



Some publications often qualify other authors such as pseudoscientists, Pseudohistoriadores, Pseudoexpertos, Pseudoperiodistas, Pseudoliteratos, Pseudoeconomistas, and a long list of similar terms.

These adjectives and similar ones show the conviction that you have to distinguish between two types of people. Some, really competent in the various human disciplines. Others, who presume to be proficient in some disciplines when in fact they are not.

These adjectives and similar ones show the conviction that you have to distinguish between two types of people. Some, really competent in the various human disciplines. Others, who presume to be proficient in some disciplines when in fact they are not.

In this way, a discussion, which could be seriously taken when analyzing arguments, by deepening the texts and their sources, taking into account the concrete situation of the experiments or studies in a field of knowledge, becomes a rant against the "Opponents" who are stripped of any credibility.

Addressing issues that deserve more serene studies is not only incorrect but manipulative. Indeed, if the "adversary" is declared incompetent, that person has almost nothing to do: for many, it would not even be heard.

On the other hand, in rare cases those that are crossed out of "pseudo" scholars not only have interesting theses or documents that deserve to be analyzed, but they can become a stimulus to deepen in subjects on which it does not exist (perhaps it will never exist in this Life) One last word.

Therefore, it is necessary to avoid the typical manipulations of pseudocríticos that seek to despise an argument from contempt to the one who defends it. On The contrary, we must promote empathic and serious looks towards so many scholars and researchers who open new perspectives and deserve attention, because they encourage them to live with less prejudice and with more open minds.