WORKING PLAN OR A WORKING ATTEMPT? IV, 2014

Considering the fact that usually the researcher must adapt towards his research [the research cannot adapt itself towards the researcher, unless the researcher (as possible in some cases) is researching himself]; I will keep my exposé in this direction. In many cases the researcher is constrained by the working conditions, working environment, finances, lack of professional or technological support; lack of logistical support… In many cases the contemporary researcher is a victim of his own research, his own institution, even his own privacy (his family, health etc.), since the legislation of being a researcher or qualified in this is somewhat fading in the long bureaucratic regulations that in many cases are inaccessible or hidden with confidentiality statements. Nevertheless the contemporary societies need the researches more than ever before (which is a result of a liberal globalization and technological improvements, as a consequence of which all global economies turn from being more social or liberal- into more in the center). That is how the attitude of the societies is. They use the social structures in order to liberally use the researchers. I must be open about this: The societies are using the researchers and their researches. That's why the copyright agreements are becoming less and less verifiable. The intellectual property, once a proud sign of the civilized western societies is now a monumental data assembly in an electronic form which has an unknown author, so to speak. I have read hundreds of pages of researches, in which I couldn't find out who did them, or what is the anonymous group or organization that did them. Furthermore I believe that indeed there are many useful and excellent researches, but they are buried in their involute fortress since we know nothing about their researchers. The only way a research can become active is by being activated by its researcher. The researcher must go to the seminars and present his work; only he can fulfill the gap between the presentation and the interpretation. Hundreds of pages of explanation can do nothing, as can do a simple explanation by the researcher in a Q&A mode. Many times finances for the most interesting researches are stopped on the closest point close to Eureka (or so it seems) since there's no real communication between the researcher and his financiers. For the financiers the research is just another step in the social system; the financier will not care if the research is not finished, presented; accessible to other researchers, scientists etc. So the principle of transparency in the contemporary democracies (as considering the fact that in most of the cases the researches are financed by some of the state bodies – agencies, ministries etc.) does not imply and for our poor researchers as well. It seems that still a lot of mystery and the so called glass sealing do exist in this resource. Why is it so? There are many reasons. I don't have here enough space to mention all the reasons I believe are the

cause of this situation. I believe it would be a good move if somebody finally allows the research: "Research For and About the Researchers." The researchers deserve at least this attention since not only that they work in a very bad conditions with a very uncertain vision of their future, but also in many cases they are put in a position to live without any human rights- the same ones that apply for all the citizens. With this I would like to state that I do not trust all the offers and international institutions like I used to. Since I saw with my own eyes and experienced everything that I mentioned afore.

In this case it would be the best for all of us if we speak about ourselves the most. As for my own research approach: I cannot tell you in particular how I plan to develop it, since everything I know about the international researches is from what I can see on Internet. I cannot guarantee that I can write a research plan and stick to it, since, as I mentioned before, I cannot trust everybody. And even more unfortunately it seems we cannot trust the contract, the agreements and any other documents we signed, anymore, since nobody respects them and asks for them. I added this in this text so that and you will be informed of the fact that "and I think that what is in the papers is one thing, and what happens in reality is another". The faces we see on Internet sites do look nice, but nobody guarantees they are really so. I can give you an example for this from the book "Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors" by Carl Sagan and Ann Druyan. This example is about a chimp which began to develop some anthropomorphic characterizations (like communicating with people with diverse hand positions). In a project that was financed far away from her (the chimps) birthplace. Just as she became almost like a human, the finances for the research were gone, and she was returned back in the wild (at this point she almost had no developed system of self-defense). There she was brutally slaughtered. So the scientists and the researchers weren't guilty for this; as the matter of fact they were the victims too; since they had to give up from all that hard work, which results and essence will be used by somebody else.

Considering my research methods, I would also hesitate to tell you something exact. Since as I said before: The researcher adapts himself to his research. Nevertheless the methods adapt to the body of the research. I would add here, since I am very eclectic: I believe in high technology, advanced routine and team work, but as well I don't underestimate the traditional research methods; as the plain observing, the experiments, the questioning, the intuitive analysis etc. I believe that it is important to have both: the scientific results and the intuition, so that one can develop/discover something new. But as well – one must not rely strictly only on himself. That can be a serious trap. As the "too many cooks spoil the soup" attitude can be delusional; the complete isolation or solitude of the researcher can be blinding.

What am I going to suggest about this? I would (once again!) suggest nothing new. Everything that is in the law (the transparency, the copyright; the social, the ecological, the scientific justifications etc.); but what is in the law (for e.g. in our institutions) should be really all by the law. Let's stick to our law and not improvise! The team work I mentioned here is not to be considered as a reference to a way with which somebody with more intelligence than me and less gray hair (so to speak) can steal something mine, on which I worked so hard and long. The team work should exist in order to confirm our believe in which "ten heads are more clever than one" and that by shearing our knowledge with others we can widen the perspectives of our research. The working groups/the team- works are becoming more important for our researchers since the interdisciplinary approach is becoming more productive, not just a trendy one. Having a linguist, doctor, physicist on a same table (in a working group) can be scientifically productive. But again "ten heads are indeed cleverer than one"; so if all ten of them are clever, that can be a good working group. I saw some derogation on this too: if those ten heads worth as zero- than ten times zero is again zero. And again we achieved nothing. So in the latest lines I guess I focus on the oldest discourse: it is not important what we do but how we do it…

About my experience in researching I cannot tell you my most exact vocation for this, but from my previous experience I can see that it is about my field of expertise with some interdisciplinary researches that are structurally connected to it. I don't have any pretension that I will make the most significant scientific discovery, but I can say I believe I can make things better. I want to make people believe that they may trust the world that surrounds them. I don't trust everything like I used to, because for e.g. I don't know how will my editor receive this text. I edited it well and corrected it, but always something is lost during the electronic transfer. If my idea from the previous text I uploaded here is "Tree" (as a working title); than my vocational research is the body of that tree, and its interdisciplinary approaches are its branches. How is it going to be presented   (in a form of a book, electronically,   interactively   etc.),   is   just   a   matter   of   technology. Nevertheless in this exposé I explained not only how I envision the dream/the perfect research, but also with what quality. In order to explain this better I would like to add here this abstract.

The Abstract:

In this abstract I would like to underline the significance of the phenomena of cog-nition and its undiscovered potentials. I agree that this statement sounds kind of pretentious; so maybe not the undiscovered potentials but the ones we discovered long time ago but we needed time to adjust our mind to them, in order to be able to

use them for the benefit of our science and ourselves. This is not the first example in our history for this: For e.g. liquid crystals were discovered long time ago, yet now we use them in our LCDs; or the technology for the computer animation was discovered 30 years before fully used. As I sad in my previous texts here many big philosophies touched the subject of cognition, but historically it was never properly associated with: the scientific method, experiment, question and conclusion making (with an exception of some quasi scientific approaches, like those in the middle-ages, in which cognition was more dogma than science). The bare mention of the term religion in the scientific method amongst the contemporary scientists provokes negative reactions. But cognition is not an impossible discipline for the science; it just makes us consider things that we guess, but are not proven. In the empirical approach this is fully accepted, thousands of years already. For e.g. if A+B=C, and if A is not A anymore, but becomes D; than D+B≠C. For e.g.: Science of middle-ages cognized that earth is flat [Though wrong for this, they cognized well, because they had the method of observation (which is close to cognition as I mentioned in my previous essay)-since our universe is more linear (horizontal) than vertical. They saw there are more stars vertically than horizontally or vice versa]; they didn't have the heliocentric system because they "observed" that there is no planet like ours (with blue atmosphere); and in deed there is no planet yet discovered like ours , and in that sense the Earth is the center of the Universe.

The other important question is the one about the terms. I think they are the second reason (after the historicism of our culture) why the phenomenon of cognition is so absent in the contemporary science. Unlike the Slavic languages where its use is strict, the term of cognition in most of the Anglo-Saxon languages is associated with other terms and its meaning is relativized. For e.g. the use of the term *letter of purpose* in the document unlike the use of the term- *letter of interest* (what we used up till very resent), shows that we all begun to cognize that our researches should be useful, rather than correct. In my previous essay I am also underlining that the truth is more important for science than reality. That's why in this text I don't hesitate to be contradictory considering middle-ages, what for classical science (that is not using the cognition method) would be unacceptable.

The discourse of reality and truth is unduptably important and well outspoken in the

communication sciences already. For this let me add here my paraphrase of Jacques Derrida about media: "The professional media informs and comments, but does not create!" Many social theoreticians were pointing that this discourse if not interpreted well will led towards a voluntarism in the media and the entire job market. Many of them mentioned this in their papers like Philipe Seguin did in the 90s, as for e.g. in his "En attendant l'emploi…"

……………………………………………………………………………………………..