

Jornalismo e conhecimento da realidade objetiva no século XXI¹

Journalism and knowledge of objective reality in the 21st century

Rafael Bellan Rodrigues de Souza²

Resumo: *O artigo explora a questão do conhecimento da realidade objetiva pelo jornalismo. Cotejando a perda de sentido do real expresso tanto na hegemonia irracionalista do território digital, quanto em importantes correntes de pensamento hegemônico de estudos do jornalismo, o texto aponta a práxis noticiosa como forma de conhecimento imersa em uma sociedade de classes, avaliando a sua potência na busca da concreticidade. Para isso, assume a perspectiva da ontologia do ser social em Marx para debater a possibilidade de conhecimento da objetividade, investigando as peculiaridades do jornalismo no edifício conceitual da dialética materialista. Assim, apresenta uma caracterização ontológica crítica para um dos problemas centrais do jornalismo no contexto do capitalismo digital do século XXI.*

Palavras-chave: *Teorias do jornalismo; realidade objetiva; conhecimento; marxismo.*

Abstract: *The article explores the question of the knowledge of objective reality by journalism. Comparing the loss of meaning of the real expressed both in irrationalist hegemony in the digital territory and in important hegemonic thought currents of journalism studies, the text points to news praxis as a form of knowledge immersed in a class society, evaluating its power in pursuit of concreteness. For this, it takes the perspective of the ontology of social being in Marx to*

1 A revised and expanded version of the work presented at the 17th National Meeting of Researchers in Journalism (SBPJor), held in Goiânia - GO, in November 2019.

2 Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES). Vitória, ES, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0165-2927>. E-mail: rafaelbellan@yahoo.com.br

debate the possibility of knowledge of objectivity, investigating the peculiarities of journalism in the conceptual building of materialist dialectic. Thus, it presents a critical ontological characterization for one of the central problems of journalism in the context of 21st century digital capitalism.

Keywords: *Theories of Journalism; Objective reality; Knowledge; Marxism.*

Introdução

There is a profound discomfort in scientific evaluations of the paths of communicational digital territory and the role of journalism in this sphere. Previously seen by techno-utopians in the stature of Castells (2007) as the most well-done expression of the total democratization of information and knowledge, recently authors like Morozov (2018), Fuchs (2016), Dean (2010), Moretzsohn (2017), among others, say how much these online platforms have been directed by the fetishist mantras of the capital and given flow to irrationalism, whose formal expression in journalism clearly appears in the phenomenon of “fake news”. This process of combat to the expression of the critical reason has been created by post-modernist currents (EAGLETON, 1996) who, finally, reached common sense through the force turbinated on social media. In this hegemonic thinking, as Netto (2010) points out, the idea of truth is transformed into discursive art-factuality, an intersubjective consensus, and it is denied the existence of a reality existing regardless of conscience. It’s as if the significant twirl in circles without the material reference. The intensified reification in communicational capitalism (DEAN, 2010) produces in the field of thinking and common sense the perception of end of the possibility of knowledge, now replaced by beliefs and fictional narratives about reality itself. There is in the last decades an intensification of irrational elements in the ideologic decadence (LUKÁCS, 2016) in a scenario of complex cooperation (FREDERICO; TEIXEIRA, 2008) of capital in the 21st century.

Although the digital platform in which journalism has spread in the last decades had enabled their wide dissemination, the irrationalist grammar of looking for quick results of the economy of attention, built by social media, also became an echo chamber of fake news, a phenomenon not at all new, but never before so effective in the constitution of the metabolism of capital. On the other hand, neopositivist branches (main inspiring current of salvationists self-entitled fact-checkers) also objectify reality, not effectively understanding the conditions of objective reality (SOUZA, 2019). In this scenario of expanded progression of

manipulated uncertainties, the journalistic objectivity understood as the capacity of a reporter to express to an audience certain reality, comes back as a fertile problem in the studies of journalism, fundamental topic for the own survival of news like praxis³.

One of the undeniable contributions of Adelmo Genro Filho (2012) for the understanding of journalism is in his description of this practice as a social form of knowledge. This means that this new modality, inaugurated with the rise of the industrial capitalist model of fact production, brought as a differential a priority access to the singular aspects of reality. Questioning both positivism, which preaches the pure access of objective facts, and ideologism, which marks the impossibility of separating journalism and political action, Genro Filho elaborates a rich understanding of journalistic objectivity, something not as understood by Brazilian researchers, which, as points out Pontes (2015), do not know the Lukacs' ontological articulation that works as a mark for understanding the real contribution of Marxism for journalism theories.

This article seeks to present, in this sense, the problematic of knowledge of reality through Marxist ontology and mark, in terms of hegemony of the irrationalist thinking (NETTO, 2010), the importance of dialectic reason in news like production. This approach allows us to retrieve the relevance of journalism beyond the symptoms of the possible irrelevance facing the communicational capitalism of digital platforms – a new environment of reproduction (MOROZOV, 2018). The option for ontology “implies the need to investigate the conceptions that found our ideas and practices that they provide (DUAYER; SIQUEIRA; ESCURRA, 2013, p. 18). We believe that the core of our problems around both the rejection and incomprehension around the issue of knowledge of reality through journalism goes through the apprehension of the dialectic relation between subject and object in the stage of a historic-social base.

Therefore, in the first part we will show the boundaries to some of the main epistemological understandings of objectivity (based in currents

3 On the subject, from the angle of journalism theories, we can mention the studies of Shudson (2010), Guerra (1998), Demeneck (2009), Tuchmann (2016) and Henriques (2014).

linked, in a certain sense, to neopositivism, phenomenology and pragmatism). Then, based in the criticism to these expressions, we will show how the Marxian standard alters the understanding on concreteness and how he problematizes the relation between subject and objective reality, showing their dialectic character of transformative knowledge. Finally, we will present the relevance of dialectic reason and the centrality of objectivity in the production of knowledge, pointing the potential of critical journalism as an antidote of predominant irrationalism in subjectivity mediated by information technologies that explode in the core of a social-metabolic system of capital (MÉSZÁROS, 2002). To do so, this research of theoretical-conceptual nature takes on the understanding, with the retrieval of the perspective of Genro Filho (2012) that the social form of appropriation of reality that we call journalism is indispensable for the consummation of human freedom and the cultivation of a life filled with meaning.

Objective reality and journalism studies

Most part of the bibliography available about the question of objectivity is easy to perceive the predominance of a view that has two main errors. Sometimes it denies the possibility of a reality external to the subject, other times it affirms the empire of subjectivity as determining of knowledge. In both situations there is a lack of understanding of the dialectic unity between subject and object. On the other hand, the “ideology of objectivity” (GENRO FILHO, 2012) – used by the own professionals and re-elaborated by fact-checkers – brings the reality as a set of “invariable” things, confusing objectivity with a political pseudo neutrality. The result is the affirmation of the bourgeois horizon as the only possible social reality, crystalizing the reified appearance of reality as objectivity. Many academic critics adhere to the impossibility of knowledge about reality, working towards the semiotics of reality, that would be impossible to know the objective world.

There are very distinct reasons that lead men that live in our time to reject the question of reality in thinking and in life. Such reasons reside partly in a satisfaction with the manipulated character of all life manifestations, partly in a refusal to this manipulation; however, a refusal that, deep down, is profoundly convicted of the uselessness of freeing oneself of the strangeness and that, because of that, searches and precisely finds this lack of perspective of the own insurgency an interior self-affirmation. (LUKÁCS, 2012, p. 100)

The critique to the naïve realism (GOMES, 2009) tends to not know the debate around the category of realism in Marxism, which can wrongly expand a genuine critique to positivism until the theory of reflection of Leninist base. The spiritual mirroring of reality, according to Lukács (2012), had never meant a photographic reflection of reality, but a mental expression of social being whose genesis and transformation come about in a dialectic relation with the material world. There is a relative autonomy of the cognizing subject in the understanding of objectivity and also its transformation, however, the Marxian ontology does not “lose sight that reality remains with its own legalities, that belong in the activity played, but also other accomplished activities (PONTES, 2015, p. 268).

As Kosik (2002, p. 32-33) says, “human conscience is, at the same time, ‘reflection’ and ‘projection’, it registers and builds, take notes and plans, reflects and forecasts; it is, at the same time, receptive and active”. The categories of human thinking arrive in a subjective sphere at the same time as “products and instruments of ideal and practical domination of reality, parallelly to the peculiar development of that same reality (...)” (LUKÁCS, 2012, p. 247). The knowledge in Marxist tradition is the march towards the essence of phenomena, in which the mental abstraction homogenizes the heterogeneity of an existing reality. The social being, thus, is a product of the historic reality, but it also produces it.

(...) One of the specific traces of the social being is precisely the fact that the awareness is not simply awareness of something which, in an ontological level, lies entirely indifferent to the fact of being recognized; on the

contrary, the presence or absence of awareness, its correction or falseness, are an integrating part of the being itself, in other words, awareness is not here – in an ontological sense – a mere epiphenomenon, regardless of how much its concrete role in each singular case is relevant or irrelevant. (LUKÁCS, 2012, p. 241)

In turn, the critical adoption of perspectivism by Gomes (2009), on the other hand, does not found the material bases of ideal elucubrations, making that the concrete dimensions of class struggle begin to blur. Well, the social particularities of human groups have an objective base in the form of production and even the cultural differences that are a part of the concrete structure of social reproduction, as already attested by the cultural materialism of Williams (1979). The ideal types of social stratification that sustain the ideas of perspectives and communities of interpretation could even help a critical understanding of human sociability, but without the dimension of class, the interests put by the search for answers lie in idealistic forms, since there is no realistic social base able to sustain the bareness of interests in conflict.

One can perceive, as pointed out by Kosik (2002), that “every theory of recognition is supported, implicit or explicitly, by a certain theory of reality and presupposes a certain conception of reality itself” (p. 33). There is, behind the explanations around the possibility or not of the journalistic objectivity a figuration of the world that goes through, in this sense, an expression that not only ideological views that respond to problems around the issue, but also a position around the society we live in. To retrieve Marx’s ontology means to make a critique to the real formations that structure the base as a systemic way of life guided by the expanded reproduction of capital. Therefore, the dialectical critique must present new figurations of the world, within the processes of social transformation.

In a very influential text, Sponholz (2009) defends objectivity, but do not take it on his theoretical framework, that pays an homage to Karl Popper, the question of ontological basis of the social being, falling in a

methodologic defense of logicizing⁴ instrumental prescriptions for the journalistic work. It is important to point out, with Mészáros (2004), that no methodology is neutral, being delimited by historic and ideological conditioning and the economic base of social reproduction. However, when calibrating the instruments of verification, with methodologic impositions of measurement of objectivity, Sponholz (2009) raises the issue of news like praxis, but that without a critical and positioned approach may be confused with a utilitarian praxis (KOSIK, 2002), incapable of advancing in the de-reification of phenomena aspects. That is because the instruments of measurement of objective facts, without an appropriate dialectic approach, are incapable of understanding the “thing in itself”, which, in the world of men, is product of the own human action. Dialectics is the path of intellectual reproduction of reality, or rather, it is the “method of development and explicitation of cultural phenomena coming from the objective practical activity of the historic man (KOSIK, 2002, p. 39).

The manipulation of the capitalist society presents a phenomenonic appearance of reality which, for expressive currents of contemporary thought, are elevated to their own reality. Thus, even when they express a genuine interest in knowing phenomena, they get stuck to their apparent fetishist character. Lukács criticizes Nietzsche and Bergson for presenting in their reflections around knowledge a subjectivity that “(...) Is not in condition of finding in its own reality a place to express itself, even though it is – already in its antithesis – inseparably linked to the manipulated world” (2012, p. 43).

Pragmatist and neopositivist currents replace the knowledge of reality for the formalist manipulation of objects that are immediately useful to them and converge to a general trend that intend to enclose the possibility of basing objective criteria of truth. According to Lukács (2012), the attitude of intellectuals that seek to update the reflections of the

4 Netto (2011) says that the instruments and techniques for assessing the facts can always be varied and are the means that allow the subject to know the investigated material; however, the results of this investigation are interpreted in the context of the dynamic categories of totality, mediation and contradiction.

gnoseological field, looking for solutions within the context of the new time express a social attitude that recognizes the “irresistible advancement of manipulation in contemporary capitalism as unavoidable, as “fate”, but they seek to display a spiritual resistance to their spontaneous and immediate ideological consequences” (p. 75). While not perceiving a way out for the reifying character of the capitalist mode of production and its delimitation for the actions of everyday life, the most that authors who deny the social reality can do is present an impotent protest. Criticizing the attempt of Heidegger and Scheler of founding an ontology based on the phenomenological method, the Marxist philosopher points towards the limits in considering only the human being and their immediate social relations, which lift to the ontological level the “universally manipulated condition of society in the era of highly developed capitalism (LUKÁCS, 2012, p. 84). Because if phenomena are what is shown in itself, the appearance of immediately perceived reality, which is typically conditioned by time, becomes a supratemporal of human life. Thus, the risk is to mark the perceptible essence engrained of being into something final, settled as a definitive characteristic of delimitating contingencies of subjectivity in a form of historically constituted spiritual production and reproduction.

The apprehension of the common sense, which corresponds to the daily experience of individuals, is given by the merely “functional” sense in the lived social world. Therefore, in epistemological terms, the base in which the fact will be settled and contextualized tend to reproduce in a latent manner the social universality such as it is immediately lived. It is not for other reason that the ideology of the dominant class is normally hegemonic, and the common sense tends to decode facts in a conservative perspective. (GENRO FILHO, 2012, p. 198)

On the contrary, Marxism understands that the thinking is not structured as a gnoseology, but as ontology. “That is because it understands that the issues related to knowledge only can be solved after the elaboration of a general theory of the social being” (TONET, 2013, p. 70). The category of praxis appears as an ontological determiner of the relation

between subjectivity and objectivity, ruled by the concrete reality in every human activity.

Well, if knowledge is only one of the dimensions of totality that is the social being, we can only apprehend as we know more general and essential determinations of that being, and as we identify the place filled by knowledge in the production and reproduction of the social being as a whole, in other words, in social praxis. (TONET, 2013, p. 74)

It is in this consideration that questions appear such as the possibility of knowledge, what would be the object, the subject, as well as the truth. To do so, in the line of thought created by Marx in his extensive work and re-elaborated by Lukács in his *Ontology*, in fact, praxis is the mediating activity that conjugates subjective and objective moments in the definition of social reality. Awareness and objective reality are two moments of equal ontological statute. For Tonet (2013), the Marxian rescue of objective reality demands a re-elaboration of its meaning, taking it towards its historic-social dimension. However, rethinking the issue of objectivity also means a re-examination of objectivity, beyond its super dimensioning given by post-modern and phenomenological epistemologies. A theory of subjectivity can never isolate it from the weave of concrete totality of the social being.

The subject-object relation and the separation resulting from it are two moments that imply the emergency of understanding the exterior reality in the form of concept and the expression of such reality through language. Therefore, it gets settled, from the ontological conditions of work genesis, the exclusively human phenomenon of capturing reality as spiritual possession. This phenomenon is in the root of the process of knowledge, whose continuous improvement leads to the genesis of science. (DUAYER; SIQUEIRA; ESCURRA, 2013, p. 21)

The insurmountable connection of knowledge and social practice is an ontological contribution of Marxism for the studies of journalism, since it marks the task of human self-construction as surrounded by the praxis of the process of real investigation. Therefore, reality itself is the

“result of the synthesis between awareness (subjective moment) and reality (objective moment), such synthesis being performed by the social practice” (TONET, 2013, p. 105). So it opens in the Marxian standard the potential of knowing not only the appearance, but the essence. Unlike the hegemonic tendencies of contemporary thinking, who reject the essence, in Marx, knowledge seeks its truth beyond phenomena immediately put to the first sight with contact with reality. The fetish and strangeness as exponents of the society of capital blunt in the shield of reality a wrong self-concreteness (KOSIK, 2002) which, stuck in an utilitarian praxis, impedes the movement of the human being as subject of social transformation. “Fact, data and events are always condensed results of determined social and historic relations and practices. Precisely because of that, these historic social relations and practices must be retrieved so we can understand their meanings” (TONET, 2013, p. 118). Fundamental in this investigation is the treatment of dialectic reason, mental abstraction and symbolic production that mirrors, in the own process of building reality, the mapping of objectivity.

The process of knowledge is the search of determination and their relations in order to make the apprehension of the concrete in thought. Knowledge is as true as it is saturated of determinations and mediations and, for this reason, it is always, despite being truth, incomplete. (HUNGARO, 2014, p. 72)

When taking on the notion of totality as a complex of complexes, Lukács (2012) recognizes that all knowledge must search as a starting point reality itself, abstractly mirrored in the mind, and that their categories and connections revealed have an ontological and non-logical character. “Every fact must be seen as part of a dynamic complex in interaction with other complexes, as something that is determined, both internally and externally, by multiple laws” (p. 338). To Kosik (2002), if the process of knowledge wasn’t capable of eliminating the pseudo-concreteness, transposing the phenomenic appearance of reality in the sense of accessing the authentic historic objectivity, it becomes a slave of fetish and reification, whose product is the bad totality. The search

for concreteness alludes to the knowledge of the historical character of the phenomenon, as well as their objective function in the heart of the social body.

Praxis is a decisive criterion of every correct knowledge because it objectively accomplishes the role of mesh the dynamics and movements of the social being in its insurmountable relationship with economic and social materiality of its time. Praxis “is the revelation of the men’s secret on how to be onto creative, as a being who creates reality (human-social) and, that, therefore, understands the reality (human and non-human, reality as a whole)” (KOSIK, 2002, p. 222). It manifests itself both in the objective activity of the man, who give human meaning to nature, and the formation of subjectivity, whose existential affections and feelings are a part for the search for freedom.

Knowledge, objectivity and classes

Adelmo Genro Filho (2012) points out that the objective reality offers numberless possibilities of meanings and that the meanings are produced in the dialectics between objects in itself and in the relationship subject-object. The news are cutouts of the flow of objective processes of reality that are elaborated meeting determinations both objective and subjective. Being and objectivity belong in a same complex of multiple determinations. Thus, there is certainly space for the incidence of ideology and individual decisions, which does not alter the process of knowledge.

To that extent, is inevitable that the facts are, in themselves, a choice. However, to avoid subjectivism and relativism, it is important to add that this choice is delimited by the objective matter, in other words, by a historically and socially built substance, regardless of the subjective and ideological focus at stake. (GENRO FILHO, 2012, p. 197)

For the Brazilian intellectual of journalism, social reality as a concrete totality comes from the processuality of necessities in freedom through work. Even without knowing deeply the category of teleologic

positing in Lukács (2012 and 2013), Genro Filho (2012) have a similar perception of the role of the subject in the construction of the concrete totality, noticing that subject and object, in its unit and difference, articulate dialectically in the self-construction of human history.

Another thesis that Genro Filho (2012) derives from Marxian ontological impostations is that knowledge is infinite, since the totality is dynamic and always alive, resulting from constant totalizations. That alludes to the fact that recognizing totality, as well-put by Kosik (2002), cannot be understood as a search of a totalizing truth comprising of all systemic complexes, but the recognition of a dynamic structure, which relates the parts with the whole and the whole with the parts. This totality moves based on the contradiction among complexes, whose rhythm and conditions are given by the mediation between the different levels of structure of each totality (NETTO, 2011).

The knowledge of objects contain subjectivity as an inseparable dimension of reality, being always politically compromised, since it positions in relation to possibilities and developments of self-construction of the social being. “For the knowledge of praxis, the objectivity can be revealed in its movement, as concrete trends and possibilities. Subjectivity, then, recognize itself and creates an awareness of its limitations and potentials” (GENRO FILHO, p. 96, 2012). The man is part of this objective world, in other words, produces the object and is produced by it. The centrality of objectivity implies, therefore, recognizing that body and spirit are parts of the same social reality. Therefore, there is a clear role of subjectivity and the interest in the understanding of the world, and journalists and their interests are fundamental for the act of knowledge, because subjectivity is not an illness or obstacle to be surpassed by objectivity, but a condition of the own possibility of truth. It has as instance of verification the social and historic practice.

In other words, all human activity is determined by a certain gradient of intentionality – awareness is responsible both for the conceptual reproduction (the abstraction that puts in the center of the activity, at the same time, the connection between medium and ends, and also the previous

ideation regarding the object) as for spiritual production, this resulting from the most complex activity of the human being, in the sphere of creation already distanced from the immediate relationship between man and nature, but whose complexification only became possible thanks to the first socialization of the natural element. (RANIERI, 2011, p. 130)

The position of class is unescapable of the processes of knowledge such as journalism and ideology, understood by Mészáros (2004) as the form through which men became aware of conflicts and in it they put themselves in struggles. As said by Žižek, we shouldn't perform a "neutral analysis, but an engaged and highly "partial" one, because the truth is partial, only accessible when we adopt one of the sides, however, it remains as universal" (2011, p. 18). But to recognize that cannot be confused with the instrumentalization of journalism as an apparel of class, serving the strategic demands of a determined organization (party, movement, etc.). Genro Filho (2012) identifies the ideological and ontological presuppositions as conditioners of the news like production, which delimitate the optics through which facts are investigated, which allows both the affirmation of the common sense of irrationality that surrounds capitalism manipulated as the criticism against the fetishized forms glued to phenomena. Talking about scientific knowledge, Marxism recognizes the impossibility of neutrality and impartiality in the investigation of reality, but marks in the option for the working class a place capable of advancing in the revelation of the essence behind the phenomena.

What are the presuppositions, linked to what conception of the world, that mark each perspective? To who interests knowing reality and in what level? It gets clear, thus, that taking sides isn't, necessarily, an obstacle for the scientific understanding of reality. On the contrary, since we assume the perspective of class which, at that historical moment, fundamentals the most elevated cognitive pattern as possible, taking sides reveal itself as a positive condition crucial for the elaboration of the scientific knowledge. (TONET, 2012, p. 111)

As we previously said, the relationship between subject and object in the view of historic materialism is not external, because the subject is inserted in the object, and from that we deduce that the knowledge produced by journalism is never neutral. However, we must not confuse neutrality with the thematic of objectivity. The condition of the own investigation of real is the activity of the cognizing subject (social being), because by his position it is possible to extract the determination of the facts (the singular produced by news). It is evident that in this perspective of class we cannot take out the field of choices (ethical) around the fidelity to the object, because the subject is active in the mirroring of reality. The exactitude with the results of a verification, this time, cannot be blurred to sustain a previous ideological truth. The perspective of class, without the work of the active subject, does not guarantee the effectivity of the knowledge produced. Even because, for the subjects critical to the bourgeois order, objectivity of knowledge can only be confirmed in practice as a criterion of measurement. And a wrong theory leads to a wrong practice. The intellectual capacity of the journalist, notwithstanding, demands a sophisticated operation of perception of the contradiction exposed in totality. Marxism offers clues to that conduct, since

(...) In every verification of similar facts, in every ideal reproduction of a concrete connection, has always in view the totality of the social being, and based in it, ponders reality and the meaning of each singular phenomenon; an ontological-philosophical analysis of reality in itself that never wanders, through the autonomation of its abstractions, above the operated phenomenon, but, on the contrary, precisely because of that, accomplished itself critically and self-critically the maximum stage of consciousness, to capture all entity in full concreteness in the form of being that is proper, that is specific precisely for it. (LUKÁCS, 2012, p. 296)

Based in this articulation, Genro Filho (2012) aims at the singular as peculiarity of the news like praxis and points towards both the particular and the universal are presented or suggested, which pass from the understanding (also methodological of this knowledge) of singular as a

destination point of the critical-dialectic investigation of the social reality. Journalism, in turn, can be understood as a praxis that has objective and subjective fundamentals both in relation to the content to which they work for (social facts) and the way the apprehension and transformation of this content (the journalist's job of transforming social facts into journalistic facts)" (PONTES, 2015, p. 363).

Therefore, there are enough motives in the ontological articulation of journalism defended by the historic dialectic materialism to retrieve the notion of objectivity in journalism beyond its neopositivists, phenomenological and pragmatistic incrustations, which, in different ways, solidify the manipulated essence of 21st century communicational capitalism (DEAN, 2010).

Final considerations

The narrative produced historically by informational journalism presents a perspective of opening of meaning (PONTES, 2015) that is very peculiar. It also enables the search of a knowledge on historic reality in its singular dimension that remains not only current but necessary. The characteristics that pick this form of knowledge as a power even in the scenario of capital crisis and predominant irrationalism in the digital territory go through the relation that this praxis have with everyday life, central location of necessary qualitative changes to the other form of sociability, since, without substantively altering the teleological purpose of subordinate classes, no other world is built.

However, one of the knowledge necessary to this journalistic practice is the ontological criticism, inevitably equipped of an ideological posture that are connected to the search of concreteness. A journalism, according to Adelmo Genro Filho (2012), can clarify paths and express a wider view of fundamental aspects of structuration of reality, having as access door the singular. According to Lukács impostation, the object of Marxist ontology, unlike classic and subsequent ontology, is "what really exists: the task is to investigate the entity with the concern of

understanding its being and finding the different degrees and the diverse connections within it” (2014, p. 27).

What we can point towards, beyond a neutralized objectivity, target of critics of classic authors of journalism studies, is that the ontological perspective gives us a base for a new path of knowledge, while agglutinating the contact with reality to a posture in tune with the optics of subordinate classes. The collective impulse for understanding the social reality must be the horizon of a critical journalistic practice, fundamental to know the world we live in. That is why, in the scenario of class struggle, it is up to who develops its social transformative practice the exactitude of the territory in which one needs to circulate on.

We understand the critical reason as a dialectic aspect of clarification, rational conflict, and, more than that, elevation of the potential of journalism as a vital recognition of the singular aspects of reality, which can determine and delimit the horizon and the awareness of subjects around a project of social struggle. Beyond the irrationalism of contemporary common sense, the dialectic reason applied to journalism become a consistent project of searching alteration in social biases that sustain the reigning metabolism. The challenge to that retrieve of objective reality in the knowledge enabled by journalism is in the increasingly intense hegemony of the daily strangeness enabled by the digital environment. The overcoming of this processes of fetishist dictatorship of structures of feeling can never be seen as a uniquely gnoseological task, because, without ontological alterations in the world of material life, therefore, without the collective praxis of social subjects, irrationalism tends to mask the possibilities of critical advancement in the awareness of individuals.

Journalism cannot be simply discarded by the use that it has been given to it in the last few years, putting as their horizon the vicious and anti-ethical posture of rumors in the digital territory. The flag of a journalistic practice with criticism and emancipation must be the main axis of journalism intellectuals and those who engage in different alternative arrangements, either in collectives, cooperatives, social movements or

critical virtuous journalists that still remain in the chairs of mainstream press. To do so, it is fundamental to recognize in a very precise manner that there is a world to know and transform.

References

- CASTELLS, M. *A sociedade em rede*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2007.
- DEAN, J. *Blog Theory*. Cambridge: Polity, 2010.
- DEMENECK, B. *Objetividade Jornalística: o debate contemporâneo do conceito*. 2009. 133 f. (Mestrado em Jornalismo) – Centro de Comunicação e Informação. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina. 2009.
- DUAYER, M.; SIQUEIRA, A.; ESCURRA, M. F. A ontologia de Lukács e a restauração da crítica ontológica em Marx. *R. Katál.*, Florianópolis, v. 16, n. 1, p. 17-25, jan./jun. 2013.
- EAGLETON, T. *As ilusões do pós-modernismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1996.
- FREDERICO, C.; TEIXEIRA, F. *Marx no Século XXI*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.
- FUCHS, C. Em direção a uma problemática marxista de estudos sobre a internet. *Crítica Marxista*, Campinas, n. 43, p. 67-93, jul./dez. 2016.
- GENRO FILHO, A. *O segredo da pirâmide – para uma teoria marxista do jornalismo*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2012.
- GOMES, W. *Jornalismo, fatos e interesses: ensaios de teoria do jornalismo*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2009.
- GUERRA, Josenildo. *A objetividade no jornalismo*. 1998. 186 p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Comunicação) – Faculdade de Comunicação, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador. 1998.
- HENRIQUES, R. P. *Linguagem, Verdade e Conhecimento*. Vitória, ES: EDUFES, 2014.
- HUNGARO, E. M. A questão do método na teoria social de Marx. In: CUNHA, C.; SOUSA, J. V.; SILVA, M. A. *O método dialético na pesquisa em educação*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2014. p. 15-78.
- KOSIK, K. *Dialética do concreto*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2002.
- LUKÁCS, G. *Conversando com Lukács: entrevistas a Leo Kofler, Wolfgang Abendroth e Hans Heinz Holz*. São Paulo: Instituto Lukács, 2014.
- LUKÁCS, G. *Marx e Engels como historiadores da literatura*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.
- LUKÁCS, G. *Para uma ontologia do ser social I*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2012.
- MÉSZÁROS, I. *O poder da ideologia*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2004.
- MORETZSOHN, S. “Uma legião de imbecis”: hiperinformação, alienação e o fetichismo da tecnologia libertária. *Liinc em Revista*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 13, n. 2, p. 294-306, ago./dez. 2017.

- MOROZOV, E. *Big Tech: a ascensão dos dados e a morte da política*. São Paulo: Ubu Editora, 2018.
- NETTO, J. P. *Introdução ao estudo do método de Marx*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2011.
- NETTO, J. P. Posfácio. In: COUTINHO, C. N. *O estruturalismo e a Miséria da Razão*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2010.
- PONTES, F. *Adelmo Genro Filho e a Teoria do Jornalismo*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2015.
- RANIERI, J. *Trabalho e Dialética: Hegel, Marx e a teoria social do devir*. São Paulo: Editora Boitempo, 2011.
- SCHUDSON, M. *Descobrimo a notícia: uma história social dos jornais nos Estados Unidos*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2010.
- SPONHOLZ, L. *Jornalismo, Conhecimento e objetividade: além do espelho e das construções*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2009.
- SOUZA, R. B. R de. “Fake news”, pós-verdade e sociedade do capital: o irracionalismo como motor da desinformação jornalística. *Revista FAMECOS*, v. 26, n. 3, p. e33105, 27 dez. 2019. Disponível em: <https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/revistafamecos/article/view/33105>
- TONET, I. *Método científico: uma abordagem ontológica*. São Paulo: Instituto Lukács, 2013.
- TUCHMAN, G. A objetividade como ritual estratégico: uma análise das noções de objetividade dos jornalistas. In: TRAQUINA, N. (Org.). *Jornalismo: questões, teorias e “estórias”*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2016. p. 111-131.
- WILLIAMS, R. *Marxismo e Literatura*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1979.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (Org.). *Primeiro como farsa, depois como tragédia*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

On the author

Rafael Bellan Rodrigues de Souza – Professor at the Graduate Program in Communication and Territorialities of the Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (Ufes). Journalist, Master’s in Communication at Unesp (Bauru), PhD in Social Sciences at Unesp (Araraquara) with post-doctorate at ECA-USP.

Date of submission: 28/10/2019

Date of acceptance: 03/11/2020