact this article- the so-called results. But I will do so establishing that the method that I'm using is not, in my opinion, the most correct.

4.1. Points of departure
As indicated in the introduction -and I asked for forgiveness for the audacity- there won't be two papers made in JCR -or similar- my points of departure are two news articles published not by two top US or British newspapers -my request for clemency also stemmed from this lack of rigor- but by two prominent colleagues in two Spanish newspapers of reference (I'm sorry). The first point of departure is the professor Felipe Fernández-Armesto -British by birth despite his name- and his article titled “Science and its fight for survival” published on May 5, 2014 in the newspaper El Mundo. The second refers to the professor Rafael Argullol and his article "Culture in Seclusion" that was published in the newspaper El

18 http://www.elmundo.es/opinion/2014/05/05/5367e595ca47417f398b457a.html
País one month before, on April 5th, 2014\textsuperscript{19}. To consult them, in both instances I've used the digital versions of the cited newspapers: \textit{El Mundo.es} and \textit{El País.com}. As it is well-known, the reader of the press now does so primarily online while the paper version is losing numbers.

Professor Felipe Fernández-Armesto is a historian and Senior Lecturer at William P. Reynolds and in Arts and Letters at the University of Notre Dame (Indiana). Professor Rafael Argullol is a lecturer in Aesthetic and Art Theory at the University of Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona).

\textbf{4.1.1. Science and its fight for survival}

The text by professor Fernández-Armesto probably has the intention of providing constructive criticism for England, Spain and Europe but that doesn't mean that these expressions aren't often heard -and in a rather explicit manner- in the Spanish media, mainly by the so-called media personalities in radio and on television. To signal the right path to follow they discredit their own environment asserting "this doesn't happen in the United States", "in the United States this would be unimaginable"... It's an obsession that exists in Spain and Latin America: to admire the foreign to the detriment of ourselves and without stopping to stress the negative that happens beyond our media and doesn't happen within it. It is undoubtedly very positive to take note of the lessons that other countries and places on the planet teach us but to do so, it isn't necessary to discredit ourselves or fail to address the defects of others that may even be worse than our own.

I've just put the carriage before the horse, this isn't done in an investigation. The facts are placed first and later conclusions are drawn, like in the courts of justice, just as multiple US films of this genre and their European imitations have shown. But older people such as myself, should be permitted certain liberties and, in the event that my blind evaluators don’t permit them, I have now concluded this act of heretical, endogamic, anti-scientific and even presumably criminal transgression where I have perpetrated influence-peddling on my own behalf. May we therefore continue to the facts so that they might extenuate the final judgment.

\textsuperscript{19} http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/03/25/opinion/1395742979_031566.html
At the outset of his article, Fernández-Armesto maintains that although as a power it has competitors in the world, the United States hasn't abandoned its protection and encouragement for research:

The global dominance of the United States is reaching its end. The hegemony of a single global superpower has ended. Other economies are capable of putting up a challenge. But North America continues to hold its lead in scientific research, not only for the amount of money that it invests, nor for the relative importance of science in the national culture: the per capita budget is higher in Israel, Japan, South Korea, Germany and various other Scandinavian countries. The US advantage lies in understanding the nature and necessities of the scientific community better than the others.

And now, the author will not continue with this opening argument -as would be necessary in order to better defend the opening- but rather will carry out some reflections with respect to the sciences so that, as we will see, in the end we will close the discourse by returning to the beginning. Thus:

Science is an art, or perhaps an illusion. As human beings we live entangled in nature and are not allowed an objective viewpoint. We are unable to escape the agglutinative constitution of the biosphere, which affixes itself to us like flies stuck to the paper that traps them. Our only exit is imagination. (...). Emotions and feelings create science. This was known by the magicians of the Renaissance and of the scientific revolution of the Modern Age, conjuring up alchemic effects while they unveiled the structures of the materials, cursing the sick as they cured them, foretelling fate as they outlined the universe.

In the article, the author complains that Richard Dawkins rejects a script of his about Darwin not because it wasn't loyal to fact but because -in the opinion of Fernández-Armesto- Dawkins had Darwin so mythologized that he couldn't accept that his colleague asserted that the physical-psychological traumas of the Darwin family were also useful to the genius evolutionist to devise his contributions to science. Therefore, Fernández-Armesto deduces from this incident -and from other observations and
reflections- the necessity of science as creation and, consequently, like all creation, science needs to be free and have social facilities at its disposal to do so:

science, like other arts, needs to be free: free of censorship, free of bureaucracy and free of committees of supposed experts whose interest lies in maintaining the orthodoxy that they themselves drew up and continue teaching. Much the same as a poem or weeping, a great scientific theory is the creation of a mind, the creature of an imagination, the expression of an emotion. Its sphere is serendipity. Its processes are unpredictable. But in the present Europe it's almost impossible to attain funds for investigation without showing the results in advance and be subjected to the judgment of unoriginal specialists, petty politicians and unimaginative public officials.

With the previous paragraph I can assure you that my distinguished colleague gives me wings to be writing the lines that you have before you. Indeed, I'm obligated to do so as I don't want to appear before those "unoriginal specialists" and less before "petty politicians and unimaginative public officials". I'm completely sure that they exist in Europe, and of course in Spain and Latin America. Maybe some of them are those who have instituted a policy of financial aid for European research projects, a policy that includes the requisite of defending the projects in English before a tribunal thereby providing privileges to the citizens of the English-speaking minority in Europe who don't even belong to the Eurozone\textsuperscript{20}. I am ignoring if they exist in the United States and if the English-speaking demands of the European Union (EU) in budget support for research have to do with that love of our central beacon: the United States. Fortunately, professor Fernández-Armesto, as can be gathered from his text, is an exception -he was born in London- although relative as he is criticizing Europe in order to ultimately praise- as will be shown- the United States. I suppose he has his own motives for doing so. First of all, and to strengthen his previous words, he turns to specific cases:

Don Braben, Doctor Honoris Causa at the University College of London, a great non-conformist of the British scientific community, recently published

\textsuperscript{20} It's not the moment to stop and elaborate on this subject but it remains open for later work that shouldn't necessarily be written by me. Before the greatest "enemies" of the EU, in Europe at least they speak English.
Promoting the Planck Club in which he maintains that none of the 500 greatest scientists of the twentieth century would have received funds under the prevailing system. Amongst the examples he gives include Max Planck, Albert Einstein, J.J. Thomson, Ernest Rutherford, Niels Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, Barbara McClintock, Francis Crick, James Watson and Harry Kroto. Braben would have been able to add other present day geniuses to the list. Kary Mullis, for example, is a guy who carries out innovative works not in a laboratory but rather in his own head while he surfs or rides in his coupé. He thought about polymerase chain reactions for first time in 1983 while he was driving at night with a girlfriend who later turned him down. Barry Marshall, another Nobel Prize winner who helped prove that bacteria are responsible for peptic ulcers, was so frustrated by conventional research that he experimented on himself by swallowing a glass full of bacteria as if it were a cocktail. When he offered to impart his discoveries to a congress of specialists, his presentation was rejected for being positioned, according to the report of the committee selector, below the obligatory level.

Our author notes other similar cases. In view of this, as is imaginable, it can be concluded that we need to bring about a change in Europe that allows us to move ahead in a coherent fashion:

If we are going to move forward, if we are going to encourage truly innovative science, if we are going to free the potential of scientific minds, we need these geniuses, no matter how eccentric or unorthodox they may be. Therefore, we need to find the financial means that allow them to exercise that creativity without limits -which is indispensable to engage in and practice science- if you would allow me to express it like such- as an art.

Of course, the article, in my opinion, is attractive and opportune. But will it be possible to accomplish in Spain, in Europe and in Latin America, to the largest extent possible, what our colleague from London presents? Other colleagues may refute that the creativity and freedom that Fernández-Armesto defends are amongst the factors that have given Europe its identity. Perhaps they've been lost? Maybe one can conclude
something similar because while for the author in Europe as evaluators in science we have, “unoriginal specialists, petty politicians, and unimaginative public officials”, it seems that this is different in the United States because, as culminates Fernández-Armesto's article, they define better methods to take care of the great minds and:

Such methods exist in the United States. Large universities have their own funds protected by state and federal legislation, which are distributed between the researchers without preconditions, in relatively modest amounts but sufficient enough to initiate innovative projects, defying official wisdom. I myself, a humble historian whose research is inexpensive and of little avail next to my scientific colleagues, have such funds at my disposal. In this way, researchers have the opportunity to demonstrate the applicability of their ideas before having to apply for the support of bureaucratic organizations. There are many private foundations in North America, made prosperous by tax privileges that in Europe we are unable to conceive, that are willing to promote work proposals that are a bit too speculative for shareholders, too puzzling for the dominant scientific order, too risky for public funds. We have to imitate that system that continues to favor the US science in global competition. But is there a government in Europe ready to grant these freedoms, trust researchers to this extent or launch such profound reforms?

I think it's an excellent idea to keep in mind what happens in the United States, we've already done so in Europe and from the perspective of my own country, ought to follow their example more. Now we only need for the South of the United States to stop putting obstacles to the unhampered teaching of Darwinism21 and for there to be support in other places and/or universities for the Political Economy of Communication. Information and Culture shouldn't be hidden when it has yet to reach a certain level on the professorial scale because they consider you a "red" or large companies don't sponsor faculties or universities because, although we find ourselves in the country of freedom, the popular saying "what the boss says, goes" still has a lot of weight. Not

---

21 I've followed the subject since the end of the twentieth century until the middle of the first half of the twenty first century and I can provide evidence of the fact but that is not of relevance here as to not further extend this work. Anyway, the subject is more than well-known in the Scientific community.
even the Medici allowed certain licenses in art and creation. With regard to with my specialization -the study of power structures and their influences on media messages- how am I going to build a genuine complex structural methodology if those that are going to criticized -for their deeds- are those that financially "nourish" the center where I carry out my research? Of course they allow my work but not indefinitely, through me or through my disciples. In this sense, perhaps we are talking about creativity within certain margins, the margins *made in JCR*. Meaning, margins that are open and very narrow at the same time: their boundaries tend to be the walls of the university.

If what I say isn't true, then why in the United States is there Project Censored (*http://www.projectcensored.org/*) or the cited Free Press (*http://www.freepress.net/*), amongst other agencies? Why has it been necessary to create them? Evidently, they might have private backing from foundations and even advertising but this leads us to an even more complex topic: the strengthening of the system by means of the support of institutions and people that reject it, essentially, the strategy of strengthening the system by means of it's negation and -controlled- incentives to those who question or reject it. It's one of the great virtues of the USA, maybe the greatest: first they ignite the flame of the fire, later they call the firefighters to put it out and present it to the public as freedom although the final result is that the problems remain or are augmented. It is, in effect, squaring the circle.

4.1.2. *Culture in seclusion and other criticisms*

Rafael Argullol coincides with Fernández-Armesto in his concern for the "seclusion" of the creative capacity applied to the sciences. But he concentrates more on the Spanish case,- which is paradigm of the existing panorama in much of Latin America and vice versa- even more so when delimiting the issue to the university sphere. Nevertheless, it seems that he falls short by not even mentioning the JCR system, so accurate on one hand, without a doubt, but we've entrusted ourselves to them with little criticism, at least explicit criticism, because they exist on individual and oral levels. This said, later we will note some of those that have been published.

Both authors have been of great value to me as point of departure for this work and as a theoretical-methodological foundation -although it isn't expressed in a clear manner in both articles- it is concluded in their texts that there is a necessity to analyze the facts through the structural approach. Both scholars come from the areas of social sciences
and humanities. Fernández-Armesto is a historian and Argullol, a practical philosopher, if you allow me to define it as such. It's logical that they would be worried about the freedom of investigation and of the creative realm. I was educated in both fields along with anthropology, communicational and journalistic, a profession that, for fifteen years, has allowed me to come out of my shell, walk the street and be in contact with power and the Power. My worry stems from my anxiety before the possibility that human beings would no longer be human, -those who desire to be so, perhaps a minority- surrender themselves, without knowing so nor being fully conscious of doing so, to superficial postures that in essence hold an ideology of dominance.

I've sometimes felt like a character from the movie Fahrenheit 451 (1966), directed by François Truffaut, downloading audiovisual documentation from the internet in the event that Google decides to censor it, as has already been the case on various occasions. Afterwards, I've also thought that, independently of the fact that it would continue to happen in the future or they would do it to an even greater extent, the strategy of reinforcing the system by means of the negation of its existence doesn't have to worry about such possible blunders, as they have done in China, Iran or in Cuba. It's enough to "brainwash" the possible receptor so that he excludes himself from using documentation of cognitive synchronic value when knowing how to employ the structural methodological focus (or ignoring that it exists). As I have maintained in other places (Reig, 2011b), if, from a human being you take away the method of understanding from its context and macro-context, offer him/her the tools for evasion and entertainment according to his/her most elementary tendencies you can play with him/her as you please concerning the concepts of freedom, democracy, enterprise, media pluralism personal freedom and the theoretical free market.

As I've said, I believe Rafael Argullol thinks more specifically in the Spanish case and is more categorical and concrete in his assessment. In addition, he expressly cites the fever of the paper as a toxic aspect in the university dynamic:

The university has withdrawn and retreated into itself as a consequence of a new anti-intellectualism favored by a consecration of the 'paper', whose production compels the abandon of all creativity and risk.
Our thinker adds risk to the necessity of creativity, which is different from Fernández-Armesto's article, who doesn't address this subject using his personal opinion although it is insinuated. The consecration of the *paper* –in my opinion- leads us to the consecration or mythification -as I pointed out above- of the JCR, at its height. Likewise, in Argullol the figure of the bureaucrat and bureaucratization appear as a negative element:

The university has developed standards in which the intellectual spirit is not recognized. The intellectual disposition is barley acknowledged, openly and critically, which is at the Renaissance root of the university. Put bluntly: the humanist has been cornered by the bureaucrat.

In my opinion, the rules that the university has developed don't exactly originate in the European, Spanish or Latin American tradition. It is now supposed that they are necessary and, as I've asserted time and time again many of my senior colleagues have accepted them, promote them, celebrate them and have turned into converts, convinced that our system was corrupt from top to bottom and, instead of fixing the mess on the foundations of our History, they've turned to the principles of the most hegemonic commercial culture. This is reinforced by the words of Rafael Argullol himself:

At present a large majority of professors have dismissed writing books from being considered a primordial task so as to focus on the production of *papers*. In many cases this resignation is painful since it hinders a certain creative vocation, thereby frustrating the researcher, but it is a result of institutional pressure, given that the professor is obligatorily evaluated almost exclusively on his supposedly specialized articles. In any case, the new microcosm in which the university encloses itself outlines a Kafkian web of connections and hegemonies that are notably opaque from outside the institution. In addition to attending to their teaching duties, university professors employ a great deal of their time in the elaboration of the *papers*, texts of hermetic constitution, destined to so-called "journals of impact", publications that generally speaking have few readers -and always from the same area as the specialization- although with great power since they are the only that "count" when evaluating the university. Accordingly,
teachers, especially those who are young and in an unstable position, wait in line for their articles to be accepted to the unavoidable journals of unequal value. And thus one is resigned to the luck of the leader who rules the microcosm. Professors are graded by means of official evaluations in accordance to their compliance of those rules. The thrill and capacity of writing extensive works-- a process that requires a slow rhythm that often spans various years-- in turn must be indefinitely postponed.

Herrán and Villena (2012) have also questioned the situation that Argullol denounces but with regard to research in the field of didactics and school organization and their relationship with what they call "The culture of JCR impact". In this line, they have written:

What it looks to be pursuing is quality. (…). But along the shore of the University a tsunami has entered that has dragged us into a very delicate situation. (…). The scientific community finds itself divided between the obligation of investigating with the utmost quality and care and quantitatively giving in. This fine line is tread while -as in almost all professions- a fundamental raw material of all that is intellectual- time- becomes scarcer each course and each day.

Argullol's conjecture with regard to the loss of the thrill and excitement of writing academic books is indeed grave. In August of 2013, professor Mariano Cebrían Herreros, professor of Journalism at the Complutense University of Madrid with extensive investigative and professional experience in the field of audiovisual communication, passed away. He was the most internationally cited Spanish expert in his specialization, indeed surpassing the author of this article who appears in 11th place, according to the data of the H Index Scholar of the University of Granada (Spaín)22. In conversations we maintained, Professor Cebrían, was very critical of the resistance to

---

22 H Index Scholar (http://hindexscholar.com/ciencias-sociales/comunicacion/periodismo/) is a bibliometric index that aims to measure the performance of the academic production of professors and researchers of Spanish public universities in humanities and social sciences using a counter of their publications and bibliographic citations that they've received through Google Scholar. The measurement of the production and impact of the scientific publications, which are the principal means used by scientists to publicize the results of their creations has been converted into the instrument "par excellence" to determine the relevance, importance and thereby quality of scientific activity.
writing books and placed the merit of a good book -evaluated and systematized- well above any paper despite the large number of papers that bear his signature.

Books are especially valuable in social sciences and humanities. I previously maintained that the two authors that we are following as a point of departure developed their ideas in these fields. It's not surprising that Argullol would be concerned in the face of the superficial treatment and "technification" of social sciences and humanities and their subjection to the narrow bureaucracy of the rigid and confounding rules of editing and evaluation. Our philosopher argues:

This self-absorption of the university, if it deserves mounting criticism in the Scientific community, (...) is directly disastrous in the field of humanities, given that it eradicates the creative and intellectually open figure in order to impose a profile of the professor subjected to the servitude of a tiny world that presents itself as "specialized" but that in reality is purely endogamic. Even worse is that this tiny world, which boasts of academic rigor, makes itself an implicit accomplice to the populist anti-intellectualism by taking refuge in cryptic and obscurantist language. This could compose an authentic anthology of absurdity if we were to couple it with the bureaucratic demands that presently govern university life. Understanding the rules of the microcosm demands so many hours of study that it barely leaves time to study everything else. Generally speaking, understanding how to do the paper in correct servitude forces one to renounce all creativity and all risk.

To understand what Rafael Argullol so categorically asserts, the reader only needs to connect to a link that has already been cited in this work23. It's a simple example of a jungle of rules and regulations where it seems that there is no place for originality and transgressive science, it's the ultimate homage to the subjugation to the documentalist requisite to the tiniest detail as well as the dependence on the occultism of a reviser or unknown reader who could very well be assessing a text of a subject-matter in that he/she has a lesser degree of command than its author. It's the dependence on the so-

---

called applied research that allows it to denominate the market ideology to whatever it pleases, primarily, to develop its activity and its principal objective: produce the most at the lowest price.

4.2. Theory and praxis
We will now complete the previous theory and broaden it with the corresponding praxis. For now, the contents of the two outlined points of departure lead us to a series of partial inferences:

1. If everything is so positive and attainable in the United States, if there are so many institutions that support the sciences, then why this US "obsession" for the paper for journal JCR?
2. Maybe Rafael Argullol needs greater profundity in his criticism as he doesn't "touch" upon the subject of the JCR in the least.
3. Therefore, the theory should be confronted in the praxis.

What are some of the causes that have lead us to fall into this uncritical dependence on the JCR system? Delgado López Cózar, Ruiz Pérez and Jiménez Contreras explain them to us (2006):

One of the agendas of the Spanish Foundation of Science and Technology (FECYT) consists in supporting the professionalization and internationalization of the Spanish scientific journals. Many of these journals, especially in the fields of social science and humanities, are barely represented in international databases. This underrepresentation can be attributed to, amongst other reasons, the insufficient quality of the journals, which impedes them from competing in the international market of Scientific Information. The detected problems include the reticence to the use of English, the lack of regularity of publication, poor distribution and scarce or insufficient scientific control of the contents. It's a vicious cycle as these publications which are always conceived with great effort and dedication, fail to attract the gaze of the high-level scientists in their field of knowledge, which prevents them from improving their content. The absent or scarce visibility of certain Spanish scientific journals leads to the
research works published in them being barely read and cited. In other words, they hardly make an impact.

David Fernández Quijada (2008) links up with this analysis but also places some initial critical elements which are largely based in Delgado López Cózar, Ruiz Pérez and Jiménez Contreras:

In the last few years, the agenda of The National Evaluation Commission of Investigative Activity (CNEAI), the National Evaluation Agency of Quality and Accreditation Quality (ANECA) along with the rest of the autonomous evaluation agencies have favored the Journal Citation Reports as the central parameter of the quality of scientific activity. In communication sciences, the same has been achieved through the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), which like the rest of Thomson's indexes contains predetermined biases: preponderance of publications in English, overrepresentation of research presented in English or pre-eminence of the hard sciences and technology ahead of other disciplines (...). The advantages that it offers, on the other hand, can be quickly summarized: visibility and measure of scientific impact.

So, given the detected “disaster”, which is the preferred model to follow? It's clear: the JCR model. This takes us to the praxis, the analysis of the JCR "entity" which defines the difference between quality, less quality and no quality.  

4.3. Praxis, empirical evidence

When we Spanish researchers want our official merits to be acknowledged on an official level, (what we refer to as six-year terms or research periods) we first turn to the corresponding rules and regulations to know what legal foundations we will use to guide us so that they can tell us if we've worked “well or not”. Later, we present some papers and a commission -that never interviews us, that has never read our intellectual work and is comprised of colleagues from various social sciences in the case of

---

24 To analyze the entities from which the messages or the role models emanate, the archetypes, whatever type they are, has been one of the personalities and hallmark identities of the Information Structures university subject since it was created in Spain at the beginning of the 70's in the twentieth century. The work is important to know in whose hands we reside.
communication and journalism (by the way, there are almost never academic journalists on these commissions)- a commission, I was saying, rules if we are deserving or not to consolidate merits as researchers. And that commission acts just as I've indicated.

In the Spanish case, it's unfortunate that although journalism was elevated to the university level in the 70's of last century, in evaluation committees of research in communication and journalism scarcely present are the colleagues that have been cooks before friars, meaning, those who have practiced communication and/or journalism before doing academic research and dedicating themselves to the university. This is an essential difference because the resume of an academic journalist is a far cry from other kinds of resumes. The academic research methodology of someone who has worked in the profession during ten, twenty or thirty years does not necessarily coincide with other methodologies and this doesn't make it any less worthy. Nevertheless, the labor of a researcher in communication and journalism is evaluated by experts in psychology, sociology, economics, anthropology... and vice versa. We won't call into question the capacity of these colleagues but we will call into question their distinction for such high responsibilities. Communication and journalism aren't subsidiary to any other sciences nor are any others subsidiary in relation to communication and journalism.

Well then, as I was saying, the Spanish researcher in communication, journalism or in any other field who is interested in the guiding regulations to measure the quality of his work finds, for example, this course to follow:

Preference will be given to articles included in journals listed in the “Journal Citation Reports of the Social Science Citation Index” and the Science Citation Index (Institute for Scientific Information, -ISI-, Philadelphia, PA, USA)\textsuperscript{25}.

My first question is obvious: Where are they trying to lead me to grant me the seal of high quality? In the first place, to the “Journal Citation Reports of the Social Science Citation Index” (JCR). So, to begin and in accordance with the structural methodological approach previously explained, my second question is obvious: What is the Journal Citation Reports (JCR)? Herrán and Villena (2012) establish:

\textsuperscript{25} Daniel Torres-Salinas and Emilio Delgado López-Cózar in a power point provided by the University of Seville, 2013.
The evaluation system of established scientific production is rooted in a creation by Dr. Eugene Garfield (n. 1925), founder of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), today part of the Thomson Reuters Science Company. In 1955, he revolutionized scientific research with the concept of indexing citations and research. Garfield eventually sold ISI to Thomson Reuters and since then the bases of Thomson Reuters are not called ISI. Thomson Reuters Science is a division of the Thomson Reuters Corporation. It defines itself as “the leading source in the world of intelligent information for researchers”. It gives coverage to the regional and international journals with the greatest influence in the world. It's flagship product is the Web of Knowledge (WOK), a platform with an extensive amount of information, tools and integrated technology. In it is included the Web of Science (WOS) database, a product for counting citations in scientific publications, updated since 1900, which currently covers over 12,000 journals in various fields: natural science, chemistry, social sciences and arts and humanities. The WOK stands on the following principle, known as the Bradford Law: The basic literature of a scientific discipline is published in journals of major relevance, which define the nucleus of the science they address along with those of little relevance that are of interest to other disciplines. Thus, it would be impractical and unnecessary to index all the journals in the market, as only a limited number of journals publish the majority of the important scientific results.

The first conclusion is clear: "it's cold" outside the JCR. Someone has delegated it the role of granting the diplomas of quality to the scientific journals of the world, I suppose on the basis of what professor Fernández-Armesto reminded us: the United States is the world power in research and investigation and also in understanding researchers. But also in communication and journalism? In everything? And even if it was, wouldn't an international consensus be necessary? No matter how positive it is, should we just obediently adopt the JCR system without criticism? The cited Herrán and Villena don't hesitate to assert:

The self-attribution as "the leader of thought" or the carrier of "essential" information in the scientific fields where it's included not only appears
pretentious and uncritical but also moves towards a certain epistemological indoctrination that is clearly dangerous and scientifically unacceptable.

Establishing tendencies and authorships stands in the way of the development of emerging or unorthodox proposals. According to a study sponsored by Thomson Reuters itself, of the 7,621 journals around the world that were included in the JCR in 2008, only 300 represented for more than 50% of what was cited and more than 30% of what was published. A nucleus of 3,000 journals account for more than 90% of cited articles and more than 80% of those published. Although it's recognized that those scientific nuclei are not static, their system marks standards in science- the recurrence and terms of the dominant scientific circles who nourish and cite amongst themselves, and not the aspects that have no reason to be related to the exclusion or inclusion of new journals in the Thomson Reuters database. Consider, for example, how naturally any journal -JCR or not- is going to be interested in publishing the habitual prestigious signatures before an unorthodox and unknown author, independent of the relevance or utility of his work, because it will receive more citations.

Other objections by the previously mentioned authors –Herrán and Villena- can be summarized as the following:

- That the system would contribute to the means being an end is at least, questionable. As described, Thomson Reuters identifies and evaluates for inclusion in its lists the new journals that are considered to be promising and gets rid of the JCR reports that have shown to be less useful.
- The power that is granted to the system organizes the production and its use so that what takes place outside the system is essentially non-existent or worthless to promote in the field of quality and of scientific recognition. Unfortunately, this is the tacit message that is transmitted to the researchers and the journals: ‘If your work isn't here, it's worthless’. Therefore, the system has an indirect and negative influence on those who for various reasons are left out because they can't or because they don't want to be included.
• This implicitly intends to undervalue the analysis and procedures to question, for example, the teaching degree.

• Because Spanish journals don't cite amongst themselves as much as others, another issue is the local problem of the relatively few Spanish journals that are indexed in the JCR. This forces them to try to publish their research works in foreign JCR mediums to improve their own lists, which further reinforces the issuer-manager system of Thomson-Reuters.

• Today the primary teacher-researcher function is to generate knowledge, but that's no longer enough. It's necessary to publish science in a particular way and in specific locations and everything— their professional development, their research, their financing and their university work will depend on the requirements of the evaluation systems that we have become attached to. Due to this, in many cases, scientists have transitioned from doing research to writing (…). The established system places the researcher in the university closer to production than tranquility, closer to personal interests than the Humanism from which all science is nourished, closer to schematic, arbitrary and rigid ways than focusing on the content itself and closer to the papers than to tests and trials. This feels like a contradiction of the scientific and the commonsensical, which are particularly important when dealing with teaching and education. Therefore, the problem could cause implications in research, but of even greater significance will be the repercussions in educational development and this is a pedagogical problem of the first degree.

The previously mentioned David Fernández Quijada (2008) reminds us of a series of key facts, taking interest in:

The reason to publish subjects of notable local emphasis in international journals. Beyond territorial anchors, a possible answer is the opportunity to compare methodologies and investigative tools that may be applied in other contexts. Nevertheless, this inquiry was removed from serious reflection as Spanish was the language of scientific transmission. The answer to this question may seem obvious in social sciences but is also answered with emphatic denial in areas like natural science, medicine and engineering. In this sense, English
has been converted into the lingua franca of scientific communication on an international level, which leads to various problems for the countries where this is not the first language. Amongst others, the role that the gatekeepers or guardians of the theories, methodologies and dominant themes that English-speaking researchers are granted (…), is of those who are most published in these journals and make up the majority of their editorial boards and revision committees. Serving as an example of this is the data contributed by Masip (2005) with regard to the origin of the authors who published between 1994 and 2004 in the 35 included journals in communication section of the JCR which were also accessible from the database Communication Abstracts (…). The US dominance was overwhelming: 66.89% of the articles were of this origin. The next three countries were also from English-speaking areas, while Spain was situated in a modest sixteenth place with 43 articles, less than 4 annually.

Another piece of information provided by Masip is reasonably significant: five journals were responsible for 50% of European production. It's true that there are alternative databases that cover social sciences (and amongst them communication), like Scopus, property of the Dutch multinational Elsevier. In addition, at the end of 2007, Scopus inaugurated a free access alternative to consult the impact factor, the Scimago Journal & Country Rank, developed in Spain by the inter-university group Scimago (…). Although the selection of journals in the area of communication is greater than in the case of JCR (53 titles compared with 44), the biases remain basically the same, as the language of diffusion and the editing countries belong to the same field.

If there aren't any more Spanish authors, should it be attributed to us being incompetent or to the guidelines that are presented? To those of us who know the amount of studies in journalism and communication in Spain -and a good amount in Latin America as well- it seems to me that we cannot happily maintain that the English-speaking world researches more or better with regard to journalism and communication (Moragas,
2011, Marques de Melo, 2009, León Duarte, 2007)\textsuperscript{26}. I think that the problem has roots of even greater importance and we must take into account the words of Jaume Soriano:

The scientific output carried out in the English language is overrepresented and research published in other languages is ignored. This system also underrepresents the research done outside the typical or dominant paradigms of a discipline, such as exploratory research. 

(…) 

The evaluation of scientific research using bibliometric standards suggests additional objections when the discipline upon which it is based belongs to the field of the social sciences and humanities such as is the case in communication research. The epistemological differences between natural sciences and social sciences affect their measurement in a very special way by means of bibliometric procedures. (…). One of the first differences lies in that the objects of study of the research in this field tend to have a more local orientation, less universal and consequently the diffusion and impact of the results of these investigations tend to have well defined national or regional boundaries; secondly, social sciences and humanities are characterized as being multiparadigmatic areas of knowledge, hence, scientific literature is presented more heterogeneously and fragmented; thirdly, there is a large plurality of formats through which the knowledge in the social sciences and the humanities is disseminated, unlike the natural sciences.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{26} Moragas studies research trends not only of Spain and Latin America but of the United States as well as other countries. Marques de Melo and León Duarte -the last directed by Miquel Rodrigo Alsina, another scholar on the subject- focus on Latin America. It is a constant in the Spanish bibliographic world: proof of research activity in communication and journalism. On the other hand, if the reader wishes to verify the relevance that leading Spanish publishers give to research in communication and journalism along with the thematic richness of this research -above all- in the Spanish-speaking world, it's as easy as connecting to these sites, amongst others: http://www.comunicacionsocial.es/, http://www.gedisa.com/articulos.aspx?modo=c&fam=1023, http://www.gedisa.com/articulos.aspx?modo=c&fam=1022, http://www.fragua.es/, http://ariel.clauator.com/coleccion/ariel-comunicacion, http://www.sintesis.com/ciencias-de-la-informacion-7/. For a link that emphasizes the practice of Communication: http://www.rtve.es/instituto/publicaciones/.

With a small experiment Jaume Sorian has demonstrated the fall of articles that originate from synchronous wisdom and the rise of technical content between 1994 and 2006 by studying the Spanish journals in communication of the greatest impact during those years. This leads me to conclude that, in effect, a path has slowly been adapted that has more to do with an ideology implanted from specific centers of market power than those of the traditional Spanish, European and Latin-American focus. The so-called unitary mindset 'pensee unique' is not only found in general society but also in the supposed scientific world.

So, everything began with Dr. Eugene Garfield. A small look at the web tells us that we are talking about an “informatologist”, who is also licensed in chemistry, with studies in library information sciences who has also passed through the Universities of Columbia, Colorado, Berkeley… But what is of most interest to us now is the current definition of the JCR by the agency itself:

> Journal Citation Reports® offers a systematic, objective means to critically evaluate the world's leading journals, with quantifiable, statistical information based on citation data. By compiling articles' cited references, JCR helps to measure research influence and impact at the journal and category levels, and shows the relationship between citing and cited journals. Available in Science and Social Sciences editions.²⁸

This is mere promotion, advertising. But my methodology takes us even further: What is behind the three initials JCR? I will provide a small illustration that is self-elaborated, as all other illustrations in this article will be.

Behind an English-Speaking Multinational Corporation:

What is Thomson Reuters?

On 3/27/2008, the cited newspaper El Mundo, from Spain, informed: “A new corporation is born with the merger of Thomson (Canada-USA) and Reuters (UK) valuing 12 billion euros”\(^\text{29}\). That was in 2008 but prior to that it acted as The Thomson Corporation which operated through five segments: Thomson Financial, Thomson Healthcare, Thomson Legal, Thomson Scientific, and Thomson Tax & Accounting. Although the company has always been linked to media networks, it's also had forays in aeronautics (owner of Britannia Airways later named Thomsonfly) and in the exploitation of the oil deposits in the North Sea. Nevertheless, it currently officially presents itself to us as a firm providing education, information, communication and above all finance services now that it is united with Reuters.

The next question in my methodological process although it may seem simple and unnecessary: What is Reuters?

- Although it’s most known for its work as a news agency, this only accounts for 10% of the group's overall income.

- The primary activity of Reuters consists in providing information to the financial markets.

- Amongst its competitors are Bloomberg L.P. and Dow Jones Newswires.

- Since 2008, it’s part of Thomson Reuters.

- Bloomberg is property of Michael Bloomberg, ex-mayor of New York.


Meaning, Thomson Reuters is immersed in the world of the communications market. The next step of my research leads me to take interest in a small sample of the names that drive or have driven Thomson-Reuters. I again turn to an illustration:
Tom Glocer, Stephane Bello and Gus Carlson lead us to the following large companies, amongst others:

- Morgan Stanley.
- General Motors.
- BlackRock.
- Hill and Knowlton

The structural focus related to the Political Economy of Communication, Information and Culture (EPICC) contains a crucial aspect to keep in mind to understand what is happening in the interior of the cognitive and media world: the processes of concentration and diversification of the capital of the market economy and even more so, in the new economy stemming from globalization and the web society, lead to it becoming increasingly common for large companies to compete and cooperate with each other in the process of joint venture. This is how -in our contemporary age since the 19th century- a socioeconomic web has been formed which clearly includes the mass media who are also companies organized in groups and conglomerates connected to firms that are unrelated to communications and vice versa: communication firms that
diversify their shareholder presence in sectors that are puzzling to the communications world (Reig, 2010a). The factor that connects all of them together is the presence of politics.

Based on the above, I will first look in the direction of Morgan Stanley and thereby will be able to verify where the company takes me. I will represent it like this:

![Articulations Diagram]

**Articulations**

- In January **2008** The Spanish bank **La Caixa** purchases part of the private banking business of **Morgan Stanley** in Spain for close to 600 million euros.


- La Caixa is a shareholder of Telefónica and Prisa.

- BlackRock owns approximately 10% of Televisa.


Morgan Stanley (USA) which, as can be observed, is connected to Japanese capital, also links us to La Caixa/Caixabank (Spain). La Caixa is a shareholder of Prisa and Telefónica in Spain. Prisa maintains close relations to the investment world in the United States and thereby maintains a similar relationship with its media presence (Reig, 2010a). For example:

- Halfway through 2008, Unióm Radio (the radio division of Prisa, in alliance with the Godó Group, from Catalonia) had power over more than 1,200 radio stations
in: Spain, the USA, México, Colombia, Costa Rica, Panamá, Argentina, Chile and announced further expansion in Perú, Venezuela and the United States.

- In the summer of 2009 it created the company PRISA IBN International, with IBN (USA) to promote their audiovisual products in Spain, Portugal, Latin America and the USA. Talos Partners, the financial arm of IBN, also bought an initial shareholding of 4.5% of PRISA's capital.

- At the beginning of the Fall of 2009, it announced the sale of 25% of Santillana a DLJ South American Partners, a private equity fund that invests in private businesses in Latin America with a special focus on Brazil, Chile and Argentina.

- In the last trimester of 2010, the entrance of the shareholder Prisa in the Liberty Acquisitions Holding investment fund was made effective.

Meanwhile, the international projection of Telefónica is more than evident and also reaches the United States:

- In 2009, it owned the Hispanic affiliates of BellSouth (USA).
- At the end of 2011-beginning of 2012 it teamed up with Microsoft to promote Imagenio (one of its television platforms) for the Internet.
- In May 2014 it saw how the purchase of Direct TV by AT&T could hinder some plans in Latin America: “The Telecommunications market moves at a very high speed, especially in the United States. It was Comcast that in February announced the purchase of Time Warner Cable for 45 billion dollars and now it's AT&T's turn, by purchasing the largest platform of satellite television, Direct TV. The transaction could surpass 36 billion euros. With this activity, AT&T overtakes Telefónica which, in its day, negotiated with Direct TV, although not to buy it -the Spanish company wouldn't be able to embark on an operation of such magnitude- but to reach commercial agreements to allow them to offer TV services to their clients and therefore complete the quadruple play in Spanish-speaking America.  

In any case, the apparent deviation from Prisa and Telefónica to the United States is little more than a small demonstration of how the structural approach quickly introduces us to a labyrinth of names and links that are very difficult to master. I should remind

---

you that, in my methodology, the starting and connecting point was Morgan Stanley. In the previous illustration I also noted:

- Among the shareholders of Morgan Stanley are Mitsubishi UFJ Financial Group, Inc., BlackRock Institutional Trust Company, N.A. and JP Morgan Chase & Company\(^{31}\).

- BlackRock owns roughly 10% of Televisa.

Another name that has appeared in the career paths of the executives (I've only chosen three) connected to Thomson Reuters is General Motors. In addition to the decline of this firm, it interests me to know some information behind the brand. I can confirm that among the shareholders of General Motors are JP Morgan Chase & Company and BlackRock Institutional Trust Company, N.A.\(^{32}\). We once again come across BlackRock in addition to the banking sector which is omnipresent when dealing with large and not quite so large investors. The above can be represented in a slide:

---


So a new and logical question: What is BlackRock, which seems to be everywhere? Blackrock is a US financial institution with headquarters in New York. It is considered to be the largest asset management company in the world, as we discover by surfing the internet a little. In reference to the corporation's relations with the Spanish stock exchange Javier Checa points out:

**BlackRock**, the largest fund manager in the world, has Spain very present in its own investment focus. In recent weeks, names like César Alierta [chief executive of Telefónica] and Emilio Botín [Chief executive of Santander Group] stated that a considerable amount of foreign money is entering the country. For the US firm our country isn't a new territory. **Present in all of the Ibex 35 Stock Exchange**, the value of its investments **reaches 9 billion euros**, positioning it as one of the most active players with significant operations almost daily in its portfolio companies. 

So we know something about BlackRock, but in reality it's very little compared to its real power. I will point out something else. To do so, I repeat, although minimally, another illustration will be of use:

---

And JP Morgan Chase who also backed General Motors? To dedicate time to this banking power would be a separate job, but there was a time when, as I was in Miami, I looked into the property of the newspaper *The Miami Herald*. I summarized it like this:
We once again find JP Morgan Chase but also, once again, BlackRock y Credit Suisse which in May of 2014 received- and agreed to pay without protest- a fine from the government of the United States in the amount of 1.8 billion dollars for consulting United States citizens in a way to avoid paying taxes to the US Treasury. “This is a rare submission of charges on behalf of the Department of Justice which typically doesn't indict financial firms, especially if they are global companies that could become destabilized by an accusation like this. This is the first time in almost two decades that a bank recognizes its guilt in a criminal case in the United States”\(^ {34} \). Of course, it is assumed that The Miami Herald is not guilty of anything. I only intend to portray the travel companions of the media world that, without a doubt, influence or have the ability to influence the editorial lines\(^ {35} \).


Thomson Reuters - mother company of JCR - is now taking us quite far despite the fact that this text only provides simple sketches of a very complex power. But there's more, much more. I will select some of the data that I've uncovered.

If BlackRock was present in GM then we should go back to GM and its relations to media power as well as other relevant questions. We can once again do so by using an illustration:

![Articulations](image)

- General Motors Corporation ("GM"), Hughes Electronics Corporation ("Hughes") & The News Corporation Limited, through Fox Entertainment Group, “exchanged” shares and formed partnerships in satellite operations.


As you can see, an arrow goes through and connects various corporations. These operations - with the exception of arms production - took place approximately between the end of the 20th century and the year 2006. And to it, we can add the phenomenon of planned obsolescence, a good invention to keep us "slaves" of needless consumption, originating in the assembly-line production which commenced in the 19th century. Since then, the market should "pursue" and determine the subject's freedom by bringing him/her to its field which is necessary to add another element to the technological tricks: elevating advertising to a science so as to present this as a sign of progress.

I will conclude that which I've just established with some additional data that bear in mind a little historical perspective:
■ In May 2014, AT&T bought Direct TV almost in its entirety\(^\text{36}\).

■ In 2006, Direct TV had already been almost completely bought by News Corp. (Murdoch) on behalf of the Liberty Media Group (John Malone).

■ News Corp. bought Direct TV around 2003. Specifically, it acquired 35% of the shares of Hughes Electronics, owner of Direct TV and shortly before, linked to General Motors.

I said it before: our executives at Thomson Reuters -"mother" of JCR- bare companies in their career paths like

- Morgan Stanley.
- General Motors.
- BlackRock.
- Hill and Knowlton

I've addressed some of the connections of three of them. Why have I also chosen Hill and Knowlton? Simply for this reason:

The media manipulations intend to treat the citizens of our democracies like children: It's possible that we are before grown-up children or before childlike adults - above all if we think about the United States- but even if the end justifies the means, the Machiavellian assertion shouldn't be applied in a democracy, unless our democracies become comfortable being but a word that is more a wish than a reality: democracy.

How was it possible to explain to US citizens in 1991 that it was necessary to oust Sadam Hussein from Kuwait if a large majority didn't know what Kuwait was nor whom Sadam Hussein was? It was not effective to use reason and didactically explain the problem. It was more affective to use emotion. And the most emotionally touching thing? A child, of course. More than a child? A baby. More than a baby? A premature baby in an incubator. And there it is, Hill and Knowlton invented a story and the matter was uncovered in the documentary -feature Sell the War37: the soldiers of the an evil being named Sadam had entered into the hospitals of a place named Kuwait, had taken the premature babies out of their incubators and murdered them with bayonets. Therefore, it was necessary eliminate the face of evil from the planet. And US citizens,

37 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mr6h9zqO3j0.
-pardon the generalization, it's a way of speaking, like when *The New York Times* or *Daily Telegraph* accused the Spanish of having anachronistic customs—exclaimed: Oh, bomb and kill evil! And that's what was done although as we now know, the physical removal of Sadam and the exhibition of his body before the media-filled plaza to teach a lesson would arrive later, in the 21st century. 1991 was when a US bomber pilot asserted while he dropped bombs on Baghdad that at night from the sky the exploding bombs looked like Christmas lights. The US press echoed this idea.

If we again look at the Morgan Stanley Company we arrive at BlackRock and amongst other names, we are lead to General Motors. But we mustn't forget that Morgan Stanley also leads us to La Caixa (Spain) and that La Caixa leads us to Prisa (Spain). Nevertheless, Prisa has more shareholders, in addition to Liberty or La Caixa. A small shareholder in Prisa (with approximately 3% of the shares in 2014) is the Mexican magnate Carlos Slim, who in the last years *Forbes* magazine was established as one of the three richest men on the planet. Slim, through his firm Carso is also present in *The New York Times* as a minority partner but also with a shareholding of around 8% in 2013.

---


39 See Giordano, Eduardo: “El control de las fuentes audiovisuales en la propaganda bélica”, in the journal *Comunicación*, from Venezuela: [http://gumilla.org/biblioteca/bases/biblio/texto/COM199175_37-64.pdf](http://gumilla.org/biblioteca/bases/biblio/texto/COM199175_37-64.pdf), p. 17. For the "orthodoxes" of the market, there's no need to consult it, as it comes from Venezuela and they are surely lying. But, unfortunately, it's not like this! I was in front of the television screen listening and contemplating the "televised war". Do I also lie?
On 11/18/2011, the flagship of Prisa, *El País*, confirmed: “Slim acquires a 3.2% stake in the Prisa Group. The Mexican businessman, present in the capital of *The New York Times*, carried out the operation through the real estate agency Carso. (…). In addition to PRISA, in Spain Slim controls 0.202% of the capital of CaixaBank (previously Criteria), for whom he was a consultant until the beginning of November when he renounced his position to join the board of Criteria Caixa Holding, the industrial holding company of La Caixa.”  

The arrival of Slim at the Prisa Group, according to the same source, took place by agreement amongst the leading shareholders:

The Timón Group, controlled by a Polish family, came to an agreement with the controlling shareholders and consultants, Nicolas Berggruen and Martin Franklin, president and respective co-founder of Liberty Acquisition Holdings, as to the creation of a society (special purpose vehicle) shared 50% by both parties and controlled by Timón destined to convert 75 million warrants into shares for a cost of 150 million euros.

Nevertheless, a later report –from the EFE Agency- went even further. From February 21, 2014:

**MEXICO CITY (EFE)** – Sources from the Proto Organization announced Friday that Mexican businessman Carlos Slim and the Italian group Proto will become the majority shareholders of the US newspaper *New York Times* (NYT).

They explained to sources of the EFE Agency, "This agreement of joint participation for 19% of the capital of the NYT was made yesterday in New York directly by Carlos Slim and Alejandro Proto (president of the group), and the transaction will be finalized next week".

The informants declined to mention the specific amounts of this operation, but signaled that they will own 19% of the capital, with Slim retaining 17% and Proto 2%.

---


41 A warrant is a negotiable value given by an entity for a specified period that gives the right (and not the obligation) through paying a price to buy (call warrant) or sell (put warrant) a specified quantity of an asset (underlying asset) at a fixed price throughout its life or at its maturity, depending on the class. See: [http://www.bolsamadrid.es/esp/Warrants/Warrants.aspx](http://www.bolsamadrid.es/esp/Warrants/Warrants.aspx). My disclaimer- not information from EFE.
They pointed out that with this operation they would become the majority shareholders of the company, although they clarified that the editorial line would remain in the hands of the original shareholders, the Ochs-Sulzberger family.

(…)

In a statement, Proto noted that the sale of the Washington Post to the founder of Amazon, Jeff Bezos, supports a trend in which the traditional groups are no longer able to continue the operation of the major media on their own, but "need a solid support to overcome the transition".

"For this reason, the Proto Organization and its president Alessandro Proto, friend of Carlos Slim, decided to back the purchase of the majority stake in the New York Times".

Proto is a shareholder of Prisa in Spain, of the British Sky Broadcasting Group (BSkyB) in the United Kingdom and of the Rizzoli-Corriere della Sera Group in Italy.

(…)

Slim lent the NYT 250 million dollars during the economic crisis in 2009, after financial turbulence caused by the fall of their advertising revenue.  

---

42 http://www.cnnexpansion.com/negocios/2014/02/21/slim-accionista-mayoritario-en-nyt. Consulted, 5/16/2014. BSkyB has been controlled by News Corp., of Murdoch, and Rizzoli Corriere della Sera by Fiat, by the Agnelli family, also present in the arms industry.
The Carso Group later denied this information while Proto insisted that they would move ahead alone to make an entrance in *The New York Times*\(^{43}\). These squabbles are frequent in the current business world. I will accept, therefore, that Mr. Slim only owns about 8% of the shares of *The New York Times*:

Since 2011, the richest man on the planet, the Mexican Carlos Slim, is a shareholder of *The New York Times*, owning approximately 8% of the shares.

Having demonstrated the connection between Carlos Slim not only with *El País* but also with *The New York Times* through the Carso Company, the next question is equally obvious, though I must also state my concern with regard to the words of Proto -nothing new but alarming nonetheless- that the media needs extra-media backing and support.

The question is: what's behind Carso? We only have to display another illustration to understand the labyrinth of companies that are concealed behind this word:

**The Carso Group: some of the companies owned by Carlos Slim**

One of them, as you can see, is *The New York Times*. But we see companies from all kinds of production sectors and for all tastes. So another question arises: Are the journalists from one media to another really so free to research any issue that affects thousands or millions of citizens? Can we really believe that Carso is going to respect the independence of their controlled media outlets? To consider another enigma: What percentage -directly and indirectly- does Mr. Slim really own from one headline to the next?

But this is not the place to tackle The Proto Group, driven by a peculiar character: Alessandro Proto about who I've barely researched. He gives the impression of being the typical investor who sticks his nose into everything, from luxury urbanizations and
construction (in Argentina, for example) to media companies. It's odd, as he maintains that he's only interested in investments and specifically in the bottom line profit and loss statement and not influencing the editorial lines of the media. So, nobody influences the media message? At these heights it's impossible to support this stance as the opposite has been exceedingly demonstrated (Chomsky and Herman, 1990, Serrano, 2009, Reig, 2010b y 2013) and in this work other examples have been cited.

Our structural exercise with the JCR has taken us quite far, although, as can be concluded, the subject contains various investigations that will lead us to even further places. The presence of Thomson Reuters in the bedroom of the JCR allows it to uncover and glance at many hidden details. In the end, it leads to a tangled mess of companies and a wide range of activities, almost none related to communication, journalism or academic research. But yet, it's assumed that we should believe in the transparency and honesty of the JCR system and that there won't be any conflicts of interest.

To finish, I still need to share the publishers that are recommended to us as researchers as starting points to measure the quality of our work. In Spain (The University of Seville) they advise us the following landmarks (in 2014):

As it can be observed, dependent research once again leads us to the English-speaking world. Without overlooking the undeniable value of these publishers to this culture and their excellent contributions in science, I must remain loyal to my methodology so it's my obligation to once again ask myself who are they advising me to direct my work to. And I find some information that provides some answers:

**Minimum publisher links**

- **McGraw Hill** is a publishing house, yes, but it is also a financial assessment agency linked to **BlackRock** which is at the same time shareholder of Morgan Stanley, linked to **Thomson Reuters**.

- The publishers **Springer** and **Kluwer** since 2011 are linked to **Government of Singapore Investment Corporation**, investment bank in Singapore, after passing through various hands, amongst them **Axel Springer-Bertelsmann** (D). Axel publishes the newspaper **Bild Zeitung** (sensationalist) and Bertelsmann, in conjunction with Pearson (UK) who are the owners of the largest publisher in the world: Random House.
• The Hearst Corporation (USA) owns 40% of The Fitch Ratings Group (USA), in 2011.

• In 2013, BlackRock Institutional Trust Co. owned approximately 10% of the shares of Televisa (Mexico) but in 2011 also was shareholder of Moody’s (3.2%) and McGraw Hill (3.8%).

• «Moody’s, Standard & Poor’s and Fitch raise many suspicions in the Old Continent. José Manuel Durao Barroso accuses them of having an anti-European bias, while Herman Van Rompuy considers it necessary to break their oligopoly and Angela Merkel demands the creation of a European ratings agency. These criticisms were answered -taken care of- by the majority shareholder of Fitch, the Frenchman Marc Ladreit from Lacharrière.»

As social scientists from humanities -we have as one of our core obligations to thoroughly question everything, meaning, to be truly free- face the obligation to carry out an act of faith with regard to publishing houses tied to the market sector along with various spheres of the production sector. Moreover, how is it possible to measure the quality of the research of publishing only with specific publishing houses? The so-called "prestigious" publishers –as can be gathered- are often submerged in a negotiator dynamic. I have colleagues that specialize in very confined subjects. In my field, for example, in communication and journalism centered in the South of Spain, how and why should we demand these researchers to publish in commercial firms?

5. Conclusions

Is the conclusions section the same as the proposals? In essence, yes. That's why I'm going to finish with clear conclusions being conscious that throughout this work, I've already been making some- a cause for which my possible "blind" evaluators would reject this article, amongst other reasons such as its narrative, as I’ve already stated. Let us get to the conclusions that are, at the same time, expressions of discontent, anxiety and suggestions for improvement:

1. Ámbitos –and I myself- will have to adapt to an "obediently" imposed and/or accepted reality. This acceptance should be thoroughly revised and checked.

2. That doesn't mean that a relentless and categorical criticism won’t be made.

3. It's extremely questionable that the research in social sciences and specifically in communication, journalism and in humanities of European and Latin-American schools should be subjected to a situation such as I have just outlined, a situation closer to the market than to science. I have established: the rules that the university has developed don't exactly originate in the European, Spanish or Latin American tradition. It is now supposed that they are necessary and, as I've asserted time and time again many of my senior colleagues have accepted them, promote them, celebrate them and have turned into converts, convinced that our system was corrupt from top to bottom and, instead of fixing the mess on the foundations of our History, they've turned to the principles of the most hegemonic commercial culture. The so-called unitary mindset 'pensee unique' is not only found in general society but also in the supposed scientific world.

4. Therefore, in Spain and in other countries a path has slowly been adapted that has more to do with an ideology implanted from specific centers of market power than those of the traditional Spanish, European and Latin-American focus. The Latin American and European world deserve dignity in their research, without excluding anything or anyone, meaning without the orthodoxy that has been detected in the English-speaking world. In this sense, it's unacceptable that, for example, The European Union (EU) would have refused to support a European website in Communication [http://www.presseurop.eu/](http://www.presseurop.eu/) which had to "freeze" its work in December 2013.  

5. For as much "independence" the JCR has -research division of Thomson Reuters- behind it essentially exists a market and functionalist-based labyrinth that can lead to a clash of interests.

6. It's impossible to reject or deny the research capacity of the United States along with its undoubted achievements. What is being petitioned for here is a greater role of the European identity in general and in particular of the Latin identity. A country can be admired in some aspects and imitated when necessary and within

---

46 [http://www.presseurop.eu/es/content/press-review/4419221-se-cierra-una-ventana-la-vida-de-los-europeos](http://www.presseurop.eu/es/content/press-review/4419221-se-cierra-una-ventana-la-vida-de-los-europeos).
reason. But it's unacceptable to mythologize and be converted into a vassal, placing a culture that has taken millenniums to be founded in the second field of vision.

7. Also without rejecting the undoubted necessity and utility of the paper -above all in certain fields of knowledge- it's crucial to maintain that the systemization of thought and science require the book because we mustn’t transfer to science and thought the spirit of "the society of 144 characters", made fashionable by Twitter. To express oneself rigorously demands a larger area, often times much larger and he who takes advantage of it shouldn’t be considered as the one with the problem because it requires an extra effort. Notwithstanding, there are few things that are very relevant in life that have been produced without great effort and while one should address the economy of words this must be done so without taking it to purely convenient and purely mediocre spheres, related to the desire to attempt to live in an eternal dynamic of the law of the least effort.

8. The evaluation of the work of a researcher should depend on, above all, the content of the work and those who evaluate it should access the primary reference base not acting solely on behalf of other factors like justifications or if the place of publication is of supposed prestige. Science and cognitive work cannot be evaluated only with papers but must include tests and knowledge of the facts.

9. The prestige of databases, journals, publishers, etc., is not granted by any one place or monopolist institution but from various and numerous places from different parts of the globe. It is granted by different academic schools without any interruption by the market and other structures or lobbies of power.

10. We must move towards an approach where the revisers and evaluators of research are explicit and have a research career path somewhat similar to the author being evaluated along with sharing the same specific field of knowledge.
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