



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

IJDR

International Journal of Development Research

Vol. 15, Issue, 01, pp. 67379-67383, January, 2025

<https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.29052.01.2025>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

PRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS OF THE PERSONAL VIVIFICATION OF NOTHINGNESS

***Héctor Sevilla Godínez**

University of Guadalajara, Mexico

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 27th November, 2024

Received in revised form

19th December, 2024

Accepted 26th December, 2024

Published online 24th January, 2025

Key Words:

Nothingness, Active resignation, Idols, Personal Vivification, Mystic.

*Corresponding Author:

Héctor Sevilla Godínez,

ABSTRACT

In this article, I will focus on the practical implications that can be lived out by the person who assumes Nothingness and his nothing. I will refer to ten basic requisites or implicit conditions that are to be fulfilled for the living out, at a more profound level, of Nothingness. Each one of these assumes a voluntary act on behalf of the individual as per a derived election of assuming Nothingness to a certain degree; at least enough of it for a greater commitment. What is spoken of here is not a traditional nihilism but a mystical experience of Nothingness, conceiving it as the primary foundation of existence and the final bosom of everything that is. The intention is to demonstrate that the common modalities of understanding spirituality are contrary to a mysticism centered on Nothingness, of which the basic elements are intended to be shown.

Copyright©2025, 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.

Citation: Sevilla H, 2025. "Pragmatic Implications of the Personal Vivification of Nothingness". International Journal of Development Research, 15, (01), 67379-67383.

INTRODUCTION

When I affirm the possibility of a personal vivification of Nothingness, I know that it may sound to some as contradictory, antonymic, or paradoxical, to say the least. The issue is, precisely, to delve into that possibility; to understand that Nothingness is contemplated by not contemplating it (not being) in what is. Through the Being we delve into Nothingness. To contemplate it is to see beyond what our eyes and our understanding perceive; it is to care about that which, in spite of being uncognizable, can be sensed through trans-phenomenal and trans-linguistic means. The intention is to show the consequences in daily life which all individuals would need to experiment, in the case of assuming Nothingness in their own existence, are assumed, including the pragmatic implications. Among such implications, is found the need to break with idols unequivocally centered on the paradigm of the Being; which implies confronting existing religions and their parameters of life. Likewise, it is fundamental to assume a disciplined situational tolerance according to the events of life that occur outside of one's own will. In that sense, it is fitting to privilege interpersonal comprehension and understand that the remaining individuals with which we share the world have the same uncertainty about things or, rather, the fantasy of certainty. To commit oneself with a mysticism centered on Nothingness leads to comprehend that the decisions made are part of a chancy set of situations and that it is favourable to annihilate all guilt, just as to provide a new meaning to things of the past and of the present. The new meanings derived from this posture must be carried out in a manner alien to authoritarian positions and be derived from a genuine experience of lightness that

corresponds to us as humans. This leads to the connection with the situation of others and propitiates a collective solidary attitude. All people have regrets and live pain; understanding this weakness develops the nullification of moral polarizations and disembowels the need to judge it all with the parameter of good and bad. To sum up, the presentation of all the elements that contribute to mysticism centered on Nothingness, have the goal of allowing a personal experience of the individual nothingness, which is precedent to the absolute Nothingness to which we are called after death.

Breaking apart from idols: There isn't something that may anticipate or get in the way of Nothingness, just as there isn't something that is after it either. The first step to enter into the world of Nothingness is to eliminate conceptions of divinity. The brushing aside of idols implies leaving the empty space that Nothingness has always dominated and conserved but that us, men, have attempted to fill with our divine ghosts. Peaking of fantasies, I will now have to affirm that God is the adult Santa Claus. And everybody is upset when you tell a child that the fat guy doesn't exist; they demand that you maintain the illusion for them. That is precisely what religion is: the illusion that must be maintained. All religion is a socially accepted manner of fantasizing, just as children fantasize about the arrival of Santa Claus. Likewise, adults hope, with yearning and acritical enthusiasm, for someone to come down the chimney of their souls! I would rather save my stocking for the daily mud, for not even with all the pious Christmas lights decorating our feeble bodies could we brighten, just a little, our recondite human miseries. To break apart from idols is not to propose Atheism, for this is centered on the denial of God. It remains on a first step that is not consequential with something further. It is not enough with the denial of God that is undergone by

the Atheist, but it is – and must be – a step that goes beyond the arrival at a consequent affirmation of Nothingness. The Atheist defines himself as a function of what he denies; but to label oneself as a denier of God, or without God, is not entirely something propositional for it provides a sensation of invalidity. It is valid in the sense of invalidating. It would be like defining oneself as anti-carnivore when it is obvious that that adjective is insufficient. That is why we use the term “vegetarian” which already implies assuming something, proposing something, that in this case is eating vegetables and not only not eating meat. The Atheist, then, does not take this step. We certainly now require a term for the individual who affirms Nothingness. And though in an initial moment it may seem that the term “Nihilist” is the most adequate, I am to affirm that it is not so – as I have already mentioned in the second chapter – for the Nihilist doesn’t necessarily assume a fertile Nothingness but a sterile nothing. For the first time then, the term *Nothingner* is assumed to define the individual who has broken apart from idols and has become a militant of the Nothingness that I have proposed.

Assuming situational tolerance: Man is always situated in a specific context. The situational vision implies that we cannot go beyond the situated present in which we are located. This makes it essential to show situational tolerance in spite of possibly being in embarrassing or painful situations; we must let them be. If it is believed that everything flows and that change is the only thing that remains, then processes must not be obstructed due to fear of a situation; rather, on the contrary, to leave the situation be, to live in a situated manner and open the possibility of embracing new situations. For example, a person who lives out mourning must assume the mourning including all letters in it without denying or avoiding it. Mourning has an expiration date. Only by allowing time to run towards that expiration date will it arrive. If that mourning is not permitted or not tolerated, then it is not lived out and will therefore remain as a pending emotional debt that our psyche will charge, sooner or later. Tolerance does not exist in itself. It requires a personal exercise that strives to contain the anxiousness to escape from a specific situation. I do not refer here to the concept that we must let ourselves suffer or not avoid clearly damaging situations; it is not so. It is about attempting to distinguish between the situations that I can avoid and the ones I cannot in order to allow myself to dedicate time to the first ones and let the process of the second ones flow. If I am in a moment in which crying must occur, then it is best to do so; if a necessary rupture must be experienced, then this must be done just the same. If another person must be allowed to learn for himself, that must also be done. This is tolerating the situation but in the clarity of its temporariness. It is also true that pain can teach us. On other occasions, the prevention of pain is also favourable by doing something to avoid it if it is avoidable. It is not about generating difficult situations for ourselves as a purpose but to assume, according to the situation, those which have already enveloped us. There is always time to cut one’s veins, bleed the soul, and let faith drip in order to later stand up and cease dragging oneself a bit.

Privileging interpersonal comprehension: The opinion of the other person, originally, differs from my own because I am not the other person. That is simple, but it is usually complex for us to naturally accept it. The other person is not the one who generates the difference; rather it is my own difference towards him which generates his difference towards me. There are no culprits in this sense, only consequences of the natural course of existence pertaining to the two implicated people. If I grasp that the other person thinks what he does because he is not completely free of thinking it in another manner, due to his dogmatization about his own truth, then I will be able to see him: not as an innocent person but as consequential with his humanity. The other person can be, even, enslaved in univocities, in absolutisms; and, in one word, it may result as more convenient to him – due to many causes – to believe what he believes and to know what he knows. There is no fault in it, only very human causality. If the *Nothingner* centers in on the importance of personal comprehension due to the impossibility of certainties that unites him with the rest of the humans, then he will be able to comprehend that conflict is completely to be expected. It is not about avoiding conflict

but the fact of conflicting oneself with conflict. Nature itself is open to conflict due to its own openness to the forthcoming, which also occurs on the human plane. If I assume that there is no possible truth, then I will not argue to know who has the Truth. Doing so would be a discussion that we would both lose, previously, for nobody has it. Nobody can escape his own subjectivity, so why should I be upset with the individual before me who attempts to defend his reasoning and who still does not awaken to the evidence that his own subjectivity drives him away from all objective certainty? There is no motive by which to become irritated, in spite of also having to recognize that the potential bother is also comprehensible; especially with some particularly obstinate individuals who, believing to know, only demonstrate their naivety. Even that itself must be comprehended; for in the end, in spite of our considerable distances, there is great similarity between us regarding the ineludibility of the failed attempts to be right.

Annihilating all guilt: Guilt is a demolishing wound that we personally produce due to our belief in a *must be* that we don’t respect at the time. However, at the time in which we decide “that” which provokes guilt for us today, we probably use the resources that we had within our reach and our decision was the one we considered to be correct in that moment. After some time has passed, we can change our perspectives since we have learnt more and are able to judge the event from another perspective. The aforesaid is very natural and understanding; it is not worth the guilt as an exercise of self-demolishment. Guilt is not had by anybody; rather, everything has been causality. Guilt, seen from these parameters, would not have to subsist. I will not be impartial by judging the person I have been some time ago, for I may no longer understand the reasons for having been the person I was. Furthermore, the consciousness of mistakenness is always to the degree of the present in which we have grasped the consequences of that act. But at the time in which such an act was carried out, I did not see those consequences which I now see. How to blame oneself for not reading the future? That is truly irrational but, above all, unnecessary. To eradicate guilt also means to live out the present; to assume that the good or evil in acts is not something implicit; that an individual who does anything today could repent and blame himself for it afterwards, in the case that, circumstantially, the undergone act derives unfavourable consequences. It is clear there does also exist the possibility that such unfavourable consequences – due to things I don’t control – may never occur; and then I wouldn’t blame myself for what I did, though the undergone act may have been the same one. As we see, guilt is a consequence of conceiving the act as inadequate due to merely circumstantial situations that make the result not be as is expected. Subject to such causality and alien to our comprehension, guilt is once again unnecessary.

For example, it could be that a father-to-be anxiously and happily awaits for his new baby and, believing that he protects it from unnecessary medical exams that disturb its calm within the uterus, trusts in his doctor’s professional practice. But that incompetent doctor leaves the pregnancy process unattended and, in the end, an anticipated birth harms the baby’s health. The father didn’t know that this would happen; and, in fact, if it hadn’t happened he could boast to himself about the elevated care that he gave to his – in that case – healthy child. The fact that he now feels guilty is not only due to his decision or acts, but because he believes that it was a direct consequence of such acts. Such a consequence is, on the contrary, mainly indirect to the father’s decision and multifactorial on the causative end. In other words, a series of circumstances outside of the father’s control came together so that the baby was not properly cared for, such as the small amount of sensibility on the doctor’s part, the environmental conditions, a risky pregnancy, the own mother’s inexperience, and many other more situations. When the father blames himself for what has happened, he is utterly mistaken; for things and events are never linear but, rather, obey a chaotic world where we don’t understand the order and infiniteness of the connections. If we don’t understand it, why should we assume that the guilt is fair? There are unpleasant events, this is true. But to think that we are directly responsible for everything that occurs is to

promote too much exaggeration and a causative main role to our human value, weak and fragile before the world and Nothingness. The causes that make things as they remain completely outside of my control and knowledge. As humans, we only see a very limited portion of things; and, furthermore, we always distort what we do see. We live in the sea of a world in which we only see the tip of the iceberg in front of us. And that iceberg can be, in fact, a whole other world and not an iceberg. To feel guilt is something human, tremendously human. But it is not about de-humanizing oneself in order to leave guilt. Rather, to understand that the comprehension of the intimate causes of the decisions about our acting (or not acting), is also something very human and dignified; perhaps more than the guilt itself. No eagle eats birdseed; and in such a manner, it does not correspond to the human to gloat over the puddle of his guilt, unless it is to begin to exit from there.

Active resignation: It has been instilled in us that resignation is a synonym of defeat or passiveness, of cowardliness or self-mutilation of the will. But if we open our eyes a little and broaden the criteria, we may note that, because not everything is under the power of one's own will, there are inevitable things. Furthermore, we must comprehend that even voluntary acts are delimited by a subjectivity that has been socially constructed, and of which I don't have utter control either. To actively resign myself implies recognizing the impossibility of control over what surrounds me and confronting, in a purposeful manner, what is possible to be done today; for today is the only thing that remains after the yesterdays that have gone. There is not something that I could do for it has already occurred if I attempt it outside of the today that is occurring. Additionally, there is a sense of the word "resign" that has not been sufficiently explored. In its most intimate sense, for a Nothingner, *to resign* means to once again put up a sign; in other words, to make a modification in a sign about something. To resign is also to allocate new meaning; for each sign has a meaning, so changing the sign assumes the modification of meanings. To a great extent, changing the sign-meaning of something implies a different perception of the occurred and the present. In that manner then, resignation liberates itself from its pejorative meaning, precisely because we have resigned to the signing. We have modified the signing of the word in our understanding, which makes it become useful and not something worthy of avoiding. Could it not occur so with that from which we flee? Could our unpleasant occurrences, past and unchangeable – after an adequate resignation – become opportune and even contributors to personal wellbeing? The majority of the time, it is so.

Crying over what has been lost is of little use if one does not learn to care even more for what is still had. That is to reassign meaning; it is to actively reassign meaning. Even for the interpretations that we make of things, we are to be creative as a function of wellbeing or honest convenience. That is why an adequate resignation is only possible to the extent that univocal, authoritarian, and absolutist visions are eradicated – like weeds. Nobody can elect the sun rising tomorrow or not, but perhaps we can elect what to do with its light. Neither can anybody avoid that same sun hiding after dusk but, even so, the option remains about the way to take advantage of the darkness. One must praise and stop cursing, for it is likely that comprehension will promote new alternatives. Reassigning meaning is a personal process. One cannot hope to arrive to where nobody has gone before. There are paths that can only be treated by being alone, spaces in which one is in loneliness. There is nothing more. One cannot demand that anybody run when they want to walk, that they fly when they want to sit down, to live when they only want to exist. Nobody has the obligation to please us; the expectation is our creation. It is time to banish it. Love never has to imply self-denial. Us people are like the seasons: one cannot obligate nature to always be Spring, buds require certain privacy in order for the flower to blossom, and at some time it will whither after providing its beauty. In life, many things die and they must be let to die; for one is only reborn upon dying. Neither can a flower be obligated to open up before its time, nor a butterfly to be it when it is just a caterpillar. Things take their time and so do people. If you have, perchance, looked at somebody in their eyes, penetrated their spirit, and felt

yourself captivated, that has already been a beautiful story; but to assume that it will be that forever, is only vanity. To contemplate Nothingness is also to let go, to let live, and to once again let stories continue in different paths. More than locking up the hummingbird in a cage, we must be happy watching it fly, for that is its natural condition.

Excerpting univocal and authoritarian visions: The impediment to open one's arms to a different vision is the supposition that what one has, or what one believes, must not be changed. This is due to the fact that we have understood that we must die faithful to the ideas that have been instilled in us by the people who love us; we assume that upon being transmitted with love, surely they constitute the Truth. There is no such Truth and there is no manner of sustaining the supposition that we are its possessors. When I mention the need to excerpt univocal visions, it is because they, precisely, seep through us all the way to our guts without being able to be completely perceived. In the manner of introjections, exterior orders, mandates, and rules, cozily settle in the conscience. We assume that the voice of the conscience is the voice of the true self and we are mistaken. Moral conscience is nothing more than the repetition of the introjected social rules, repeated in the manner of reflexive sleepwalking. We believe that is what is mostly ours, the most intimate and pure which proceeds from the interior. But in that sense, there is nothing in the interior that has not been previously exterior. To act according to conscience is not necessarily to act correctly. To cling to an idea, belief, position, or postulate, is evidence that one is lacking a wider vision. We are not the beliefs that we have. We are not the suppositions. We are not the constructs. To believe that all of that belongs to the self, makes the greatest of all univocalisms noted; that is, precisely, the idea of the self's substantial existence. The conscience has generated fiction about the self; that is what we could call selfness. Now, we are not selfness for it is only the costume we place over the self, which – without the costume – vanishes from our sight. If as a function of my *self* I am authoritarian towards myself and impose on myself what my *self* supposedly decides, then I have lost sight of the fact that my *self* is one more lubrication of my conscience in order to separate itself from the rest of the supposed selfness. Truly this supposes that – at the base – what separates us as individuals are only ideas, illusions, and falsities. To eradicate even the supposition of the self is to allow the nexus to be real; it implies the comprehension of the other person due to common comprehension. How to get rid of the self if it is the only thing we have? Any ingenious interrogator could ask that question. My response would be that we, effectively, do not have to get rid of the *self* because it has never really been ours; and I cannot get rid of something that doesn't belong to me. More concrete is getting rid of the idea of self, of truth, of Goodness, of the only thing, of the Supreme. It has already been spoken of the need to break away from idols. I now speak here of the unavoidable prose of detaching oneself from the rest of the supposition that makes us think that there is *one* correct manner among so many. Authoritarianisms, impositions, insane confluences, ill-considered adhesions, and absolutist partisanships are not sustainable. Contemporary man knows that if he eliminates this, he is left with Nothingness; and, precisely, that is what this is about, though we may not want to see it. A man like that, unalienated and unallied to systems, is an isolated but followed man. He has people who see and recognize him. He constitutes, together with others, an underground group which will emerge any moment. This requires bravery. Not the bravery in which one feels superior and extra but the bravery of knowing oneself to be light and small. This bravery of even knowing oneself to be perceived as someone without bravery and – even so – to remain congruent with what one believes: that nothing can be believed in without the risk of erring, for there is nothing more erred than to believe the apparent error of considering Nothingness.

Vivifying lightness: To know oneself to be fragile, contingent, small, and light, is to begin to be great. Not an expansive greatness but an implosive one. It is not about continuing with the Western structures that impose saturation or excess; rather, we can understand that, on occasion, less is more and what is small is greater. To vivify lightness is to recognize humanity. Not arrogant humanisms that suppose that

we are the fulfilled architects of personal life, but humanisms that assimilate the lightness and smallness of what we manage to perceive in the naïve supposition that that is the Truth. Perhaps this may be the advent of a post-humanism that will suppose a truly more human humanism that is less attached to control, power, happiness, and fulfillment. One can also be in partialness; even in poverty and misery, man learns to know himself. Contemporary man does not need to “self-fulfill himself” in order to truly find transcendence for it is already, here and now, in Nothingness. To vivify lightness is to calmly accept the unforeseen changes that life supposes; the need to modify plans, of leaving previous projects, of having to break relationships, of leaving spaces or jobs, of saying goodbye even to a loved being. There is always a corresponding inevitability to each human life. Partially, we know ourselves to be controllers of our life; it is time to let go of such control and accept only the small reigns that chaos allows us to have.

To vivify lightness is to know oneself to be mortal. To think of death not as an enemy or sad ending, but as something that is a forger of senses; which, if they are at least not univocal, can partially cheer life up. It is about recognizing that the body is also changing and that it will soon cease to have all its faculties. It is about recognizing the influence of the passing of time, of the impossibility to pause its effect in us, and that everything flows like an unending river that not only runs over our feet but includes us as it carries us along. To recognize lightness means to understand the expiry of our promises, the changing aspect of our emotions, and the falseness of what is perpetual. To recognize fragility is to accept the possibility of ceasing to love or be loved; the ever-present possibility of treason, of forgetting, lowliness, and deceit. Man is light, always needful of oxygen, space, nourishment, and inconstant affection. So light, that he needs to pause his day during eight hours; that he cannot evacuate, once and for all; that he gets sick, changes in humour, changes in spirits and motivation. What is light is fragile and what is fragile is weak. Only upon assuming himself as weak, it is that man begins to strengthen himself. Everything else is only denying appearance: richness, power, fame or fortune, beauty, controls, leaderships or possessions; for, in the end, Nothingness remains of it. Man is alone, before the storminess that each of his days can be, before the misery that he observes in the mirror when tears have rusted the concealing makeup. Man is in loneliness; hence he hides in the tangible, the visible, the verbal and quantifiable. He loses sight of the fact that what is in his sight does not help him to escape his own nausea. To admit lightness is to push aside all possible haughtiness; to make vanity pregnant and allow it to abort on its own. Even larger is man's nothing if he does not accept the Nothingness that he is. Less is one when he wants to be; more is one when he banishes the being of himself. We are nothing until we may be Nothingness.

Solidarity as a product of collective comprehension: If in the end we are only lightness, what we should feel for those who have not yet realized it is, then, comprehension. A comprehension that is consistent in the recognition that such a person still lives immersed in the basic belief of what is traditionally ontological. He who finds his *self* in everything that surrounds him, without making his own Nothingness evident, is condemned to the Being. And the more he is the Being, the less he *is*. The more the hurtfulness of this process increases for our neighbour, is when we can turn comprehension into pity. The man centered on Nothingness must pity those who are still looking to find their own leisure activity in insane diversions: leaving art as a function of other people's needs; emptying days in front of the television; looking for old relations in a yearning search for reconciliation; depositing hope in entities constructed by ancient cultures that never found the promised Land nor the constantly awaited Heaven on earth. We are to pity those who still suppose that honour is to be won and isn't yet had; those who live ready on alert before any opportunity to take advantage of others; those who still believe that they can become illuminated people if they identify their interior, when – in reality – this isn't theirs and neither is it completely internal. We are to pity those who tell others what to do and, furthermore, believe it; they truly believe they were “sent” to the world to do so. We must also pity univocal moralizers, domineering

and imposed hierarchs, domain constructors, and the un-reflexive devout who constitute the mass of the people and who hatefully point out those who search to make them think. To pity lightness, after finding one's own lightness, is to not create differences as a function of naïve patriotisms. The countries of the world celebrate their independence when they have not become independent from their need to divide themselves before the others. True independence would be to transcend the absurd gregarious nationalisms and understand that we are all citizens of the world and that we are equally in debt to each other. When all people are able to assume that the homeland is only an idea, perhaps we will accept each other more without races, colours, or ideologies mattering. In the end, what joins us is something inevitable: the Nothingness that precedes and waits for us, just as the lightness and failure of our identity.

A great deal of comprehension is necessary, having the capacity to pity. Once having it, it is necessary to turn pity into solidarity due to the certainty – the only one possible – of the impossibility of certainties; which turns us all into sufferers, in fact. If another person is pitied because he believes in his fantasies, then nobody – not even oneself – can be exempt from such lightness. We need to believe in something, even in the impossibility of beliefs. Constructing some posture on which to edify is required; even upon knowing that the ground is slippery and hollow. Searching for honesty, though only lies come out of our mouth, is required. We are to construct systems – like this one – despite knowing about the ambiguity of them and the impossibility of their universal fulfillment. Our lightness lies in it; in needing what is unnecessary, in never escaping contingency. Such lightness and such reality would seem pathetic but it must not be assumed to be negative because of that; for that would be to fall into a polarizing error and that polarization itself would have to be eradicated from our system.

Nullifying polarizations: A concrete manner of assuming Nothingness is that of not attributing the things we see to polarized situations. We are to assume the wisdom of non-duality; the recognition that even in the Being and Nothingness there is dialectic; and that just as we understand the Being and just as we understand Nothingness, are only fragmentations, products of our polarization. Reality is a continuous connection between the Being and Nothingness; the form is the Being and the base is Nothingness. It is an updated hylomorphism that never breaks off of everything that exists. Polarizations – beyond the Being and Nothingness – are to also be destroyed from our conceptions; for example, the one with regard to good and bad. How are we to define it? If there are so many matrices between such opposites, how to only keep the opposites? And, mainly, how is it that those opposites are defined? There is always something worse or something better, according to our parameters about what we believe the limit to be. There are no such dichotomies. Perhaps we only need them to explain things to ourselves or as a teaching intent before the complexity of life and what surrounds us; but there are no such polarizations and even less in the manner which we usually conceive them. There is really no difference between saint and sinner. They are two people who follow distinct parameters about the desirable. Polarization is a product of unilateral visions; for if these did not exist, there would not be any polarization possible. Neither is emotional polarization necessary, to think of oneself as having failed or succeeded, when in the end, that in itself is a personal production based on one's own ideas which unleash a specific state of emotion. There wouldn't have to be polarization between rich and poor. This has been one of the main pillars of division throughout all of humanity's history; just as setting forth racial, economic, or ideological differences directed towards segregation, fragmentation, and the partition of unity. I am not saying here that all men must be equal in the sense of living out the same conditions. It is not that; rather, what makes us different does not assume an ontological difference. The rich and the poor man are not distinct beings with regard to their ontology; they live in distinct circumstances, but there is life in both. Avoiding polarizations would have to make us cautious in our judgments, avoiding the unjustifiable intrepid comment. Neither is slandering, unfavoured critique, dull comments, or hardly civil confrontations between two opposing

postures, necessary. For in the end, it is not that one has the truth or the lie; it all depends on the perspective in which things are revealed to our consciousness. All discussion – due to it – must begin with the univocal establishing of polivocality and this would be the only possible univocism. Neither is it sensate to accuse another person for the fact of not coinciding with our perception of his acts; even less when one does not have utter certainty about the accusation. One would have to avoid distorting the fame of someone about whom the truth is not known; for that, the utter knowing of another person, is only chimera. We would have to let people live their lives, leave judgment outside, and begin to direct it inside. Avoiding polarizations is to think before speaking to destroy others. In the end, the leaving behind of polarizations, focusing solidarity, breaking apart univocisms and idols, the annihilation of guilt, active resignation, interpersonal comprehension, and situational location, will allow us to conjunctly vivify interior Nothingness and/or vice-versa.

Vivifying interior Nothingness: Before anything else, we are possibility. And it is due to Nothingness that we are such a possibility. Each human being is a set of potencies, not yet fulfilled but always present. No living being has its possibilities subtracted; in spite of each person limiting or segmenting his own potencies, or that the risky and decided circumstances of his own life place him in a perspective that is far from some type of better possibility, even so, possibilities always exist. The question about human nature has been very frequently raised throughout the centuries of Philosophy's history. Likewise, it has been overly responded that spiritual essence, implicit bounty, or the ineludible connection to a creating divinity, is the model for such nature. I will not affirm any of those here; rather – considering the variety of interpretations in itself – I assume that nature consists in something moldable, modifiable, and flexible. Human nature probably has no real fundament, and we are already in time to realize it. More than human nature, the human condition is, in any case, the capacity of adapting to structures, ideologies, and beliefs. Such a condition of malleability is a founding aspect of the phenomenon known as evolution, for beings that evolve, species that survive, are those which better adapt to circumstances. The aforesaid supposes, to a great extent, that the human condition has to do with adaptation, with malleability. From there, congruently, is explained the existence of people whose customs are always inherited from their own culture. Our perspectives of the world have been configured based on our being in the world. There we have the natural condition of humans, for we are naturally cultural.

Breaking apart, then, from polarizations, it is imperative to observe that such conditional nature is neither good nor bad; it simply is. The capacity of adaptation is the only thing that prevails in any individual of any culture, era, of geographical location. That is why we can construct, elaborate, and intimately constitute a lifestyle for ourselves, but always adapting ourselves. There is neither a structured essence nor nature unless it is not, precisely, the de-structuring that one is looking to structure. Immediately following I can understand that this may cause a great deal of lethargy, especially in those who have supposed a determined, beautiful, and bountiful essence. Such superfluous considerations are simply vanity. The living being has the nature of adapting to preserve life, with the only intention of dying in its fair moment, naturally. I understand that an amorphous nature, the main characteristic of which is precisely amorphousness or the disposition to take the form that is desired, may result too be grotesque for those who cover themselves behind univocisms and absolutisms.

How much can it disturb the reader to know himself as being of amorphous origin? Perhaps this disturbance is a proportional indicator of one's own clinginess to absolutist beliefs. Now, what allows our nature to precisely be amorphous – willing to take on the shape that is required – is the proof that it is Nothingness. Nothingness *is* – as I have mentioned throughout this piece – and precisely because of it, it is that our nature *is*, as a function and measure of the fact that Nothingness is present. Only to the extent that one is conscious of this Nothingness that one is, one is also flexible to the forming of a life structure. This implies that human nature is Nothingness; a Nothingness that has the capacity to be filled in the manner that is according to the human condition. There is more Nothingness in man – for example – than in a mosquito since in the latter, though it also has possibilities, there is less available space for these possibilities than for man. Therefore, every living thing in some manner possesses a nothing that is distinct from the nothing that corresponds to what is human, for the latter is decidedly greater than that of the rest of the living beings – that we know; and from there, its greatest omen of possibilities which will never have the nothing of a mosquito or any other insect or animal due to the categorical distinctions that are unique to each being. That would be sufficient to respond to the question about whether Nothingness is also the nature of existent things and not only of man; for it will be understood that Nothingness made nothing (not-being) which corresponds to things, is only similar – though not equal – to the relative nothing (not-being) of that which is human. To the extent that a being is more ontologically complex, to such extent, its nothing will be greater and, thus, more fully in Nothingness. To vivify Nothingness is to allow possibilities; to recede from the established or dogmatic for our own life. It is to understand that everybody can be everybody; it is to trust in the other human being, in that he may fill his emptiness in the manner which he deems convenient, or even the option of not filling them. Nothingness permits this possibility of action, this updating of possibilities that is, in itself, life. Once life is terminated, it allows the final birthing of our last possibility: death.

CONCLUSION

The personal vivification of Nothingness is to be up for Everything. It is leaving behind fears by allowing them, it is leaving behind uncertainty by assuming it, and it is leaving behind what is univocal upon assuming the equivocal and, with it, the total Univocal. To vivify Nothingness is to temporarily love, is to slightly promise, is to hope for nothing, is to receive a lot. It is about believing in the Absolute upon denying it, seeing God upon not seeing him, and seeing other humans upon seeing oneself and understanding the sense of constructive solidarity. It is to keep quiet in order to listen for the first time, to cease speaking in order to hear our own voice that is within but is still foreign. To vivify Nothingness is to cease saying certain things in order to understand oneself by it. It is to go through language and use it only as a reference. It is to understand what is behind all understanding; to relate to others without fusing oneself or allowing the alienating fusion of another person with oneself. To vivify Nothingness is at most: to live dying, be reborn each night, and reintegrate oneself to the cycle of inevitable chaos. It is to allow things to be and allow oneself to be part of the universal flowing. To vivify Nothingness is to raise one's voice without fear or controlling it; to demonstrate the inconsistency of our ideals, the un-sense of sense, and the Nothingness of what is.