

# Display or philosophical decline: an inactual crisis?

María Elizabeth Mejía Muñoz\*

*It is true that, in the Musée d'Orsay, Ónice's work has a glow for its reckless title: "Nature discovering itself before science", but they forget that the first philosophers known as physis philosophers had already built the relationship philosophy-science. For example Democritus, philosophized about the becomings or changes in nature, makes it clear that everything that moves is in constant evolution. With this theory is framed an eternal return between science and philosophy; the changes are constant, and turns are allowed in the views from philosophy as well as from the sciences. They are in a constant becoming together.*

*The sciences, since they began their detachment from philosophy, have always been in revolutions; Not so philosophy, their movements are slower, but accurate. Although Azcárraga argues that: "(...) philosophy does not go through today's period of greatest splendor" (2002, p. 1), it implies that its changing slowness does not go hand in hand with science, due to the fact that philosophy As a discipline he does not give immediate answers, he takes the time necessary to debate the errors left by the sciences in his progress. Popper argues that:*

*However, my opinion of the matter -valga what is worth- is that there is no logical method of having new ideas, nor a logical reconstruction of this process. My opinion can be expressed by saying that every discovery contains "an irrational element" or "a creative intuition" in Bergson's sense. Einstein speaks, in a similar way, of the "search for those extremely universal laws (...) from which an image of the world can be obtained by pure deduction. There is no logical path, he says, that leads to these (...) laws. They can only be reached through intuition, supported by something like an introjection (Einfühlung) of the objects of experience (1962, pp. 31-32).*

*Popper's thesis is punctual because he maintains that this irrationality is interpreted or deconstructed by philosophy; It gives science the interpretive elements for a better understanding of what Bergson calls "a creative intuition". For Popper, it is impossible for any theory to sustain anything from an empirical world, and it would only do so as long as it struck itself, for which it would enter into problems with that world; Philosophy would be in charge of those events, that is to say, a direct relationship with science. Azcárraga says: "Philosophy must be, today, linked to science. Science helps us to understand how things are, not how they seem or wish to be, and therefore is, in the long term, more immune to our preconceptions (2002, p. 2).*

---

\* Licenciada en Matemáticas de la Universidad Católica de Manizales. Magíster en Enseñanza de las Ciencias Naturales y Exactas de la Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Doctorante en Educación de la Universidad Baja California, México. Tutora del Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia, programa Todos a Aprender. Correo electrónico: elizabethmemu@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-1075-8910.

That thesis should be posed, on the contrary, philosophy is what leads to understand science and see the things of nature as they are and should be, because: "What men can hardly avoid (is that) are continuously affected by the outer bodies" (Spinoza, 2007, II, 47). And it is there that there is the importance of philosophizing, interpreting and making known things as they are and should be. In Bunge's text: *Philosophy for Physicians* (2016), this raises questions such as: how can philosophy help or harm medicine? or what is the reason behind the delay in psychiatry? being medicine science and psychiatry a medical side. Then, to give answers, the doctor should know philosophy, because philosophy is born as medicine in a plane of immanence, as argued by Deleuze (2008). Philosophy has been able to "sculpt your own statue," said Hadot (2006, p. 47); but that sculpture would be stronger if science were at his side.

Hadot poses, in the text *The Veil of Isis* (2015), a very interesting proposal with respect to the interpretation that should make the intellectual, the academic and more specifically the student of philosophy in trying to unveil the intricacies that surrounds the mysterious world of nature, insofar as it says that nature contains mysteries that even man can not understand and that, therefore, it is pertinent that every subject restless for knowledge, and especially for the natural and medical sciences, would be called to delve into the labyrinths of nature for the sake of appropriating, in the first instance, unknown knowledge, and secondly for the understanding of existential evolution that, whether we like it or not, is influenced by the information that it gives us.

On the other hand, Colli says that Heráclito affirmed: "nature loves to hide" (2008 p. 13). This must be understood and assumed as a challenge to the obligation to try to study and understand the mysteries that Mother Nature contains. The question would be: why and for what to enter or commit ourselves to the study of natural mysteries? The answer obeys to the need to unravel the contributions that nature provides, but that still continue to be unknown, according to Heraclitus. In other words, how would the philosophy-science relationship be valid to unravel the occult of that nature?

If so, each discipline would be obliged to interpret that unknown veil or that does not allow to see or know all the mysteries or, if you want, all the knowledge that natural knowledge contains. It is there where the philosopher, the intellectual, the academic itself would be called upon to play a role in understanding the scaffolding of universal knowledge. Philosophy and science have not been distant in their fields of knowledge; On the one hand, philosophy as the first science of things, according to Aristotle, has provided for over twenty-five centuries invaluable contributions in relation to the emergence of rational thought; science has been able to provide its contributions to all conceptions of knowledge that require demonstrable rigor and verification.

Both disciplines, although with their different objects of study, do not quarrel among them. This would lead to the understanding that philosophy continues and will continue to provide inaccurate concepts for today's societies and sciences.

## Conflict of interest

The author declares the inexistence of a conflict of interest with an institution or commercial association of any kind. The same way, La Universidad Católica Luis Amigó is not responsible for the handling of the author's rights that the authors make in their articles, therefore, the veracity and completeness of the citations and references are the responsibility of the authors.

## References:

- Azcárraga, J. A. (2002). Ciencia y filosofía. Documento de trabajo.
- Bunge, M. (2016). Filosofía para médicos. Madrid, España: Gedisa.
- Colli, G. (2008). La naturaleza ama esconderse. Madrid, España: Biblioteca de Ensayos Siruela.
- Deleuze, G. (2008). Dos regímenes de locos. Barcelona, España: Pre-textos.
- Hadot, P. (2006). Ejercicios espirituales. Madrid, España: Siruela.
- Hadot, P. (2015). El velo de Isis. Barcelona, España: Ediciones Alpha Decay.
- Popper, K. (1962). La lógica de la investigación científica. Madrid, España: Tecnos.
- Spinoza, B. (2007). Obras completas. Valencia, España: Alianza Editorial.