

## Bio-ecditorial: an inter and transdisciplinary dialog

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18359/rbi.1438>

During the twentieth century, in the academic and intellectual context, the argument between the soft sciences and the hard science, the exact and experimental sciences with humanities and social sciences became sharper. This fact in Western academia and most marked in Latin American countries generated a social imaginary in which the exact sciences (hard) were considered as those eligible to be called scientific; whereas the human, social sciences or humanities were conceived as speculative sciences. The huge mistake of academic and intellectual society was the understanding of the sciences of a hierarchical classification and stratification, a phenomenon that favored to forget that both types produced knowledge and allowed the transformation and improvement in the quality of life of human beings. But more than that, they forgot that the production of knowledge should meet the objective of protecting the sacredness of life; Added to this, the uncritical blindness of exact and social sciences against the capitalist system and marketing knowledge is a fact that in the XXI century is more evident and real.

In this context of the dualistic and fragmentary fallacy between hard sciences and soft sciences, for some still in force, Bioethics emerged as an alternative to demonstrate both the accurate scientist and social scientist, that a scientific epistemic trend is no more (or worth) than other. On the contrary, they are complementary, so they are called to create and produce knowledge in a troubled society, where life is increasingly being affected by technoscientific developments, market and financial formulas, religious-moral models, urban-asphalt structures, among other phenomena characteristic of historical dynamics.

To come up in the XXI century that the exact sciences are more than human, social sciences or humanities; or on the other hand, biased to radical dogmatism of presenting human, social sciences or humanities as they have the last word against the scientific knowledge raises a dichotomy between scientific knowledge and humanistic knowledge that more than a confrontation invites to build a dialog between the sciences but from the social reality that arises in each context, a science where the laboratory is the social reality of everyday life from its holistic and not fragmented nature.

The dialogue should be characterized by open-mindedness of scientists of one trend or another. There must be respect for knowledge production in each epistemic

space. Not to think as in old medievalism time that the humanities have the last word, and the exact sciences must submit to its judgment; or do not fall into the fallacy of giving more value to the experimental sciences, denigrating the meaning of the humanities. The dialogue is not between the sciences in a speculative and unreal way; this dialogue is between the social agents leading the processes of each science, that is, scientifics, researchers, and academics. For this dialogue, it should be removed any arrogance and pretentious because it is believed to have knowledge thus one of the natural conditions of the dialogue is that there no hierarchical verticality with power but horizontal consensual with listening skills.

Thus, in the field of bioethics, it is urgent and necessary to conceive dialogues increasingly inter- and transdisciplinary, put them off the center merely of the bio-medical or biojuridical speech, especially when in the current context of science and its relationship with society and culture are becoming more interdependent. The bioethical dialogue is par excellence a field where the action is not postponed, in which the human, social sciences and humanities have an action space for their approaches. In the same way, it is the space where the “exact” sciences can call into question their progress, their sense of the biotic and abiotic process that surround us, because, at the same time, this bioethical dialogue is a dialogue between man and his environment, body, life, existence, but in an interdependent way with nature, environment, and ecology.

We could do a big argument about the sense of the inter- and transdisciplinary, their importance within the academy. But it is important to leap towards inter and transposition of ideas, feelings and thoughts that become actions; but this is only possible through dialogue, not only scholars but also agents and social players that feel the membership of an independent world that requires care and protection. The theoretical, academic and intellectual constructions, either from the exact sciences or humanities, should encourage dialogue with everything that means life or allows its development.

The bioethical dialogue cannot turn its back to the revolutions that accompany humanity today: cultural, political, social, economic, financial, environmental, ecological, proliferation of genres, medical and scientific, among others. On the contrary, these revolutions should be taken from the sciences built by the knowledge of men, interdependently, since what is in the middle is not the discussion of its validity, rather, it is seeing its relevance or not within societies. To introduce the bioethical dialogue is essential to be placed in a liquid society (Bauman) , in the paradigm of complexity (Morin), philosophy of finitude (Méllich), the risk society (Beck) and a myriad of proposals arising from the human sciences and to help make sense of the progress of calls today technoscience and humanities.

Bioethics is a speech that with its opening and prospective becomes the stage and ground for spreading the holistic sense of the science, of all sciences without social classes, this is a space where questions and redefines anthropocentrism with which they have been built sciences, which projects a dialogic setting meaningful speeches to the reality in which life develops today. Bioethics, because of its dialogic nature, requires open bioethicists at the same academic and scientific dialogue, social agents that break with the paradigmatic complacent and self-centered attitude as owners of knowledge and science, landing at reality with the humility of the wise, not with arrogance Smarty. A social agent capable of being knowledge interlocutor between social phenomena, science, human, ecological and everything that involves the biotic and abiotic.

In this issue, we found dialogic bioethical perspectives, proposals to engage reflections from the beginning of human life, including the environment and care, these texts grounded in medical sciences, humanities, philosophy, law, ecology. We invite our readers and authors to motivate to meet current trends in bioethics and to support us in our magazine research with articles that contribute to meet the needs of our society. Bioethics is not only biomedical or Biojuridical, but is also a dialogue with biosocial, biopolitical, bio-economic, in other words, it is also an inter- and trans-disciplinary dialogue with everything that surrounds and affects life as a whole.

10  
Bioética

*Juan María Cuevas Silva*  
*Editor*