



## **Full Length Research Article**

### **THE FALL OF HUMANISM AND THE ADVENT OF A NEW NIHILISM**

**\*Héctor Sevilla Godínez**

Doctor in Philosophy and Human Development Sciences, Member of the Mexican Philosophical Association and Founding Member of the Iberoamerican Transpersonal Association, CUValles, University of Guadalajara

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

##### **Article History:**

Received 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2016  
Received in revised form  
27<sup>th</sup> April, 2016  
Accepted 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2016  
Published online 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2016

##### **Key Words:**

Nothingness,  
Being, Post-humanism,  
Liberation,  
Humanist psychology.

#### **ABSTRACT**

The paper is a critical analysis directed of conceptions about the human being proposed by humanistic psychology and by the United Nations. It is shown that the anthropological idea that sustains them is centered on an ontological paradigm centered on the being; in that sense, the article proposes an inverse ontology, centered on Nothingness, from which can be conceived a distinct idea of what the human being is. Adjoined to it, some reflections are presented regarding man's condition before nothingness and the impossibility of excluding himself from his final encounter with it. Finally, it will be demonstrated that the overcoming of humanism reaches the consideration of a Universal, like Nothingness, which facilitates a more conscious, open, and flexible exercise about existence that corresponds to us.

*Copyright©2016, Héctor Sevilla Godínez. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Nothingness is metaphorically present in the zero; in space; in change and mobility; in substance modification; in silence, losses, and "no-senses". And it is there, within the Nothingness that is still left for the contemporary man, that he must reconstruct himself to once again be, though now in a distinct way, more profoundly and completely. The consideration of Nothingness implies a new perspective. Nothingness has been seen with different faces; always modeled by human subjectivity, by religious interests, or by topical fears. Nothingness has occupied roles which we have constructed so as not to allow others to see it. Nothingness is seen without seeing it. We have covered it with veils; we fear the unveiling of Nothingness. This has made us understand it as contrary to Being; as the counterpart of that which is most laudable and dignified in the human being; as if with it there were no further motives to keep on living; when, in reality, it is from Nothingness that we can have the option of re-understanding the world. Nothingness can be embarked on from various fields since it has been a persistent topic,

##### **\*Corresponding author: Héctor Sevilla Godínez**

Doctor in Philosophy and Human Development Sciences; Member of the Mexican Philosophical Association and Founding Member of the Iberoamerican Transpersonal Association CUValles, University of Guadalajara

generating fascination from the distinct proposals of human knowledge. Since Heraclitus, philosophers have attempted to understand it. Since Sophocles, intellectuals have attempted to describe it. Since the atomists, mathematicians have attempted to decipher it, as the Mayans did with the number zero and its personification. Since Saint Augustine in the beginning of the Middle Ages, it has tried to be denied in order to vindicate divinity; but other theologians, like Meister Eckhart, have unified it with the Deity. Astronomers have attempted to locate Nothingness beyond the world, and since the Stoics it has been understood as beyond the universe. Scientists filled with ether, that which could be Nothingness, until arriving at quantum physics which conceives it as dialectic with the Being. Hence, Nothingness has not only been in distinct disciplines of knowledge but is implied in, and related with, the most fundamental questions that man may ask himself. Issues such as life and death; the existence, or not, of values; the existence, or not, of knowledge; ideas posed about truth or lies; about the being or the not-being; about change, movement, space, matter, or emptiness; Nothingness is always present. Hence, it is clear that the issue of Nothingness is implied in the life of the person who understands it, and this directly affects his or her anthropological perception. Therefore, to conceive man based on Nothingness will ineludibly propitiate the reconsideration of the conception that he has about what is better for the human itself; in other

words, the ideas about what human development or improvement mean. What is set forth in the following pages generates a direct, up-front, clear, and argued critique toward perceptions unmistakably centered on the Being, toward the comprehension of life based on tangible and measurable parameters, toward the quantification of the senses of life, and toward the search of complete certainty. An alternative system is proposed for self-understanding, social tolerance, and the construction of destructions that allow a reconstruction. This is not a text for a person who is not prepared for being aimlessly adrift; it isn't a study for those who fear the possible drowning of nausea and the loss of certainties. It's about attempting to speak for Nothingness; about creating from one's own voice a something which partially means Nothingness. It's about unveiling; seeing without seeing; understanding beyond reason.

It is intended, at most, to propose a form of thought which, without excluding an ontology centered on the Being, doesn't exclude Nothingness either; a perception that implies a constant dialogue between the Being and Nothingness, both of which constitute an always moveable and temporary reality in the world and beyond. This implies a critique as well towards conventional structures about the meaning of human existence and the forms of constructing it. The proposal of that which contemporary man must experience in order to come alive in Nothingness, is clearly presented in order that, through it, he may achieve a manner, not previously set forth, of finding oneself with one's own self; with that which, upon being, one is not. Firstly, I will speak of the psychological humanism as the third force of psychology in order to, subsequently, concentrate on the common perceptions that are have about human development, or that which is "best" for man. Finally, it will refer the impossibility of liberation from Nothingness.

### Nothingness and humanist psychology

As heir of existentialism, humanism – I refer to the psychological humanism, precursor to humanism in other fields – inherited the notion that what was truly valuable was in the center of the individual; and that external issues had to be diminished in order to pay attention to man's interior. This new structure radicalized more each time the intention of believing in liberty as the human essence<sup>1</sup>, or the position that man is the "architect of his own destiny",<sup>2</sup> until arriving at the point of considering man as a being capable of "self-fulfillment"<sup>3</sup> or of implicating him as the only main character in his "process of becoming a person".<sup>4</sup> All of it is also an absolutism; in this case, an absolutism of the value of the person, the value of his decisions, and the value of his responsibility. Each one of these suppositions will now be touched upon. To speak of the person as the only one who has something to see, say, and decide in his own live, is a terrible ecological and sociological myopia. The human individual is not entirely conscious of everything that surrounds him. Neither can he consider all the options, nor does he desire to consider all the options, which is why his decision is always

situated, partial, and relational. If man is so limited at the time of his decision election, we cannot demand of him the entire responsibility of these actions, the consequences of which he doesn't previously know either. Responsibility itself is previously elected, not assumed. There isn't, then, an individual independence, and even less a separation of it from the rest of the cosmos. More accurate is Adler's affirmation<sup>5</sup> in that – as beings that live out contingency day by day – we pessimistically assume inferiority, looking to compensate ourselves; filling, by it, our life with neurosis. There are types of humanism that do not escape being only an egotistical compensation before the anxiousness of being aimlessly adrift; an anguishing filling of the gap that provokes not knowing oneself to be the owner of the circumstances that surround decisions. In the end, it is fear of not having the helm; which, may it be said in passing, is never had.

In essence, all psychology must be based on the comprehension of social order; on the understanding that everything that is in our psyche, was previously part of an external system that we have made interior from the guideline of our valuing structure; which, furthermore, was also generated by external influence. There is no way in which to judge without a judgment scheme. And every judgment scheme has been taken from social life; from within family or outside of it, but never outside of social structures. Where is the cosmic man, beater of the alienations that some humanists speak of, left? There is no possibility of it.

A person will never entirely know himself or others. How to concentrate hope on the knowledge of man himself if he only knows himself superficially? This man, who partially knows himself, is in what way supposed to become the architect of his life? Unless an alternate reality is constructed – in which the mentioned construction is found outside of any relation to the rest of the world – we cannot take this affirmation about life's architecture seriously. It is already full, not only of haughtiness, but also of anthropocentric ignorance.

Man is not the designer of his destiny. He is simply the construction worker of his mock construction. Even the physical construction of a house – to mention a specific construction alluding to the issue of the architecture of one's own destiny – is not exempt from contingency. It requires at least the existence of materials, of a blueprint designed depending on the type of soil in which the construction will be founded. It is hoped that the climatic conditions are favourable and, furthermore, that there are other men in existence to help the construction; and that, in the case that there are, they know how to follow instructions. Now, even the construction of a house supposes inevitable contingency, which is why wouldn't this same contingent characteristic in the construction of personal destiny, the construction of sense, and, at most, the decisions set in the shade of that sense, be supposed in a human being? It is superfluous to refer to the univocal posture that is granted to the concept of *destiny* in this phrase about its architecture, as though supposing that such a destiny is constructed once and for all. The person, then, is not self-fulfilling but requires a series of conceptualizations that may permit him to make valuations;

<sup>1</sup>Vid. Sartre, *El humanismo es un existencialismo*, 1999.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibidem*.

<sup>3</sup>Vid. Maslow, *El hombre autorrealizado: hacia una psicología del ser*, 1993.

<sup>4</sup>Cfr. Rogers, *El proceso de convertirse en persona*, 2006.

<sup>5</sup>Vid. Adler, *El carácter neurótico*, 1971.

from which, depending on the adaptation of his own life to such hierarchies, we will obtain fulfillment. The aforesaid is possible only to the extent that such valuing structures are not modified, as it would be normal to expect; and that, even without considering how it is that the archetypes of that which we call fulfillment are gestated in us. All of the aforesaid is not entirely in man's hands. Rather, Nothingness itself is implicated, drawing lots for the possibilities that man foolishly believes are in his own hands. Without any obstacle, we can affirm that the Maslow's anthropological option, just like that of the majority of the current psychological proposals and trends, are centered on the Being and have completely left aside the consideration of Nothingness; from it, is its derived partialization. The success that said postures have had in the West is explained by that in itself, for they correctly respond to the univocal needs of the Western man who centers his most valuable and Caucasian hopes on the Being. With regard to Carl Rogers' work, it is clear that he has interesting leads which can still be constructed for the development of his proposal, centered on the person, as long as the center of the person himself is truly and profoundly considered; in other words, Nothingness.

If we are to provide a return into man's interior, we are to provide it truly, deeply, and not by way of emotional rubbing. We could begin by understanding human Nature itself centered on Nothingness and not on the Ego; centered on the Absoluteness of uncertainty and not on the self-affirmations still bordering on the most superfluous vanity. Nothingness, as man's container, does not allow him to elevate himself to the point of self-sufficiency. Man's own contingency is his main counterpart to the so desired supremacy. It is assumed here, obviously, that the term *humanism* can still be utilized, as long as it done so with a new meaning, probably even paradoxical. This is to say, understanding it as the capacity of opening oneself to what is extra-human; of contemplating what is beyond that which is human and acting in regard to it. Only in the affirmation of what is extra-human (Nothingness), does the human find himself with his superior worth. This is also very distinct from the simple and always equivocal anti-humanism, but also from any good-natured and non-reflexive formula of humanism. So, it is about maintaining a humanism which is *critical*, *self-critical*, and truly open to Nothingness; a post-humanism.

### Nothingness before common conceptions about human development

Neither can a structure of human development that implies univocal measurements, other than the psychological humanism, be understood, as is done by the United Nations (UN) or the different countries that assume they can assign a percentage to the human development of their inhabitants. If this would have to be done, we would previously have to refer to a model of human development; and, previously, have to establish an anthropological structure from which to establish the basis for the conception of human development considered. Since such aspects are not done and organisms require numbers in order to present their political advances, then they measure people's economical incomes, or their type of housing, or even their public security structures. All of these are aspects referred to the *conditions* of the individuals'

lives, not to their intrinsic development or improvement. On the economical plane, the structures of human development are well sold, for it is fashionable to be a socially responsible company supposedly centered on people. This is because it generates an image that instills trust; and trust allows sales to rise. On the educational plane, structures called humanistic are offered, which manage to buy social respect at low costs. So poor is the vision in it that the supremacy of the Being has never been questioned. Little is what is understood by the humanistic issues in many institutions where the image, what must be, the noble and axiologically correct, is what occupies the first positions with regard to the idea of humanism that is had. But, as we have covered, all of these issues are dangerous enough to be assumed as a dogma.

Now, the obligated question at this point is: so then what is human development? And the most obvious answer – which a good reader should already be anticipating – is that human development in itself is nothing; or, at least, not something univocal. And we demonstrate this through the wide array of existing suppositions about *what a man must do in order to be better*. We could speak, for example, of the structures which have been constructed throughout history based on the cultural structures in which man is found. In ancient Greece, they valued the man capable of respecting the *polis* with an attitude known as *Paideia*,<sup>6</sup> which made men noble and united them with society. Myths were not questioned – let us remember Socrates' death as corruptor of the young upon proposing it – and the idea of Nothingness as such was repudiated. In the Roman culture,<sup>7</sup> warlike virtues were reinforced and it was conceived that the honourable man was always willing for combat; art and trades were valued, but the conception of their world had little to do with Nothingness. Having arrived in the Middle Ages,<sup>8</sup> we find ourselves with a theocentric structure which repudiated vanity and the centralization of the person as a manner of understanding the world. There was no possibility of critique; and the good man was, without any doubt, the believer who was willing to serve God, in spite of it potentially costing him the greatest sacrifices. Having passed the Medieval schools – still existent in certain spaces –, we find ourselves with an anthropocentric model of the modern world, elevated to rationalism and to the valuing of that which is strictly provable.

The ideal of a man as an individual, capable of searching and finding answers, was modified with time; until arriving at the conceptions of the contemporary man who places a life structure worthy of being sought out on doing, or undergoing, competencies and obtaining earnings. This has been propitiated, to a great extent, by neoliberalism and the dominating monetary structures, parting from the idealization of the consumerist lifestyle until the consequent labour-slavery to which the current man is subject. It is not surprising that based on these structures, there is no manner of understanding human development within international organisms that is not an issue that is measurable in strictly tangible aspects. We have previously made the small historical sketch in order to understand that the structures about what the human being

<sup>6</sup>Vid. Jaeger, *Paideia: los ideales de la cultura griega*, 1985.

<sup>7</sup>Vid. Altieri, *Roma: Introducción al estudio del pensamiento romano*, 2003.

<sup>8</sup>Vid. Pastoureau, *Una historia simbólica de la Edad Media occidental*, 2006.

must be and achieve, vary according to paradigm modification. That these paradigms become stable and difficult to move, we owe the educational system; which, as such, no critical sells a model of a man that must be sought out, except for rare and honorary exceptions. Being so, Human Development is nothing more than the manner in which to call the nominal exteriorization of a univocal eagerness – personal or collective – centered on what man must achieve; and which responds to the valuing structures acquired, consciously or not, and due to the social life within a particular context and situation. Hence, there are so many manners of understanding Human Development as there are individuals that search for it; just as there are so many moral models as there are thinking people.

All of the aforesaid does not affirm that one must erase, deny, or simply prohibit personal structures about one's own improvement, for these are what impulse many people to try to assign a meaning to life. What I affirm is that we are to recognize the widely feasible possibility that the structures we have assumed to be real and univocal, may not be more than relative constructions –in fact, they are– that can partially respond to some people's life motives. But they are not necessarily connected to the most intimate realities deposited in our Being; in each being. Stated differently, any conception of human development that is desired can be had, as long as it is not considered univocal and obligated onto the rest of the humans. This would be the conception of Human Development gestated through the vision based on Nothingness; a Nothingness that doesn't imprison and dogmatize, but which allows individual diversity and an ample range from the ordinary to the extraordinary. Therefore, to contemplate Nothingness is an ineludible parting point for the advent of a posthumanism that –finally– provides the human with his privileged position as a being who assumes Nothingness; not as the univocal main character of the cosmos. To overcome the prevailing humanism is to truly allow what is human: the leftover part behind the ego.

### **Nothingness and the impossibility of liberation from Nothingness**

Nothingness contains us; which is why it is not possible to liberate oneself from Nothingness without ceasing to be, for this ceasing to be will imply complete Nothingness, becoming one with Nothingness. So, seen in this way, not even death is liberation from Nothingness. It not only contains us in life but also before and after life. Its possession in us is broadened even beyond our existence. Even when we cease to be, Nothingness will keep on being. It is before and after; and, in that sense, is the only and true alpha and omega of the Universe or beyond it. This may be so evident that the way in which distinct cultures throughout the history of humanity have denied, hidden, prohibited, subtracted, or covered up the issues about Nothingness, is slightly less than incredible. It is already time to recognize Nothingness. Not because Nothingness deserves it but because humans deserve a new structure; a new and more complete paradigm from which to value reality. Contemporary man requires an alternate manner to comprehend his own self and to comprehend others. The Being is insufficient; the Being requires Nothingness. And Nothingness is not enough; for if only Nothingness were, then it would not be possible to write this, neither would there be

someone to read it, nor would the reader have this material in his hands in which these words are written. Hence what there is, is not only Being and not only Nothingness but a dialectic between Nothingness and the Being. There is an evident impossibility of liberating oneself from Nothingness; for if the latter remains in a constant dialectic with the Being, then if Nothingness were not, the Being wouldn't be either. And, therefore, there is no being which is liberated from Nothingness; since in the precise moment of his supposed liberation, he would also cease to be what he is. Without Being, naturally, nobody could be free either for they would no longer be. We can elaborate elegant suggestions or sophisticated mental elaborations for the denial of Nothingness, but we cannot escape it by putting the idea in our minds that we have escaped. To believe that one escapes Nothingness is like assuming that upon thinking that the world no longer exists, due to that thought in itself, it doesn't exist. What we think is not necessarily a parameter of truth (for they aren't there) which is why thinking that we have been liberated from Nothingness does not assume such a liberation. It will be said to me, "then to think about Nothingness does not assume that it exists either"; before which we will have to say that the syllogism of the detractor is well elaborated, but I am to also affirm that we are not thinking of Nothingness as such right now. Rather, we lucubrate, imagine, assume a Nothingness; and we know beforehand that the Nothingness described is not such as it has been described but, in fact, Nothingness is.

Nothingness is more than what I have said and what will be said of it. Hence it is obvious that not upon thinking of Nothingness is then Nothingness the same nothing we have thought of. To deny that Nothingness exists would be yet a stronger affirmation; for it assumes a substantial denial, distinct to the affirmation Nothingness' manner of being, which would be only an affirmation centered on the manner of being and not on the Being of Nothingness. It is clear that Nothingness is not as I have attempted to describe it, but there can be no doubt up to this point about the Being of Nothingness. Now, I have said here that it is not possible to free oneself from Nothingness, and that may seem tragic. But, in reality, what is tragic is the contrary: to not be able to escape the Being. Nothingness is not the enemy from which we must escape. It is not from Nothingness from which we must liberate ourselves. For if it were, we would assume that Nothingness is *evil* or *not convenient*; and then we would be assigning an adjective to it, by which we would be making it be; and so, due to it, *that* would not be Nothingness. We don't have to liberate ourselves from Nothingness, even due to the fact that it is Nothingness which liberates us. In each one of the previous pages, I referred to Nothingness as the fundamental aspect from which the improvement and better comprehension of what we are, is enabled. Centered only on the Being, we have walked in circles without advancing during centuries. After so much walking, we are in the same place. It is hardly useful to run if we don't know where we are headed as humanity. Let us assume ourselves as vital mystery surrounded by flesh; what is human is simply a sigh that deeply vanishes in the end. Being so, we are to say that immersed in the Being it is that we desire the liberation by Nothingness; not the other way around. And I have said the liberation *by* Nothingness and not *from* Nothingness. There is

no motive by which to desire to liberate oneself from Nothingness for we are Nothingness also to a great extent; and to want to escape oneself from that is hardly probable. Only death liberates us from liberations, but not from Nothingness for death itself is its waiting room. We are not Nothingness yet but Nothingness is already in us.

### Nothingness and liberation from liberation

What is most vivifying is the possibility of dying. Death also supposes liberation from life; a life that implies a continuous exercising of liberations. Being so, death is the liberation from liberations; the only thing that makes it unnecessary to look to liberate oneself from something since it liberates us, even from liberations. Previous to it, there is no liberation from liberations unless, happily or unhappily, the most profound slavery is embraced. Prior to death there is no motive to not desire the liberation from so many structures that we have already mentioned. The only thing that justifies the not struggling against it all is death itself. The localization of the self in Absolute Nothingness assumes the elimination of the self. We have already said that the self is only an illusion of the conscience. It is not so with liberations for they do not have a substantial quality but a predictive one; it is an act that must be carried out. The philosophical exercise can be an alternative to liberation or to new prisons. It certainly is true, however, that a philosophical exercise centered on Nothingness can contribute to greater liberations, though it never assumes the liberation from the need of liberation. That will only be done by death. The events that we see, we grasp as a micro-cosmos of the Being's and Nothingness' last dialectic; and neither are we able to escape from this dialectic. Every being with a life has a line to follow before his life ends. Death is the final and unavoidable tendency of life. That in itself assumes that in the end, the liberation from liberations, or from the non-liberated attachments, does exist. Death is the exit from the world of appearances. With this I don't want to sound Platonic nor bring back the famous world of ideas. It is not so, simply because Nothingness has no ideas and ideas cannot be had in Nothingness. Certainly there must be something more than appearances, and that would be the state of the non-appearance; the world of Nothingness that is this world itself and others, all of the existing ones, but in another perspective. Death is also a disconnection from the visible; a separation from the sensible and a natural fleeing from the tangible in a definitive manner. There is no turning back after dying. There is no place which will keep us. There is no deposit of old bodies into which we can throw our on flesh. There is Nothingness. Hence death is the waiting room of Nothingness; the waiting room for the being that we were. For once the slender door of death has been entered, one will no longer be the same thing; one is not even anything any longer.

Death gives eternal life, but we speak of a life not centered on the Being. I speak here of a life that is not life, an existence that is the not-existence, an insensible sensitivity, an immaterial materialness, a bodiless corporality, intangible tangibility, a being that is not being. Life after death is no longer ours and it is not life, but it *is* without being. The self does not end there for, in reality, there never was one. And such as we said when we spoke of love and the sensation that love leaves us when it ends – which is more like a ceasing to

pretend – in the same manner, death is ceasing to pretend that one is a self. Death is really the unifying principle. Death is the true pacific and equalizing Communist that leads us all to the same location and with the same treatment. Hence upon being willing to die it is that one lives better. You may let go of me, hurl me, destroy me, annihilate me, and turn me into dust, but in the end I will reconstruct myself. I again become the being that is not and I re-begin the way to the un-sense, as always, as never. No power does the Being, your being, have when Nothingness is assumed; so turn out the light for the heaven cannot be seen.

### The nothing that we are and the Nothingness that we are not yet

It could be objected up to this point that if we will be Nothingness upon dying, then right now we are not Nothingness. If we assume this, we are mistaken due to the following; the nothing that we are today is in dialectic with the Being; the Nothingness that we will be is only in dialectic with itself. Hence, there is a situated nothing and an Absolute Nothingness. The situated nothing belongs to us and the location – it is not too much to say it – is us. Absolute Nothingness has no location for it is *every* imaginable location and not. Hence, it is relevant to affirm that there is a nothing that we are and a Nothingness that we are not yet but that, due to the nothing that we are, we will be in some moment in time; in fact, in the precise moment that time ceases to be something for us. There is no time in Nothingness for there is no possible movement. However, we have learned to fear this reality that we are and that great reality that we will be. And this is very clear, even in the area of our own use of linguistics. We say phrases that implicitly deny Nothingness such as “I don't feel anything for you” or “there isn't anything there”, “I don't know anything”, or “I didn't see anything”<sup>9</sup>.

The issue is that if I say that “I feel nothing for somebody”, it is because I, effectively, feel *something* for that someone; at least rejection. The inclusion of denial with the word *no* really has no sense – or logic – in it, unless it is to affirm what has supposedly been denied. In any case, we would have to say: “I feel nothing for you” or “I don't feel something for you”. But if we conduct a careful analysis of these terms, we will see that they wouldn't have to be applied either. For if I say that “I feel nothing for you”, then it is not really that nothing is felt for I at least feel indifference; since if I did feel nothing, I wouldn't say that phrase either. In any case, we would have to say: “I don't feel what you supposedly expect me to feel for you”. And though such a phrase is evidently more complex, it assumes less possibility of being mistaken; unless our supposition about what the other individual expects that I feel towards him is mistaken, which – it should be said in passing – is most likely. With regard to the phrase “there isn't anything”, we would instead have to say “there isn't something”. But here, though the phrase is less incorrect, we find ourselves with another problem; because, in reality *there*

<sup>9</sup> In English, the word *anything* is used so as to avoid the double negative use of *no* and *nothing*; however, the common phrase in Spanish does use the word *nothing* (there isn't nothing), which implicitly denies Nothingness as is specified in the text. Nevertheless, the English phrases using *anything* in a negative sense, as mentioned in the text, also imply nothing; therefore, Nothingness is also implicitly denied by the English vocabulary.

is the absence of what we had expected to be there, which is why there is actually *something* which is the absence of another thing. We would probably have to say, “I am not finding what I am looking for here”; which is more correct and less problematic. Similar things occur with other affirmations that include *no* and the word *nothing* as a denial. We lose sight of the fact that the denial of a denial is, consequently, its affirmation. It is very common to hear anybody who solemnly, as though showing off his Atheism, says, “God isn’t anything”. Here we would have to object that if his intention is to affirm the inexistence of God, then he is erring in his terms; for his expression “God isn’t anything” assumes in itself that “God is something, since it is not nothing”. I will partially agree with the initial affirmation but in another sense; this is to say, with the affirmation: “God is Nothingness”, which elevates the concept of God to the category of Nothingness – which doesn’t diminish it but is, rather, a compliment. On the other hand, it could also be said that “God is not Nothingness”. This would imply that if he is not Nothingness, then he is nothing, which would lead us into a playful singularity. If God is not Nothingness, then he is nothing; which is why God – whatever that may be – has no exit: either it is nothing upon not being Nothingness, or it is Nothingness being nothing.

Leaving the idea of God and referring once again to the idea of man, we have to affirm that it is not the same to exist as Being and Nothingness, than to exist only as Nothingness. I have already spoken of the dialectic between the Being and Nothingness; and it is into that dialectic which life inserts us, what we are now. But what we will be later is a non-sense. Absolute Nothingness implies a Being without Being. The Nothingness that we will be implies a no-longer-being what we were under earthly parameters. This Being without Being that Nothingness is, ends up being unexplainable from our limited logic. There is no manner to know today what Nothingness will assume for us. What is certain is that the impossibility of certainties that Nothingness itself implies, creates one of its most drastic games here: the fear to Nothingness that creates the greatest ambiguities in us. While that occurs, we are to construct from Nothingness; attempt to vivify the Absolute even prior to being (or not being) the Absolute. Today, our nothing that we possess assumes that transcendence is today; that one must not die in order to vivify Nothingness for infiniteness is today, already, here. To live from Nothingness, to philosophize from Nothingness, or to think Nothingness has, all of it, its consequences.

### Conclusion

In Western thought there has not been sufficient credibility given to such issues about Nothingness, as occurs in the Orient. The situation summons us and it is time to do it. Logical thinking, scientificisms, and various philosophical concepts have prevented the possible fructification of an idea of Nothingness more bound to man’s real life. We have excluded Nothingness from Western thought and we have lost a good part of Everything.

The preponderance and domain that has been given to ontology of the Being has gestated our frames of thought and interpretation from which we have conceived the world in a myopic, and particularly rudimentary, manner. It is timely to awaken Nothingness and consider it in its greatest sense: not as a denial of the Being, but rather as its possibility, its propitiation and sense. The majority of our constructs have been built up from a univocal valuing structure of the Being. The contemplating of Nothingness precisely supposes the possibility of confrontation. The confrontation must commence with the usual versions of humanism. It is time to recognize that the human is not the centre of the Universe, neither the centre of the world, nor centre of anything. What exists around the person is what configures his or her state and modification. Humanistic psychology has exhausted its proposal on the reliability of liberty and deposited its hopes on a self-knowledge that does not elude the disparity with which each person is in reality. That it is oneself who assigns labels to him or herself does not exempt their inaccuracy. In that sense, the vision about what is human progress must be reconsidered, for it has usually responded to conventionalisms, fashions, or postulates having emerged from the culture. It remains clear, finally, that although we have been able to confront the constructs from which we edify the ideas of what we are, we have no manner of confronting the ineludible fact of finding ourselves with the definitive Nothingness upon dying. This impossibility of liberating ourselves from Nothingness, more than generating anguish or unrest, constitutes an invitation to live profoundly what remains of our existence in this earthly world. To delve into Nothingness, allowing in ourselves a post-humanist stage, more than negative news, can be the beginning of a new condition, more conscious, open, and flexible in our life. That Nothingness that we will be, absolute and perpetual, is distinct to the nothingness which we are already; but only to the degree in which we contact the latent portion of inexistence in our being, will we truly achieve to conjecture our being and our nothingness in order to become, finally, human.

### REFERENCES

- Adler, Alfred, *El carácter neurótico*, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1971.
- Altieri, Angelo, *Roma: Introducción al estudio del pensamiento romano*, Puebla, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2003.
- Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia: los ideales de la cultura griega*, México, FCE, 1985.
- Maslow, Abraham, *El hombre autorrealizado: hacia una psicología del ser*, Barcelona, Kairós, 1993.
- Pastoreau, Michel, *Una historia simbólica de la Edad Media occidental*, Buenos Aires, Katz, 2006.
- Rogers, Carl, *El proceso de convertirse en persona*, México, Paidós, 2006.
- Sartre, Jean Paul, *El existencialismo es un humanismo*, México, Quinto Sol, 1994.

\*\*\*\*\*