

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

Acceptance date: 07/01/2025

ETHICS, SECULARITY, SECULARIZATION AND ATHEISM IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN MEXICO (AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL VISION, AMONG OTHERS)¹

Uriel David Avilés Rangel
Mexico City

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



1. Research Professor. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional. Unidad 096 Norte CDMX.
Copyright@ All rights reserved.

Abstract: Theoretically, the importance of ethics in higher education. The secularity of society allows an approach to inclusive democracy, because it has its foundation in the freedoms of conscience and religion. In the nineteenth century, public higher education emerged without theology, but with philosophy, philosophy, and teaching of various ethics, while preserving the morals, with *touchstones* in religions. Currently, secularization denotes a certain “failure”. In Mexico, socially unfinished, it suppresses diverse expressions with the religious; that makes of the post-secularization something incidental, with the necessity of an interreligious and intercultural dialogue. Dialogue for peace.

Keywords: Secularism, Atheism, Education, Anthropology and Infinity.

INTRODUCTION

It is important to take into account, the need for secular ethics, because if we understand that, although secularity has several ways of being conceived, it has a very important conception, which gives us (Blancarte, 2017) “... secularity assumes the autonomy of the political against the religious, regardless of the various forms of relationship between the State and the Churches or institutionalized religious convictions. One can thus speak of secularism when there are these three central elements in a given regime: respect for the freedom of conscience, autonomy of the political from the religious and equality of individuals and their associations before the law, as well as non-discrimination (Blancarte, R :10).

The above definition is very important for formal aspects, but as Poulat says, words more words less: “One thing is what is said and another what is done” (Poulat, Émile, 2012). This means, that in relation to secularism, something can be constituted, therefore formalized and founded, however, something different can be done, especially by the population, I

mean society as a whole, in the understanding that Blancarte himself tells us that the secular state has its main figure, because it is not the divine authority who legitimizes it but the popular sovereignty, but this concept alludes to something that can be counterfactual, not totally real, and since, for the population to legitimize a State, and secular, it is necessary a certain secularity of the society, therefore also of the culture. And although Blancarte himself tells us that laicism is different from secularism, in that the latter is combative, in which I certainly agree, because it is an ideology; laicism has an aspect that cannot be left aside, which is the society and culture of a country, and because a country is defined by three elements: population, territory and government, it is necessary for society to have a level of secularism, and this is achieved with a whole series of ideologies that can be fought among them, as in the case of secularism and anticlericalism, but this supposes convictions and therefore, it needs an understanding of secularism.

DEVELOPMENT

SECULARISM

From what has been introduced, I think it is important to clarify that what Blancarte has worked on secularism seems to me very wise, however, I am not entirely certain that “... secularism implies a transition from a regime with an authority based on sacred power to another whose authority no longer comes from the religious, but is sustained, essentially, in the sovereignty or popular will” (Blancarte, 2017: 10). It is precisely this last aspect that jumps out at me, that of popular sovereignty, although it is a very common and long used and accepted concept. For what was said above, in Mexico, to speak of sovereignty, in general terms is very complicated, for example, a national sovereignty, when there is a whole set

of interventionisms, from various countries throughout the history of Mexico since the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first century, with greater reason before a multicultural society and plural, thinking so what would be that “sovereignty or popular will”? Certainly, there is a secularity of society and of the State, as Blancarte has conceived it, except in my opinion that it is due to the popular will, it has always been of diverse elites, with not totally Mexican thoughts, it seems to me that it is more complex, in non-formal terms.

Following Blancarte himself, we have the following definition: “The secular State is, then, that modern juridical-political instrument at the service of freedoms in a society that recognizes itself as plural and diverse. A State that, by the same token, no longer responds to or is at the service of a particular religious or philosophical doctrine, but rather looks after the public interest, that is, the interest of all, manifested in the popular will and respect for human rights” (Op. Cit.: 11). This definition seems excellent to me, for formal terms, but for other aspects not totally juridical, very problematic, therefore, there have been definitions such as “positive secularism and negative secularism”, but I think it is not necessary, considering that secularism is a dynamic concept, and polysemic, in the sense that it has different ways of being understood by society, we can stay, except for the problematic that I have already mentioned of popular sovereignty, with Blancarte’s conception.

SECULARISM AND ETHICS, SECULAR ETHICS

It is worth all this clarification, to then continue with the fact that secular ethics are necessary for an inclusion, therefore of a democracy, so it seems to me that in the historical *continuum*, we can understand secularity as an aspect that cannot be finished and say, post-secularity, as in the case of post-seculari-

zation, that is, considering that post-secularization does not mean precisely that secularization has culminated, but that it is no longer the basic or first thing, so it can be continued as a process, but it is not as urgent as the aspect of a democratic society, although it may not be the only urgent thing.

Now, to understand secularity in this way, in the *continuum* of history, is to think precisely that such secularity comes from difference, and from the multiple, both of thought, philosophies, convictions of all kinds, therefore a coexistence that seeks peaceful coexistence of ideologies, so it is included, ethics, in general everything in the inclusion, although I ask you to infer what I mean by democracy, although I do not give a concept of democracy, however I hope it can be better understood with what I will say later.

Now then, without the alienation that has been tried in the history of Mexico and the world, to make secular ethics, there are even some very interesting proposals, for example in what historically have been conceived as secret societies, although in reality it is rather in another way, these societies, form civil and cultural associations, and are very discreet, but have interesting approaches, as well as some clubs or societies derived from the above mentioned, but with all this, it is understood that there is still a long way to go for society to accommodate such ethics as a whole, so it is important to build them.

Taking into account the above, it seems appropriate to think about the construction of one, taking into account aspects such as secularism, secularization, atheism, etc. All this, because diverse philosophies, as well as theologies and other ideologies, are in the deepest and most intimate part of the human being. Regardless of the multiplicity of conceptions about ideology, they are part of the family, where the individual develops and with which he can grow and have an ontogenetic develop-

pment; ideology, like culture, are constituent parts of the human being, who becomes conscious in the broad understanding of consciousness, which includes the materialist conception that the material basis of consciousness is the brain; therefore, for there to be social action, culture is necessary and with it, although not equally necessary, but united almost on a par with ideology; therefore we also have phylogenetic development, which is an essential part of the human being.

With all the above mentioned, continuing in the understanding that education constitutes a very important part in everything previously expressed, due to the fact that education, as it is understood, is in the whole process of socialization and such ontogenetic development, population wise, in the age condition of people, so that for what concerns education, it is thought, it can be understood the relevance of the whole need of an ethics in the secular State. As it is to be understood, with the formalization of the secular State since the XIX century in Mexico, came the disappearance of the faculties of theology in the Public Higher Education in Mexico. It is important to mention the essay by Kant. I. (2020), "The conflict of the faculties" in which he discusses the aspect that the so-called higher faculties (medicine, law and theology) needed a counterweight, since they were governed by the State, so they could not seek what philosophy did, which is the truth and reason, so necessary for all times and epoch, so that the faculty of philosophy (lower faculty) urged an independence from the censorship of the State (Kant, I, 2003).

Thus, understanding Kant, that in the XIX century after the Constitution of 1857, followed the disappearance of theology in public Higher Education in Mexico, since it is known the influence that Kant's thought had on Benito Juarez and other intellectuals of that time in Mexico (and still today), so, not

only that but all the historical events already known, of influences of thought and diverse ideas are added, Therefore, these same diversity and cultural, in this article, the opinion so far, is that they facilitate the secularity of society, and with it in Mexico, the pioneering forms of democracy, and as already said in the historical *continuum* to the present, we have the reason why there are no faculties or departments of theology in public universities in Mexico, the same National Autonomous University of Mexico does not have it, but instead, the philosophy and in it the teaching of ethics.

ATHEISTIC THINKING

Being so, what concerns a religious thought, which is part of the culture, with all that has already been said, it is found in the depths of every human being, in this way, we can understand the emergence of thoughts or philosophies called atheist, that for example, (Horkheimer, 2000), told us approximately this in "Longing for Justice": "that saying atheist leads us to a contradiction" and we can still notice this in the thought of (Onfray, 2015, 2017, 2017, 2006 respectively) , both in "Cosmos" (2015), as well as in "Decadence" (2017) and in his "Treatise on Atheology" (2006), where he exposes us in short that atheism is a religion, and that although it does not start from "no myth or legend" (not myth as narration) that is to say, from "no fiction" we find ourselves before an oxymoron when he tells us that it is vitalist and as it is known, vitalism, has as a thought the life and the impulse that gives us life, as an "energy" is the *élan* of (Bergson, 1907), so it ties with many religious beliefs or similar, that tell us that we can practically reach God consciously, so the vehicle to reach God would be some conceptions of that *élan*, or better said even, we could think that this "energy or impulse of life" comes from some source or there is someone who has created it or had an origin, then what

exactly does Onfray tell us? He tells us that atheism is a religion and is vitalist, and that it is based on the *élan*, be it simply so, like Bergson's *élan*, one can think that his God is the *élan*, so where is atheism?

If we attend to atheism, to its etymological root, without God, then there is a God, of which we say what: without him. All this, in the understanding of Onfray.

Now, in similar understandings, atheism as denial of God, when denying something, it is because there is an existence, at least conceptually of what is denied, therefore we can say, that it is not, because it was and there is something that still is. Moreover, if we say atheism, as non-existence of something, equally conceptually at least we have that something of which it is said that it does not exist. Therefore, it exists conceptually, and that is enough, for many religious beliefs to say that God exists, because it is conceptual. But understanding Onfray, in that his atheism is a religion, there are many people and philosophers who accept the term atheism as something generic, and therefore then there is atheism, but even so, within a secular ethic, there can fit such atheism, and as I have said before in correspondence with Blancarte, laicism is inclusive, and therefore democratic, so including atheism is pertinent, whether or not it is also a fiction, or said oxymoron, if it is held as acceptable, it is included without problem and formally so, our Political Constitution, as it is known, says: words more, words less, that we all have the right to believe and not to believe, in correspondence with non-discrimination.

Now, following the argument of an atheism, either as without God, or non-existence of God, or of a vitalism or of Onfray's *élan* (even as a vital force), are included in a laicism, the problem is to understand, in terms of an ethics, that is to say, in terms also of philosophy, as Kant posed it, for example, of the search for truth and reason, because there is no faculty

such as theology in public higher education in Mexico, and so, thinking about the relevance of such vitalism, we could think about its theoretical validity, and thus, say that it is philosophically interesting, but a radical vitalism, based on a principle where life is (to say it a bit exaggerated) everything, is not possible, for life itself, even as Onfray argues, about veganism, and its rationality, the vegetables are also life, and in the so called food chain, we need to nourish and feed ourselves with something, and that something is something alive, as long as we are not autotrophic or have managed to find a way to feed ourselves where we do not have to suppress any life, even more so to say that the "good" is what goes with life and respects it, what happens with the death of those lives that are suppressed and of ourselves as a species when we die?, we are irremediably "bad", although "good" has been conceptualized, but not "bad" in vitalism", yet logically it is accepted as the opposite.

So, one can take vitalism as valid even with everything (even if it cannot be totally radical) and think that life is life in itself, but it does not solve the problem of meaning, of the meaning of life.

WARS

Let us consider that yes, we think that everything in favor of life and its continuation, even the suppression of other lives, in order to continue life, makes us think that we would have to decide which lives must be suppressed for there to be life, and being so, we would become a form of Darwinists, social Darwinists, which is well known to have brought as a consequence, great genocides. Moreover, to think in a reality, where human history is full of great wars, crimes and genocides and still continues, and learns to make more forceful forms of human extermination, according to the rules, regulations, laws or whatever prevails at that time in history, is extremely im-

portant, to consider life itself and the forms of life, present and those that may be future. Even more, to think of violence and war as something constant in life, if not vegetable, then animal, including human, of course, is also to think of the need to consider the confrontation of opposites and opposites, and perhaps to understand that from there something new emerges, which can be, beyond the deterioration, degrading, but also that overcomes the imposed order and thus, to consider the philosophies, which have, despite these barbarities, hope in the advancement of humanity towards something that can be better.

Thinking about the above, is also thinking about what has been secularization, as part of that certain faith in a certain idea of progress, by scientific and technological progress, which goes along with the idea even from the very idea of modernity, and then, it leads us to look for what would be, if not the “good” if at least a “good life” or “good life” even as it was conceptualized in the European classical antiquity, and Aristotelian, which was also included, as a “life towards better” by (Marcuse, 1985), in all his vast work, but especially in the “One Dimensional Man”.

PRESERVATION OF LIFE AND JUSTICE

Continuing, with thinking about what preserves life, let us focus, in a situation of right, that is to say of the right to life (the first of human rights) and along with it, the right to death (as a right of life, and power over death, as opposed to (Foucault, 1979) in “right of death and power over life”)². So, looking for that first human right, we have the reality, that in its fullness, that is, the right to life and all that it entails, for a “good life” or even “dignified”, that is, a “life made better” (Marcuse, 1985) is contemplated as the search for a good, for

2. With respect to the preservation of life, and the need for some permanence in the world along with consciousness, there is memory and from there probably arises the importance for the history of each individual as in general, among other aspects that I cannot address in this article, but that may be very obvious.

the majority, that is utilitarianism, thinking of “the greatest good for the greatest number of people” or as in Marxism “give to each according to his needs” (the problem here is when needs are created, even as a desire), due to the fact that, as in Marxism, “to give to each one according to his needs” (the problem here is when the needs are created, even as a desire), due to the fact that the right to life is not only a right, but also a right to life, even as a desire), because we are told that it is not possible to give everything to everyone, but we do speak of minimums, and as (Beuchot, 2005) says, of maximums, in the understanding of the discussion at the beginning of the century between liberals and communitarians, in the framework of human rights, together with (Cortina, 1993), when talking about those unrenounceable minimums, even, it is the conception of human rights with intercultural and interreligious dialogue, which is thought taking into account the dialectic, and the thought of (Habermas, J. 1987, 2000) in the ethics of discourse, which brings us closer to a conception of not being radical, but rather of a certain moderation, between an analogy, analogical hermeneutics, which is the proposal of the same (Beuchot, 1995), but I will talk about it a little later.

Continuing with Onfray, in his work “Cosmos”, he is right in saying that the term cosmos comes from order (in this respect it is necessary to say that, although it is used as a technical term in cosmology, in the multiverse, we could also think of pluriverse, coming from universe, but more extended, it seems to me important that to the space between a universe and another, and its possible relations, would fit the term interuniversal, or intermultiversal, interpluriversal, even more interdimensional), but it is still a possible alternative terminology.

GOVERNMENT AND DEMOCRACY

Returning to the order or cosmos, we have that it alludes to a principle that comes from antiquity, which tells us that everything must respond to an order, and that just as there is an order in the universe, there is an order on earth, so it is to understand that the forms of government that were based on the legitimacy of a divine right, as in any theocracy, respond to that principle by equating the sacred with what is related to divinity, as in any theocracy, respond to that principle by equating the sacred with what is related to the divinity, being so, that the order or cosmos (universe or heaven) would become the receptacle of divinity, and therefore sacred, so that the order on earth was sacred, and the king was worshiped as God. Even in the Roman Republic, the emperor was deified, and still at a certain moment in Mexico in the 20th century, there was a tendency to sacralize certain aspects of the political, as a form of Civil Religion, not to say, of the patriotic symbols, in the understanding that the sacred, is also understood as that which is worshipped, and nowadays even an object which is very precious to someone and does not want to be separated from it, is said to be sacred. Therefore, what is sacred for some, may or may not be sacred for others, or the sacred may be lost, as desacralization.

In this way, we have what in a democracy, which is understood not only as the suffrage or the election by the citizens of their rulers or representatives, but of respect for differences, diversity, equality in the broad sense, *inclusion*. We have no room for such cult to a person of the government or politician, but in the understanding of what has been called formal and substantial democracy, where the ruler governs for the people, not only by the people, perhaps that is why Weber told us something like this, as “regarding American democracy, he asked, why do you Americans spit on their rulers? The answer was because if we did not spit on them,

they would spit on us “...the high democratic level of the United States, a “new country”; and this circumstance, in turn, is the main reason for the gradual decay of that system. The United States can no longer be governed solely by amateurs. Fifteen years ago, if American workers were asked why they let themselves be governed by politicians whom they publicly despised, they would answer: “We prefer to have people in office whom we can spit on, rather than have a caste of officials who spit on us. (Weber, 2021 : 52-53). It is worth the sense and the idea that in democracy not only do we not worship the rulers, but we are even irreverent with them. This is understood in today’s culture, where the ruler and others are told everything, even publicly.

In addition, when it comes to democracy, we have in the discourse in Mexico participatory democracy, but it is also important to mention deliberative democracy, even together with Habermas, to think of a democracy in which all citizens participate extensively in one or more dialogues being well informed in politics and decisions are made through such dialogues, which makes it necessary to include all philosophies, thoughts, and of course religious leaders or similar, who carry their proposals, in the language of the prevailing policy in such a democracy, which implies some “translation of their theological terms, to the language of the prevailing politics” but rather following (Beuchot, 2005), the use of these cultural interpretations, be reflected in a hermeneutic, and that this be analogical, where there are no mistakes, an equivocity, which leads us to a relativism, which has been made to see, leads us to expressions of fundamentalism, as in the so-called postmodernity, nor a univocity, which implies going for a unilateral thought, based on a unique and particular culture, which disturbs communication and therefore hinders perlocutions, which would be something that would not allow a dialogue based on symmetry.

PHILOSOPHY, MODERNITY AND SCIENCE. IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF DEMOCRACY AND JUSTICE

This univocal thought, puts in evidence the secular thought, or rather secularization, where this process gives us to think about science conceived, under certain parameters, only Western, even, for example, in the logical positivism, where everything had to be strictly scientific, in the understanding of experimentation as an important part of the scientific method, which came even from Bacon (to mention some, especially in his contributions in relation to logical induction and experimentation) and all the European thought, which formed for a long time the Eurocentrism, which we still see manifested now, so to consider that for the sciences there was a division as Dilthey said, between “the sciences of the spirit” and the so-called “hard” or “exact” ones, even, to say that philosophy was not science, or yes it was, because it could be experimented with the mind in the so-called mental experiments, all this a reduced conception, of what I express here as social and human sciences, so it is understood the relevance of the emergence of decolonial thinking, which as we know, has its predecessors in the subaltern and postcolonial studies, and now it has been called decolonial or decolonial, to seek that epistemological or gnosological independence from the West or the North, if we follow (De Sousa Santos, B. 2009).

Now, it is true that secularization, as well as the conceptions of science as we still have and have had, cannot be totally left aside, because they have been part of the historical and therefore cultural evolution, they have shaped certain parts of the Latin American being, for example, and of course Mexican, if we can take parts of the thought that comes from the West, although they are very univocal as mentioned by Beuchot, who in general terms also recognizes a certain univocity in

his proposal, in his thought, we can think of discursive ethics such as that of Habermas, in his proposal of dialogues, with the rules of such a dialogue, which at the beginning puts us on an equal footing, and Beuchot's already mentioned proposal of analogical hermeneutics, which makes us neither so univocal, nor equivocal, nor relativistic, but rather a middle ground, like the Aristotelian middle ground, which is neither radical nor lax, but rather reflects an option that corresponds to an idea shared by the participants in the dialogue and agreed upon by consensus of an “ideal of society”. The problem is that it is possible to reach a certain Platonism, to think of an ideal State, and then, in a sovereign lie, how can it be agreed between the parties? Above all, if it takes only a few to reach this ideal of society and State, it is the same problem of the elites in representative democracy.

The above seems, without a doubt, a problem, but, even so, we can think that, although we have much of that representative democracy, even a participatory democracy and conceiving the deliberative one, would allow us to include more of the citizenry, to solve the problem of elites and minorities of people who decide who to vote for and to legitimize through a hackneyed conception of democracy the vote as its culmination.

Now, what does all this have to do with education and higher education? Well, the majority of the population of students of such education is citizens by law, and then it is necessary to think about their judgment not only for life, but also for making decisions in society. So with this we think of the philosophy of education from its first conceptions, as that which deals with virtue, and therefore of judgment, and with it the criterion, which is worth saying, which is of the etymological family of criticism, so that a critical judgment, based on critical thinking and criticism, -there again from the proposal of (Kant, 1876),

presupposes a well-formed criterion, a capacity for judgment and therefore of, at least a certain virtue, so the relevance of the philosophy of education, where the role of Beuchot's proposal, contributes to the taking of a judgment, it is worth saying, balanced, where it is not univocal or equivocal, all this despite the difficulties mentioned of the univocity of his same proposal, but it is worth in any way the understanding, that one cannot abandon all western thought, as I hope to have supposed before. Only, it seems to me to land more, and not to arrive at imaginary "ideals" of society or State for a few. But that it can be conceived by all citizens preferably, and if it is not possible factually, then to exhaust the possibility to the maximum, certainly, it is also necessary to think how, and it could also be said that it is "ideal" or utopian, but in any way a utopia that is not based on a justification whose justification of reality is only known by a few, an elite or similar.

EXCURSUS OR REFLECTIONS

This reflection results from thinking in general terms about the concept of the good and the good; It follows from the reflections I made on science and religion, which are often expressed as something that do not currently have a reconciliation, and result in concepts such as secularization, then together with this, the concept of atheism, which led me to seek a way to include these positions, I have been looking for a way to include these positions with the particular convictions of all people in society, and it seems to me that, as it is expressed in our Political Constitution on non-discrimination, it is laicism, as part of what would encompass in summary the triple motto of modernity: Liberty, equality and fraternity, without any kind of discrimination, without any kind of discrimination: Liberty, equality and fraternity, without which there can be no conciliation between the three concepts, a so-

ciety that seeks freedom and with it, religious freedom, freedom of worship, conscience, and others, which at the same time brings together the aspect of an equality, taking into account that all individuals who make up that society, we are human, and that there are human rights that are part of a discourse whose international acceptance is broad and so far sufficient, despite the edges that could be objected. This discourse prevails in the international community, for being necessary for life and all that it entails (the right of life-death, among others) for a better life, together with universal brotherhood (read here fraternity) as part of the love for humanity, and that humanity is also natural, which leads us all together to think about Justice, and democracy, which move this article around Education, Higher Education, and particularly public Higher Education in Mexico, for the situation of the decision, for what is chosen.

ON DECISION, PHILOSOPHY, AND PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND/OR OF THE BODY

From the aspect of the decision, we often have several options, for which we are inclined to some (choice among a multiplicity) however we decide for one (in terms of democracy and decision making) which moves me to think, in what makes us make that decision and without getting too lost in the details, for the briefness of this paper, we often have in the origin, of the conceptions an expression of opposites, between good and evil, good and bad, right and left, more and less, maximum and minimum, etc. Such conceptual expressions were said at the time, by the structuralists, to respond to binary oppositions, but already before conceptions had been expressed that they were not only oppositions, but also confronted each other, in contradictions, that result in something different from them and

that often it was like their synthesis, so dialectics emerged, from it was expressed in European modernity the dialectics of Hegel and then the materialist dialectics, that of Marx, which is taken for this article from the explanation of (Engels, 2014).

Such dialectic, as expressed by Engels, in a nutshell tells us, that there is something, which is denied as negating in the algebra “a”, then we have -a and oppose it the negation of the negation: “-a” by “-a” which is expressed as follows: “(-a) (-a) (-a)” and which gives us as a result: “a” squared, which contains both the “a” and its negation -a negated (negation of the negation) which gives as a result the “a” negated and positivized in something superior (the “a” squared) and thus, we would have to look in nature for those negations of the negation, as when dies the grain of wheat, which gives the wheat, one has the grain of wheat and denies itself, in contradiction with itself denied, which gives as a consequence something different, which is the wheat, but which contains the grain, denied and in contradiction with its own negation, but they are neither the grain, nor its negation, they are the wheat “they are at the same time that they are surpassed” in the wheat.

Now, what does the above have to do with the decision? It has been said that the material basis of the consciousness is the brain, from the brain come the decisions, then, the brain is composed of two hemispheres, the right and the left, which are united by the corpus callosum of the brain, these hemispheres in turn are divided into two each, the lobes and in sum are four; the brain, are not the two hemispheres, which contain the lobes, but they contain both, the lobes and the hemispheres, at the same time that overcome in the brain, which gives as a consequence that the union of the two hemispheres by the corpus callosum, could make us think, that this union makes the decisions arise³. It was thought, in

3. Here, it should be clarified that neurology is not my profession and I could not therefore state this categorically.

the so-called disease of the hand with autonomous life, where apparently, one hand takes its own life with respect to the other, being so, while one hand buttons a shirt, the other could be unbuttoning it, the possible solution was to cut the hemispheres by the callosal part of the brain, but with it was discovered another function of the corpus callosum, which here we come to think with my general and basic knowledge of the brain, which may be the decisions, but I reiterate that I do not state categorically by the respective footnote.

From what has been said, leads us to think how this aspect can be symbolized, but before, it follows with that what does not detract from the reflection, is the point that there are two hemispheres in the brain, with two lobes each, which in its totality form the brain, which is the material basis of consciousness, I say again, and therefore, of decisions, all this as a whole, has as part in my argument, the dialectic, reflecting from (Engels, 2014), in that in society, as in nature, thinking in global terms, the opposition between Nature and Culture, leads us in turn to consider that, in contradiction with Nature, the human being, when confronted with it, with his action on it, in very general terms, with work, results, making leap of many intermediates: culture, as Second Nature, which contains the natural with what the same human being does, and with it his life in society without which he cannot live, for being gregarious by Nature, also this Culture, is expressed in different ways, in which without stopping the reflection here, and for the same reasons, as above, making the leap of intermediates, it goes to what is of interest: which is that Culture and knowledge, united, so that culture is transmitted in general by education, being a for what of education, the best coexistence among human beings, at least, and namely.

Making a decision includes thinking, and everything that has to do with what is involved, in the choice, with it is resolved and decided, so having a self-government or self-government, allows us to have in mind the kingdom of each of the two hemispheres, and hence its empire, united by the corpus callosum of the brain, in turn crowned, as one of the most representative symbols of Freemasonry: the double-headed eagle. With it the caduceus of mercury, current symbol of medicine⁴, where the red and blue snakes, climb up the caduceus to the upper end, in the awakening of the spirit, symbolized by its wings, being thus, the two symbols, unite us in the physical and spiritual, if we consider the caduceus of mercury in a Gnostic interpretation, that the serpents can also symbolize, not only the passions, but the material life -energy- (red serpent, also the blood) and the blue serpent (water, the soul) going up the spine, up to the brain, where the awakening of the spirit can take place⁵. It reminds us of the One, the *nous* and the soul, of the neoplatonism of Plotinus (the One basic hypostasis, and the *nous* and the soul, derived hypostasis), from here, the *nous* and the soul, give as a surpassed part to the awakening of the spirit, that is, the One as in Aristotle, the sun and the *nous* as the light, the light of the sun, and the soul, what gives life to the body or life principle, could be interpreted as “vital force” or “vital energy”, the *élan* of (Bergson, 1973), the vitalism of (Onfray, 2018), alluded to in the article in question.

In addition, that consciousness, thought, etc., have their material base in the brain, which is a part of the body, we can better understand the statement of (Engels, F. 2014) that “man has thought dialectically, even before he knew what dialectics was” so that relationship, of consciousness, thought, imagination, memory, etc., have a base which is the same organ mentioned above. They have a base that is the same organ mentioned, at the same time, the human body, has two arms and two legs, with their respective pairs: two hands, two feet with their fingers and *ortejos* (toes), and so on, for example the hand that moves, can, in the so-called disease of the autonomous hand or with its own life, move differently one from the other and can even be contradictory, which refers us to the two hemispheres, therefore, what makes unique its coordination and movements, can be thought, that are the hemispheres. This being so, it is a natural way, to think dialectically. Therefore, it is necessary to note how contradictions occur in general in everything, and from there, to deduce their dialectical overcoming. Thus, we have the One (it is the unity, for Plotinus) and it results, the overcoming of the *nous* and the soul. Now, there are four Aristotelian causes, and four elements in antiquity, which would come to resemble the four lobes, the four extremities, and their overcoming would be what could not be conceived, which would be thought of as the irrational, that is, what is not, according to Reason and is the consideration of chance, or chance. But as is well known, for Aristotle there is no chance, there are no accidents wi-

4. Also symbol of fortune and commerce does not contradict its representation, because health is not only physical, but economic or financial, regardless of the symbol of Asclepius, which represents only one side, which is not practically, but the subject of a recent controversy, which is not concluded in the completeness, of the previous interpretation, among other aspects, which I will not delve into here. Let this symbolization be valid for the moment, with medicine, fortune and commerce, in complete health.

5. One thinks in the logic of dialectics, in the butterfly, that is to say, the caterpillar, which undergoes its metamorphosis in the chrysalis, and results in a butterfly, which, is not “worm” that crawls or crawls, nor the cocoon, but the butterfly that already flies, which contains the first worm denied and the chrysalis denied, overcome in the butterfly, which corresponds to the part of the brain as gray matter, the butterfly, in the brain as the material base of the consciousness with wings, symbol of peace, of spirituality among others, like the dinosaurs that evolved into birds, can be the dove, symbol of peace or of the spirit itself, like the freedom and the empire of the eagle, the owl or *tecolote*... among others.

thout a cause, and the cause of causes is sought, therefore, to think of the first cause, and the end that would be God, together with the beginning, so that God is beginning and end.

All the above, could be better understood, if we think in turn, that, for the Neoplatonists, as for Avicenna, the one is not number, it is unity, which is beyond Being, therefore, there is no definition that can tell us about the One and what remains is the negative. In this regard he tells us for example (Afnan, Soheil M, 2021 : 148-149) that: “The problem of the one and the manifold had to be examined because the “One is closely connected with the being which is the object of this science”. The oneness of what is indivisible is affirmed, whether in the sense of the genus or in the sense of the relation, or in the sense of the object or in the sense of the definition. There is a way the One, in the sense of number, can indeed have multiplicity. Thus, it would be one in composition and in combination, or it could have, in potency, it would then be continuous and one in continuity, or it could be one as absolute number. The manifold is the number that is opposed to the one, and is that which contains one, although it is not one by definition. It can be multiple in the absolute sense, or in relation to something else. Then comes the curious statement that “the smallest number is two”⁶ . Many Islamic philosophers, express the idea that “one is not number”, and we find a lexicographer who says “and therefore, one is not a number”⁷ . Two could be the sources of this notion. It was Plotinus who first said, in the *Fifth Aeneid* that the One is not one of the entities that form the number Two”⁸ . On the other hand, the translation of a passage of the *Metaphysica*⁹ of Aristotle, contains a

great error, because the translator who translated from Syriac, did not know Greek and translates saying that “the one is not number”. Although it was corrected, later, by another translator, the error for some reason continued to persist. Be that as it may, it became a commonplace notion in Islamic philosophy, which was continually repeated.”

From the above, we can say that possibly in the reflection, it was thought that the one was not number, because the Unity together, matter and form, are the One, that is, they would be like the overcoming of matter and form, therefore “Unity is the concomitant of substance. It is subsequent to matter, or is predicated of accidents.” (Op. Cit. :149). Being thus, the accidents in so far as they are produced and have their existence in their relations with other things, for not being causes by themselves, that is, in themselves, have a part that follows from the four, that is, the One, the beginning, the two, the means, and the three the end, which gives by consequence the four that, would be the totality¹⁰ , being in numbers one, two and three towards the four, respectively. Thus, they are for antiquity, four elements, four Aristotelian causes, four lobes which are the pair plus the pair, in One, the new beginning (four, which is followed by five and the pair of three equal to six, for a new beginning and so on, the nine the end of ends, that is three times three, and the ten the totality of three times three, for a new beginning in eleven.... up to the pair of ten, twenty, ten fingers and ten ortejos, twenty the numerical base of the Mesoamerican pre-Hispanic peoples). Everything in its relation to the body.

Still, we think of the Jewish conceptions of the tree of life or cabala, ten the crown, and ten

6. From Afnan, Soheil M. (2021 : 148). With footnote number 7. *Najat* p. 365.

7. From Afnan, Soheil M. (2021 : 148). With footnote number 8. *Jurjani* p. 152.

8. From Afnan, Soheil M. (2021 : 148). With footnote number 9. *Cf. Dean Inge: Philos, of Plotinus, Vol, II, p. 108.*

9. Comes from Afnan, Soheil M. (2021 : 148) With footnote number 10. *Metaph., 1052b23-24, Arabic translation, edit. Bouyges.*

10. In Jung, Carl G. 1(981). “Symbology of the spirit.” First reprint. Mexico, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. There is a similar idea, very similar, I am inspired by some arguments in this work.

down, heaven and earth¹¹, the one from heaven to the world, and from the world to the underworld, for a new beginning in twenty-one and even to infinity. So pi is close to four, but they are not four, and hence, with the Fibonacci sequence, along with the number or golden ratio, which all three have in common, being irrational numbers, which leads us to think again about irrationality and Reason, asking the reader's indulgence, for the forcedness of the comparison that follows. We have the language of nature, seen in geometric bodies, the triangle and the circle, the straight and the curve, the square and the rectangle, the four sides, the axes of the Cartesian plane, which comes from less infinity and towards more infinity, in the sense of left-right and right-left, and up-down and down-up and is supplanted, with a point, in it that comes from a curve, (including the ellipse, which is a form in very crude terms, of the squaring of the circle¹², that until now it is known, that there is an elliptical form of the orbits of the planets) and they join in the zero, the point from where the one is denied, towards the infinity and from where its negativity starts, because it becomes and supplants, which brings as a consequence, thinking about the origins, that is, the cause of the causes, the first cause, and the end of the ends, which is the end towards which Aristotelian philosophy tends and what has already been mentioned. **Therefore, the cross is a universal symbol.**

11. Also the six-pointed star, which is formed by two triangles, one with the point upward, from earth to heaven, and the other with the point downward, from heaven to earth, united in contradiction, can be thought of dialectically... and with points on the sides, from the less infinite, to the more infinite... and their respective figures coming out...

12. A problem to my knowledge, still unsolvable. Not even infinitesimal calculus solves it, nor does non-Euclidean geometry, or Riemannian geometry, since Archimedes. However, it should be clarified that I am not a mathematician.

13. Here, among other aspects that could be unrelated or not corresponding, we can think of the symbolization of the Phoenix Bird, which rises from its ashes...

14. Let it be said in passing that the elements for organic life are also four, C (carbon), H (hydrogen), O (oxygen), N (nitrogen), and for the Hebrews they would also be four letters of the name of Yahweh (YHVH or YHWH -Tetragrammaton-) ...

15. Let it be said here, that if there were to be something totally sacred for all beings, it is food or that which nourishes, we need a source of energy or similar. We humans are not autotrophs.

16. Here, let it be said in passing that the nut also has a relation with the Eye of Horus and this with the Eye of Nazar or Turk, which in passing is related to the golden ratio, which gives relation to the conception of time in spiral, which transcends the other relations of time as the linear with the symbol of the bifronte or Janus, neither with the uroboros (cyclic conception) but in spiral (also Mayan and Aztec conception) because one never returns to the same point, there is no going back either, but they are "different phases of time" (read also conceptions of history), that is why one thinks of the temporal paradoxes, among others...

Thus, from there we can think of the Christian thought that has its basis in the cross and the crucifixion, being, the zero point, where the body of the sacrificed person lies, from top to bottom, descends and rises again, dies and resurrects¹³, descends to the underworld and ascends to heaven, releasing the underworld. Likewise, the brain, would have its four points, the lobes¹⁴, with the zero point, where the hemispheres meet.

The human body has the digestive system, which makes the function corresponding to the feeding and nutrition¹⁵ of the body, so the brain, and the crown, which often has tips, like hair, which protects the head, the double-headed eagle with crown, the empire or kingdom of the two kingdoms and so, we can notice, as the correspondence was sought, the brain in convolutions alluding to the numbers and sequence already said, that I say in passing, that the nut has a shape very similar to the brain if cut in half, that it has omegas that make it a good food and many more aspects, which can be deduced.¹⁶

At present, much is said about the American democracy, there are two political parties, from which arises a ruler, who decides and executes, all this in relation to the political conception of left and right, in correspondence as can already be noted with the ancient principles and the same human body, which is part in turn of nature, which was created and hence the contro-

versies about the creation, including classical and medieval, in European thought, but as the human body namely is in the same proportions, it includes the human race. So the question, for the origins, leads us to understand the concern for history, and with it its very basis: the brain, as a receptacle in addition to memory. So it was thought that there was a relationship between the cosmos (order) and society, understanding here, Government, what happened astronomically as an order, was equal in similarity, on earth (or below).

CONCLUSIONS

It seems to me that for the purposes of this article, the considerations for the construction of this much needed secular ethics, in spite of the already existing proposals or inspired by them, in order to find one as complete as possible and feasible. It seems in turn, that secularity is a good principle for that assumption of modernity, which has been received as the triple motto of "Liberty, equality and fraternity" where, as Beuchot says, in these times there have been greater freedoms, lesser equalities and almost null fraternity. Hoping that it is not so discouraging; from laicism, it encompasses freedoms and human rights, therefore equality is sought and because it is inclusive and conducive to democracy, fraternal. Now, although it can be said that modernity is behind us, it seems that no, it is not so, and although it does not have the same form of the eighteenth and nineteenth century and still the twentieth, there is no postmodernity as such, perhaps, of other options, such as the proposal of Rodriguez Magda (2004) of transmodernity¹⁷, but yes, it seems that secularity as it follows, we could not speak of post-secularity. Reiterating, therefore, it is a process, if not laicization, then laicization

and towards laicization, therefore, it is undoubtedly necessary, an ethics, which even leads to the reflection of what has now been put in society in consideration of importance, such as artificial intelligence, and other aspects, all related to life-death and the meaning of life itself, we could speak of a secular biopolitics, or secular bioethics.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The education, of a ruler, has been the concern of the philosophers of antiquity, and continues to be, an important part of the thought of the philosophy of education, which wonders in this understanding, for the why of education, being thus, for Aristotle, the search for the good as an end, that is to say, the why, would be the good, through virtue, and with it prudence or *phronesis*. Also Averroes¹⁸, was interested in education in general, as well as of the rulers, following Plato and it is understood, consequently the situation in Aristotle, from there, to the whole medieval period, where the education of the rulers was sought, until they were enlightened (enlightened despotism) until the French Revolution, which is often taken as a very important point of modernity. It is still of importance, even in today's meritocratic times, where academic merits are discussed, perhaps with relegation of social merits, so that the *curriculum vitae* is of interest. From there, to the Higher Education and therefore of Mexico, since, it has been sought to remove the aspect of religious reminiscences to the concepts of good.

Then, in correspondence with the thought that comes from classical antiquity, medieval times and European modernity, secularization and together, at the same time, secularity, with it, the longed-for achievement of the tri-

17. It is said transmodernity, but we could well think not in a modernity, nor in the already mentioned transmodernity, but in an era of artificiality, for example, now we speak of artificial intelligence, then, I will try in the future to develop and give content to the concept of Artificiality, as an era (It should be noted that, intelligence involves learning and resolution, design, among others and that it is not natural).

18. Averroes (2011). Exposition of Plato's "Republic". Tecnos. Classics of thought. Spain. 6th Edition.

ple motto “Liberty, equality, fraternity” that, in some way, corresponds to colonial thought. There are still bases of the thought of the original peoples, this because as it is known, the country is multicultural, pluricultural, so it is said, interculturality, which leads us to secular thought, which has had a settlement in such multiculturality, pluricultural; from which are deduced, secular ethics. Without saying totally from there, because, in tune with everything expressed, to think about the origins of secularity, is still a situation that occupies the history of thought and, also of the good, even with all the above. But as it seems to have been shown, in the classics there is much from which the concept of good and evil is derived.

In the current meritocratic thinking, there is also much of the thinking of the colony, and of the original peoples, because, as in almost all the peoples that have shaped humanity, putting a headdress on the head of the ruler and distinguishing himself, the legitimacy of a ruler also has to do with his merits, including, as already mentioned, education. Thus, in pre-Columbian America, in the same way, education was a concern, along with the ruler’s education, and consequently merits, des-

pite the fact that, from Europe, came the differentiation into castes, which meant that a person was born in a caste, and died in it, with little or no social mobility. Just as in Europe, the governments responded to the families (Bourbon, Hasburg, Hohenzollern...) in Mexico, the elites still move in a way that seems to be caste-based. So often, social mobility in contemporary Mexico is almost null or null, in contradiction with the idea of liberalism and others, which makes us think that by our own effort, we can ascend socially, and that became, and still is, part of the popular discourse of why study, that is, to move up the social ladder of the organization of Mexican society.

It is also important to mention that it is assumed, at least in this way, that a person who has a high formal education can make better decisions in society, which is why, in the aforementioned meritocracy, it is sought that the population studies up to the higher education level. Therein lies another answer to the purpose of education. Not only formally, but in general, education in broad and general terms is: a necessary domination for a coexistence, which can be better.

REFERENCES

- Averroes (2011). “Exposición de la “República” de Platón”. Tecnos. Clásicos del pensamiento. España. 6ta. Edición.
- Bergson, Henri, 1859-1941. ([1973]). “La evolución creadora”. Espasa-Calpe. ISBN 84-239-1519-0. OCLC 4315. Consultado el 16 de junio de 2020.
- Beuchot, Mauricio (2017). “Perspectivas hermenéuticas”. Ciudad de México: Editorial Siglo XXI.
- Beuchot, Mauricio (2005). “Interculturalidad y derechos humanos”. México: Editorial Siglo XXI: UNAM.
- Beuchot, Mauricio (1997). “Tratado de hermenéutica analógica. Hacia un nuevo modelo de la interpretación”. México: UNAM 5ª. Edición.
- Blancarte, Roberto (2017). “Para entender. El Estado Laico”. Ciudad de México: Producciones Sin Sentido Común, S. A. de C. V. Nostra Ediciones.
- Cortina, Adela (1993). “Concepto de derechos humanos y problemas actuales. En derechos y libertades”. Revista del Instituto Bartolomé de las Casas, núm. 1.

- De Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2009). "Una Epistemología del Sur. La reinención del conocimiento y la emancipación social". Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores, CLACSO.
- Engels, F. (2014). "El Anti-Dürhing. La Revolución de la ciencia por el señor Eugen Dühring". Fundación Federico Engels. Madrid.
- Foucault, Michel (1979). "Historia de la sexualidad. 1. La voluntad de saber". España: Siglo XXI 5ª edición.
- Habermas, J. (2000). "Aclaraciones a la ética del discurso". Madrid: Trotta.
- Habermas, J. (1997). "Facticidad y validez. Sobre el derecho y el Estado Democrático de Derecho en términos de teoría del discurso". Madrid: Trotta.
- Habermas, J. (1987). "Teoría de la acción comunicativa". Cuarta edición. Madrid: Tauros.
- Horkheimer, Max (2000). "Anhelo de justicia. Teoría crítica y religión". Madrid: Trotta.
- Jung, Carl G. (1981). "Simbología del espíritu". Primera reimpresión. México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kant, Immanuel (2020). "El conflicto de las facultades". Madrid: Edición de Roberto R. Aramayo, Alianza Editorial.
- Kant, Immanuel. "Crítica del Juicio". en la Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. (ed. 1876, en castellano, traducción del francés de Alejo García Moreno y Juan Rovira).
- Marcuse, Herbert (1985). "El hombre unidimensional". México: Obras Maestras del Pensamiento Contemporáneo/Editorial Artemisa, S. A. de C. V.
- Onfray, Michel (2019). "Decadencia. Vida y muerte de Occidente". Ciudad de México: Ediciones Culturales Paidós.
- Onfray, Michel (2018). "Cosmos. Por una ética sin moral". Ciudad de México: Ediciones Culturales Paidós
- Onfray, Michel (2006). "Tratado de ateología". Barcelona: Anagrama
- Poulat, Émile (2012). "Nuestra laicidad pública". México: F. C. E.
- Rodríguez Magda, Rosa María (2004). "Transmodernidad". Barcelona: Anthropos Editorial.
- Soheil M. Afnan (2021). "El pensamiento de Avicena". F. C. E. Breviarios. Ciudad de México, 3era. Reimpresión.
- Weber, Max (2021). "Política y ciencia". Buenos Aires: Biblioteca Virtual Omegalfa. Fuente Editorial La Pléyade p. 52-53.