

Covid-19 and biopower: How to resist the normalization of crisis

Covid-19 y biopoder: cómo resistir la normalización de una crisis

*John Camilo García Uribe**

<https://doi.org/10.36105/mye.2021v32n1.02>

Abstract

It is an analysis and reflection on the normalization of the crisis as an exercise of biopower, its possible consequences and forms of resistance. All this, within the contextual framework of the SARS Cov-2 virus pandemic, Michel Foucault, Hans Jonas and Jared Diamond are taken as the main conceptual references. A reading of the Foucauldian theory of power is made to address the relationship between normalization of the crisis and biopower. Diamond and Jonas' proposals, are placed in an interpretive dialogic framework, through which the author intends to give a responsive critical approach to the current situation. This from a position that takes fear, not as a paralyzing and stunning factor, but as a mobilizing agent that forces us to think, reflect and, with that, to be able to respond, expand the circles of compassion and empathy to take care of life in a common home and resist the normalization of biopower.

Keywords: standardization, crisis, biopower, coronavirus, compassion.

* Professional Nurse, University of Antioquia, teaching in Bioethics at the CES University, Fundación Clínica del Norte, Colombia. Email: Johnc.garcia@udea.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3810-5583>
Reception: September 20, 2020. Acceptance: October 15, 2020.

Introduction

The SARS-Cov-2 virus pandemic –also called coronavirus or Covid-19–, although it is not the first pandemic in the history of mankind is the first pandemic of the 21st century, since neither the SARS Cov, Mers Cov (1), nor did Ebola reach pandemic reach. However, today the burden of other pandemics of the last century, such as HIV and tuberculosis, both with an ostensibly higher mortality rate, but which have different biological and sociocultural connotations, since they generate exclusion and stigmatization, to those who suffer from the disease, which translates into a somewhat alien-distant conception of the disease, so its impact on today's society is, therefore, different. The coronavirus, for its part, has expanded exponentially and globally. It does not seem to distinguish by race, gender, class, profession, lifestyle, among other factors. The mere fact of breathing or coming into contact with surfaces contaminated with the virus seems to be the trigger for a possible infection. However, other factors such as access to drinking water, disinfectants, food, employment and health cannot be ignored, which can be even more lethal than the virus itself, and some of them have been and continue to be classified as ingredients of a new normal.

The hyper-connected world, in which the chain of production and consumption is hyper-fragmented, and in which before the pandemic there were around 120 thousand commercial flights per day (2), is an ideal scenario for the transmission of a new and unknown microorganism, in which many of those infected do not present symptoms, but are hosts in which the virus reproduces and from which it is transmitted. This same connectivity has facilitated the flow of information through the media and social networks. Indeed, you can have first-hand information and, almost immediately, the number of infections per day, the mortality rate, containment measures and, in general, how the «new normal in China and Europe» is happening if it can be called normal. Likewise, the radi-

cal change in the habits and customs of society, which range from avoiding close contact with other people, the use of masks, the increase in hygiene measures, to restricting the freedom and autonomy of individuals under confinement. As a result, many questions have arisen and many others reappear, in the face of a crisis that brings to the plane of the tangible other crises that seemed to lie behind the oblivion of invisibility. Why did you give in so easily to a change in lifestyle? Replying to a question by Agamben (3), is the virus a pretext to restrict the freedoms of human beings, through mechanisms of a state of exception? Will the state of exception be imposed as the ideal solution to the crisis? Will confinement and social isolation worsen phenomena such as social exclusion, aporophobia (rejection and aversion to the poor), xenophobia and racism? Is it a utopia to think about empathy, compassion and solidarity in times of crisis?

1. Results

The normalization of a «new normality», an exercise of biopower

Usually, we refer to power as something, something alien, external, something fully identifiable; even from the very nomination and representation of «power» as a noun and not as a verb, it passes by, and the same power immersed in language ends up dominating a discourse, which precisely reproduces the mechanism of power. «Power does not constitute a property of beings, but the very essence of everything that is; that is to say, of everything that lives. Being is nothing other than the will to power, a changing constellation of forces that fight each other to ensure domination (4). Power is not a thing; power means relationships between individuals, in such a way that one can voluntarily determine the behavior of another (5); power is not installed in a central organ, but in relationships. In the same way, returning to Foucault (6), «where there is power there is resistance, and nevertheless (or better, for

the same reason), it is never in a position of exteriority with respect to power». In other words, power, in order to be recognized and to be exercised as such, needs functional resistance; therefore, the prevailing need to classify it as normal and abnormal; without the abnormal, the normal is not functional. Therefore, talking about a new normal is by itself a way of constraining, dominating and excluding everything that does not fit into this categorization, and of making it functional to a system.

Talking about a new normal, in the pandemic or in the post-pandemic, is an exercise in biopower. It is part of the same discursive normalization to convince the other to act in a certain way. Therefore, following Foucault (7), «a knowledge, techniques, «scientific» discourses are formed and intertwined with the practice of the power to punish», only now we are not in the society of punishment, but in the society of fatigue and in the self-controlled society by producing and consuming. From the very exercise of power, of being able to know, it is intended to naturalize pre-existing human realities. A new normality is something similar to the «speech of the gallows» (7), in which the condemned to death testified his guilt and the justice of his sentence. Now, unemployment, labor informality, the precariousness of health systems, great social inequity, fear of the other and stigmatization are part of a «new normal», in which everything seems to be justified.

Standardization generates redundancy, that it is normalized that some subjects are excluded from the rights that are established as proper to the human being. This normalization as an exercise of normative power, leads to speak of the other, but not in the hopeful sense, but of the other in a discriminatory sense, in which otherness is not welcomed in a static movement of hospitality (8), but rather of the other; life is disposed of naked (9), removing its uniqueness and placing it in the necessary place for normalized functioning.

However, the normative discourse as an exercise of biopower has many questions: What is and what is not precisely normal? At

what point is normal functional for a macro and microsystem of power? Moreover, how is the normal reconfigured through relationships, to the degree that it is necessary to feel that it is truly a new normal? In a more tangible way, this new normal led to a transfer of the Foucauldian panopticon to the everyday life of people; it is a vivid representation of the big brother of the novel «1984» (10), in which it is watched and controlled, kept at bay, warlike speeches and euphemisms are used. As in the novel, it is intended that the excluded and the needy transmit all the fear, hatred and feelings of their precariousness to an external agent, in this case to a virus or to all those who may be a source of virus contagion. It is believed in freedom, but it is controlled from freedom and with freedom. To the extent that the control mechanism is normalized, it can be watched and controlled, but it is unknown who is behind the control device; punishments and fines are clearly assumed as mistakes by individuals and not as strategies of the system to create discipline.

Although it seems paradoxical, «the countries that have had the best management during the pandemic have been the most authoritarian, the most controlling, where, through cameras with sophisticated mechanisms for facial recognition and data collection, it is possible to control every movement, every click, each relationship of people» (11). That is why some questions remain: Is this sufficient evidence to propose a state of exception as the most efficient form of government in times of pandemic? To what extent are these surveillance and control measures necessary? How has a change that crosses human relationships and all devices of power been installed in such a docile way?

Faced with this reality, the possibility remains that said normalization of control and surveillance could extend beyond the pandemic, in a state of eternal exception (3), since we have witnessed a triumph of «dataism», which understands any organism and society as a data processing system (12). Countries with better information systems, with better surveillance and control systems, obtain a

greater number and higher quality of data on individuals, on the health-disease process, the economy and society in general, which allows them to manage, analyze and make decisions in a faster and more efficient way. Data, in turn, reveals the reality of individuals and, through data, power is exercised over individuals. Thus, data-supported discourses, in the midst of a dataist, monitored and controlled society, generate overwhelming power that gives certainty and reassures, in the face of the panic generated by the same flow of data, the precariousness of health systems and an invisible, new and stealthy entity.

From the perspective of ontology, power is being able to be. According to Heidegger (13), being in the world is an open being, «it is being from a possibility of oneself: of being oneself or of not being». Ontologically it can be or not be; power is essentially human. As a finite being, the human being lacks omnipotence; that is, it cannot do everything. Its possibilities are finite, therefore, its power is limited and so is its time. Power shapes vulnerability and limitation as a human trait, and a virus reminds us that not even techno scientific power can do everything. Nevertheless, behind biopower, it is intended to annul that vulnerable humanity and configure a gross and powerful mass, which normalizes, classifies and standardizes, even itself. This mass is the same society of Han's fatigue (14), an automaton society, prey to itself, sick of so much work and so much technology, with needs created, but so common that they are not reflected on.

This problem is long-standing and has been referenced by other authors. Seneca (15) stated, «When it comes to the happy life, it is not proper to respond according to the quantity; this part seems to be the largest, but for that reason it is the worst. Human affairs do not go so well that better things please more people; the proof of the worst is the crowd». In this way, one must seek, not the most accustomed, but the really good; this requires thinking, reflecting, discussing and proposing, something difficult in these troubled

days, in which not even some media (16-19) escape from biopower, but assist it behind the scenes. It is somewhat similar to what Goebbels has done, only now it is happening on a global and diversified scale, ranging from social media to print newspapers.

In this way, in a Nietzschean context in the midst of the death of God (20), with faith placed in humanity, in the capitalist system, techno science and data, normative-true discourses emerge that calm the anguish. Biopower, the power over bodies, uses truth, certainty, to face uncertainties and fear. Through knowledge, power is exercised, taking as a premise that «in knowledge there is no adaptation to the object, a relationship of assimilation, but that there is, on the contrary, a relationship of distance and domination. There is nothing in knowledge that resembles happiness or love; there is rather hatred and hostility: there is no unification, but rather a precarious system of power» (21). In this way a discourse is formed that leads to obedience. Information, data and knowledge generate knowledge, and this, in turn, is a way to legitimize, justify and normalize power, in order to create a «new normal» that defines, decides and normalizes ways of life and relationships, in a life subject to the designs of power.

The limitations, the restriction of the freedom of individuals and many other measures implemented to confront the virus are necessary (to a certain extent), and perhaps insufficient, since they leave out the excluded, tending to widen the gap with the most favored, excluding more and making the conditions of those already excluded precarious. However, although some measures are necessary, calling the past «normal» and the present or immediate future as «new normal» is a euphemism loaded with anesthesia, which tries to re-impose the veil of ignorance to justify the unjustifiable. Perhaps it is more appropriate to speak of an unusual crisis with the virus, in the midst of a latent crisis, precisely because of such latency. Here, the bio political exercise is hardly visible from comfort, and those who are in the midst of discomfort are placidly silenced.

2. Discussion

a) A crisis in the midst of other crises: a reading from the theory of Jared Diamond

Why it is not called «new crisis», or simply «crisis»? Is the word «crisis» an eschatology? If so, with more reason it should be used, for it is human life on earth that is at risk. «The word “crisis” derives from the Greek noun *krisis* and from the verb *krinein*, which means “to separate” or “to decide”. Crisis is something that breaks, and because it breaks, it must be analyzed [...]. The crisis forces us to think; therefore it produces analysis and reflection» (22). It is not called a crisis, because analysis and reflection are avoided at all costs. We do not want to accept the situation and, therefore, we intend to fall into the game of normal and abnormal, in order to normalize the abnormal; from climate change to inequity, and from economic recession to the fight to the death for a vaccine. This since, once it is developed, it is likely to fall into the logic of the market, that is, to test it in poor countries with lax rules, and then to commercialize it under patent mechanisms, under the protection of the right to intellectual property and international conventions. In times of crisis, it is imperative to call a spade a spade, starting with the crisis itself, in order to analyze, reflect and look for decisions that will make a difference, but not those that are 360°.

According to Jared Diamond (23), individual crises can be extrapolated in certain respects to national ones, and perhaps to global ones. Therefore, identity, values, and worldview are called into question, or at least that happens once the problem is recognized. In fact, the first factor at the individual level is to recognize that one is in crisis (23), as this is what allows people to seek help. It could be thought that, at a global level, speaking in terms of a pandemic was the first step to recognizing the possibility of a crisis and, as a result, international cooperation has been achieved. However, it has not been strictly conceived as a crisis, much less

the pre-existing ones have been accepted, so the measures in place are insufficient. Apart from recognition, other factors that, according to Diamond (23), affect the outcome of national crises are «acceptance, construction of the fence, obtaining help, adoption of other experiences as a model, national identity, honest self-evaluation, historical experience, and assumption of national failures, national flexibility, core values and absence of political constraints». As an individual, social and global crisis, an analysis is proposed based on some of the factors mentioned above.

b) Acceptance of responsibility in action

One could easily speak of national and global responsibility regarding this particular crisis, but little or nothing has been said about the responsibility of the human being in the health emergency due to the coronavirus, which, by the way, is a lot. In addition, by responsibility, we do not refer to conspiracy theories that propose warlike intentions to destabilize the dominant power. But to responsibility from an environmentalist perspective (24, 25), in which as a result of the exploitation of nature without any principle of precaution, habitats have been modified, species exterminated, and temperatures increased, caused droughts, and that's just to mention a few changes. Changes that, by the way, are largely irreversible and that because they are part of a latent and slow (although increasingly fast) critical situation, they have not been given enough attention, and are still called climate change and not «ecological crisis», from which a new crisis has emerged.

However, the responsibility is not only at the global level, but also at the level of institutions such as the WHO, which took a while to name an epidemic that was getting out of hand and growing exponentially a pandemic. Also at the level of nations, such as Brazil, «which never recognized the seriousness of the epidemic and, on the contrary, use it to carry out social Darwinism, eliminating sectors of the population that are no longer of interest to the economy»

(26). Moreover, of course, responsibility is given at the individual level. Individuals here do not include those who do not have the means to follow the recommendations and avoid the spread of the virus. The word media is very broad in this sense: food, water, soap, housing, information, education, health services, among others. But if we include those who, even having the means, did not follow the indications and, of course, all those who corrupted and continue to corrupt politics, health, education, housing and the welfare of the population in general, then they do have a great responsibility in the present crisis, the underlying ones and the ones to come.

Also responsible are those who, having the possibility did not extend the hand to the one who asked for it, did not widen their circles of empathy, but, on the contrary, reduced them. Also those who used the situation to take advantage of the needs of others, and those who were part of the chains of disinformation, false news and distribution of fear. But so many innocents are also responsible, vile pawns of a system in which evil becomes so banal that it becomes a mere duty, through a discontinuity between the motivation of an action and its consequences (27), to the point that evil covers itself in the duties imposed to have a good face. In the midst of the banality of evil and the normalization of the crisis, there is still resistance, reflection, ethics and solidarity. Cases such as that of the police officer Zúñiga (28), who refused to comply with orders to evict a group of people and, although he was arrested, today is considered a hero. This is a reason to maintain hopes that the good is not trivial and that, in the midst of the crisis, it is possible to resist, but above all to respond.

c) Construction of a fence to limit problems

«It involves building a fence to delimit and identify the problem to be solved, so as not to be seen as a complete failure» (23), and find the rescuable in the middle of the crisis. The problem with this

approach is that, at the global-national level, it is probably the most pernicious factor, since the capacity to establish limits is lacking, with the tendency to think that almost everything, or even everything, is fine. Therefore, as everything seems good and normal, there is room for little criticism and, therefore, little analysis, which ultimately translates into few substantial changes that overlook the reality of the «excluded», the existence of underlying crises and the proximity of those to come. Usually, the fence of the good is very broad, the bigger the crisis, the less selective the fence is and, instead of including more good things, it includes more bad things; bad becomes good and, with it, normal; before this, everything is left as it is, and everything is done so that what is continues to be and does not cease to be.

d) Obtaining the necessary help

Contrary to the previous one, this seems the most hopeful approach, since the current crisis shows that cooperation, compassion and solidarity are the ideal path, and that they are possible and necessary in a world in crisis. It is worth highlighting the cooperation between countries and the public-private sector; cooperation between families and individuals and open access to knowledge immediately. However, a big question remains on the table, once an effective vaccine or treatment is available, will it be possible to cooperate with a profit-hungry patent system? A somewhat bleak precedent is that:

The monopoly control of the technology used to detect the virus hampered the early introduction of more test kits; similarly, the 441 3M patents where the words «respirator» or «N95» appear have hampered new manufacturers willing to manufacture medical grade masks on a large scale. Worse still, three of the treatments used for Covid-19 (Remdesivir, Favipiravir, and L2opinavir-Ritonavir) had valid patents in most parts of the world (29).

Some will argue that without guaranteed profits there would be no way to vaccine research and development, which would be a disincentive for the scientific community. Although this is not the focus of this writing, two questions remain, what is the purpose of scientific research? Which will carry more weight: the right to life or the right to intellectual property?

e) Adoption of the experiences of the other

This factor refers to the «value that is given to others as a source of help; takes as an example to follow their value as models of alternative management methods» (23). All the factors are linked to others: one case is the search for help and the adoption of the experiences of the other, particularly in this crisis. They have had role models and this has facilitated prevention, containment and management. It is a way of seeing in the other a role model; it is to recognize one's own finitude and the other as a valid interlocutor, which takes on a fundamental value in the ethical framework and in the empathic-cooperative level. This is a crucial factor to take into account and, in adoption to the experiences of the other, it is also possible not to adopt negative experiences; that is, adopt the good and avoid the bad.

f) Assumption of failures-patience

As proposed by Diamond (23), it refers to «the ability to tolerate uncertainty, the ambiguity of the first attempts to solve the crisis». This could be one of the current critical points: Can we ask patience from a capitalist macro-system and geopolitics? Will it be possible to save the self, leaving aside the circumstance? To the first question, the answer is yes. The dominant system, rooted in biopower, will use its tricks not to wait, to continue producing and «progressing». However, since what moves the system, and with it a large part of the people, is precisely production and consump-

tion, it will be a question of quickly activating the system, increasing production and consumption, after the slowdown in the economy caused by the virus (30). However, it will have no place in the immediacy, to make resistance, and not be the brake for a lethal acceleration. It can be claimed that health prevails over the market and, although the economy is one of the determinants of health (31), health is *roughly considered* a superior good. Hopefully the same logic that prioritizes health over the market in the hierarchy can be applied to the development of the vaccine, and it will be possible to avoid patent commercialism. In general, it only remains to wait. Waiting implies, among other things, not putting pressure on the scientific community. Although a vaccine is imperative, scientific rigor cannot be lost, given that «the pressure on science (which is slow because it complies with trial and error until the error no longer appears) has led to more disasters than successes. Recent history is clear on this» (32). To the second question, the answer is no; the self is not oblivious to the circumstance; human interdependence is multiple and ontological, so the self is always self and its circumstance, a circumscribed self (33).

These factors and the missing factors are crucial in the development and solution of a crisis, but the crisis *per se* generates fear and uncertainty. The crisis is «danger and occasion» (23), in the same way that fear due to the crisis can be danger and occasion, insofar as it can stun and paralyze, or shake and mobilize.

g) From stunning fear to fear heuristics

In a context, where the fight to death with death seemed to be closer and closer to being resolved, with a triumph on the side of humanity, even with a tentative date for the demise of death around 2045 (34), now a microorganism, a virus, takes a turn in this story, delivering such a blow that leaves humanity on the verge of a *knockout*, and brings to mind the painful memory of human finitude and vulnerability. In the pre-pandemic environment, it see-

med that it was getting closer and closer to transcending human finitude. However, the saying goes well: «the higher, the harder the fall». Therefore, the surrounding fear is natural, «fear of getting sick, of infecting others, of dying, of dying alone; not being able to accompany loved ones, not being able to say goodbye; fear of hardship, of losing your job; fear of existential breakdown» (35).

However, fear, like the crisis, must not be paralyzing devices but, on the contrary, mobilizers. A fear heuristic is needed «in which the feeling of danger is an anticipated demonstration of the planetary scale and its human depth» (36) and, simultaneously, forms a vision of the disfigurement of man and the ecosystem, which allows reach the concept of humanity that must be preserved from such dangers (36). Resigning fear in times of crisis, to care for and mobilize, implies recognizing above all the intrinsic vulnerability of all forms of life and of this common home with living matter. Moreover, this means «recognizing the human being as a subject, as subject to something, to otherness and otherness. Therefore, not only the human good should be sought, but also that of extra-human things, expanding the recognition of ends in themselves beyond what is human, and incorporating the concept of human good in caring for them» (36).

This crisis of the crisis not only generates fear, but also interest. «There are only two levers that move men: fear and interest» (37). In this sense, it only remains to appeal that the interest be an interest for the community, for life itself, and not for a harmful egoism that sharpens the exploitation of discrepancy and otherness. And this in order not to be afraid of fear but, on the contrary, to recognize it in the midst of a society that demonizes recognizing itself vulnerable and fearful in the face of the uncertainty of crises (38), so barriers are imposed to mobilize in the face of the dangers that set it up. In the midst of fear, all that remains is to recognize one's own vulnerability, that of others, and of the common home, to respond to, from and with the other, for everyone, for them (those who have not yet arrived) and for life itself.

b) From social isolation to compassion and caring for the other

A social being forced to confinement and social distancing should not get used to and normalize neglect, disinterest in the other, but, on the contrary, strengthen their social ties and essentially compassionate care practices, in order to resolve a systematized crisis that guides the child. Individualism, rather than cooperation. It is time to remember so as not to forget, with it, reflect, and act. Remember finitude, vulnerability and that present (unrequited) desire for companionship, as essential components of human life and of life itself; so as not to allow an insensitive amnesia, which anesthetizes any possibility of feeling the other and with the other.

Compassion comes from the Latin *cumpassio*: *cum* «convergence, reunion, together», and *passio*, «feel». In turn, it comes from *patior*: «to suffer, to suffer», plus the suffix *-tion* «action and effect» (39). In its roots and origins, it refers to another, a relationship, a movement, a response, an action that arises in response to the suffering of the other; it transcends the realm of the self. Following Estrada (40), «it is about the challenge of becoming one with the other, of going beyond the narrow horizon of individualism and recognizing that everyone else is another-like-me, not an abstraction». Compassion implies recognizing, understanding, being with and for the other. A compassionate and caring attitude, is a way to resist; to resist before the mercantile and reifying tyranny; resist to subvert, because a caring and compassionate economy, is also required that truly considers human beings as an end in themselves; that it does not distance itself from the subjects to focus its attention on the surplus value, and that it does not open the existing gaps further.

It must be remembered, then, «the ability to cooperate on a large scale was what catapulted the cognitive development of *Homo sapiens*» (41). It is this same capacity to cooperate, but in an extended and vivified way in compassion, beyond «speciesism» (42),

which is a path of hope in the face of an apocalyptic scenario. To expand circles of cooperation, you need to expand circles of empathy and compassion. Finally, this would translate into a magnification of the circles of responsibility and care, with human rights as the diameter of some circles of feelings and with a guiding center that is not anthropocentric, but rather ecocentric. This crisis and the underlying fear represent a moment to reflect on confinement and isolation, from a narrative perspective that allows us to understand what Rifkin proposed (43):

If the search for company were not something so basic to our nature we would not fear isolation or ostracism. To be the object of rejection or exile is to cease to be a person, to cease to exist for others. Empathy is the psychological means by which we become part of other people's lives and share valuable experiences. The very notion of transcendence means going beyond oneself, being part of larger communities, being part of more complex networks of meaning (p. 28).

An understanding of vulnerability, finiteness and own temporality; of otherness and of the other takes place when the self is more individualized and developed. Individualization is understood not as a very independent isolated being, but as indivisible and differentiated, which is not part of the gross mass, lacking its own will and autonomy. It is from the differentiation that the wishes of the other are understood. In other words, «the authenticity of what I have discovered about myself is reinforced because I have seen something of me reaffirmed in you and of you in me» (44). It is the recognition of oneself, of the other, that constitutes one's own identity, and of otherness, in Honneth's terms (45): «intersubjectivity is required to constitute subjectivity. However, staying with the mere constitution in its strict sense is not enough; It also implies contributing to the constitution of the other through their recognition».

An openness to the care of the other and an expansion of care circles can be seen from an increasingly global, hyper-connected

world, which is interdependent even in the midst of confinement, which enables interaction with the stranger. This is well exposed by Rifkin (46), when verifying that small populations have been more closed and xenophobic. Being very close communities, they are much more likely to consider outsiders as «others». On the other hand, the daily social and commercial dealings with very diverse people that urban life entails tends to foster a more cosmopolitan sensibility. This global crisis should not be a way to legitimize the excessive restriction of freedoms or to opt for a cannibalism, in which the strongest feast on the weakest, but to remember that everyone can do something for the other close. Responsibility is, above all, to respond and, to respond, one must feel, but responsibility in closeness is not enough; it is necessary in space-time distance. This requires a broadening of empathic and compassionate circles. Following Rorty (47), it is necessary to signify the formation in feelings, since they are not discovered, but are created and, in this task, it is necessary to remember that the art in all its expressions models the human morality, even more than an extensive ethical-philosophical treaty.

Undoubtedly, the crisis leaves lessons; learning them or not is everyone's responsibility, from nations and organizations and institutions to individuals. Today more than ever solidarity, compassion and care are needed to establish priorities between the vital and the superfluous. However above all, it is necessary to resist the normalization of the abnormal, the exclusion of the excluded, the violation of rights and sentimental, moral and ethical anesthesia, in the face of a current crisis and other underlying ones that have been made up, silenced and abandoned, but that today appear again hidden and exacerbated behind the veil of a pandemic.

Bibliographic references

1. Bratanich A. Mers-Cov: transmission and the role of new host species. *Argentine Journal of Microbiology*. October 1, 2015; 47(4): 279-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ram.2015.11.001>
2. Coronavirus: impact on the frequency of flights of world airlines 2020. *Statista*. [Accessed on July 22, 2020]. Available from: <https://es.statista.com/statistics/1105535/covid-19-impacto-en-la-frecuencia-de-vuelos-de-las-aerolineas-mundiales/> <https://doi.org/10.4060/ca8614es>
3. Agamben G. The epidemic seen by Agamben and by Giorgio Agamben. *Santiago Magazine*. [Accessed on July 22, 2020]. Available from: <http://revistasantiago.cl/pensamiento/la-epidemia-vista-por-agamben/> <https://doi.org/10.1344/oxi.2020.i16.30106>
4. Nietzsche F. Will to power. 2nd ed. Spain: EDAF; 2000. [Accessed on July 24, 2020]. Available from: <https://ferrusca.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/voluntad-de-poder.pdf> <https://doi.org/10.5211/9788496780071.ch9>
5. Interview with Michel Foucault. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Neuropsychiatry*. 2009; 29 (1): 137-144. <https://doi.org/10.4321/s0211-57352009000100010>
6. Foucault M. *History of sexuality*. Mexico: Twenty-first Century Publishers; 2002.
7. Foucault M. *Watch and punish; birth of the prison*. Buenos Aires: Twenty-first Century; 2004.
8. Torralba Roselló F. *On hospitality: strangers and vulnerable like you*. PPC; 2003. 208 p.
9. Agamben G. *Homo sacer*. Valencia: Pre-Texts; 1998.
10. Orwell G. 1984. Spain: Debolsillo; 2018.
11. Han B-C. The viral emergency and the world of tomorrow. Byung-Chul Han, the South Korean philosopher who thinks from Berlin. *El País*. 2020. [Accessed on July 24, 2020]. Available from: <https://elpais.com/ideas/2020-03-21/la-emergencia-viral-y-el-mundo-de-manana-byung-chul-han-el-filosofo-surcoreano-que-piensa-from-berlin.html> <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1t89k2z.6>
12. Harari YN. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. Spain: Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial España; 2016. 543 p.
13. Heidegger M. *Being and time*. 3rd ed. Madrid: TROTTA; 2018. 492 p.
14. Byung-Chul H. *The Tiredness Society*. 2nd ed. Herder; 2012. 120 p.
15. Seneca L. *Of happiness*. Editorial Alliance; 1980.
16. Doctors in Antioquia rejected accusations of an alleged «Covid cartel». *Blu Radio*. 2020. [Accessed on October 12, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.bluradio.com/salud/medicos-en-antioquia-rechazaron-acusaciones-de-supuesto-cartel-del-covid> <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.iatreia.v28n3a01>
17. Doctors accused of killing patients in Ecatepec hospital. *Excelsior*. 2020. [Accessed on October 12, 2020]. Available at: <https://www.excelsior.com.mx/comunidad/acusan-a-medicos-de-matar-a-pacientes-en-hospital-de-ecatepec/1379539> <https://doi.org/10.4067/s1726-569x2010000100007>

18. Tiempo CEE. «My dad was not killed by Covid-19, but poor medical care». El Tiempo. 2020. [Accessed on October 12, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.eltiempo.com/colombia/medellin/coronavirus-medellin-un-hombre-habla-sobre-la-muerte-de-su-padre-por-covid-524368> <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edumed.2020.05.005>
19. Semana. The scandal over intensive care units. *Semana.com Latest News from Colombia and the World*. 2020. [Accessed on October 12, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/coronavirus-en-colombia-escandalo-por-las-uci/677788/> <https://doi.org/10.7311/itinerarios.29.2019.11>
20. Nietzsche F. *Thus, spoke Zarathustra: a book for all and for none*. Madrid: Alliance; 2003. 504 p.
21. Arancibia Carrizo JP. *The concept of power in the work of Michel Foucault*. Santiago de Chile: University of Chile; 2010. <https://doi.org/10.5354/0717-8883.2016.43146>
22. CRISIS. Etymologies of Chile. Dictionary that explains the origin of words. [Accessed on July 26, 2020]. Retrieved from: <http://etimologias.dechile.net/?crisis> <https://doi.org/10.36576/summa.29376>
23. Diamond J. *Crisis: How countries react at decisive moments*. Spain: Debate; 2019. 528 p.
24. Bonilla Aldana DK, Dhama K, Rodríguez Morales AJ. Revisiting the one health approach in the context of Covid-19: A look into the ecology of this emerging disease. *Adv Anim Vet Sci*. 2020. [Accessed on July 26, 2020]; 8 (3). Available from: http://nexusacademicpublishers.com/table_contents_detail/4/1359/html <https://doi.org/10.17582/journal.aavs/2020/8.3.234.237>
25. The coronavirus crisis, «typical example of an ecological crisis». RFI. 2020. [Accessed on July 26, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.rfi.fr/es/salud/20200406-la-crisis-del-coronavirus-ejemplo-tipico-de-crisis-ecologica> <https://doi.org/10.22201/crim.001r.2020.13>
26. De Sousa B. *The cruel pedagogy of the virus*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO; 2020. 84 p.
27. Arendt H. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Study on the Banality of Evil*. Barcelona: Debolsillo; 2003. <https://doi.org/10.3989/arbor.2010.742n1108>
28. Semana Magazine. Police will not investigate police officer Ángel Zúñiga. 2020. [Accessed on July 31, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.semana.com/semana-tv/semana-noticias/articulo/policia-no-investigara-al-patrullero-angel-zuniga/685297> <https://doi.org/10.36414/rbmc.v5i12.13>
29. Stiglitz J, Jayadev A, Prabhala A. How will patents work in a possible vaccine against Covid-19? 2020. [Accessed on April 30, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.elespectador.com/coronavirus/como-funcionaran-las-patentes-en-una-eventual-vacuna-contra-el-covid-19-articulo-917105> <https://doi.org/10.14201/gredos.125903>
30. Covid-19 (coronavirus) plunges the world economy into the worst recession since World War II. *World Bank*. [Accessed on July 27, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.bancomundial.org/es/news/press-release/2020/06/08/covid-19-to-plunge-glo->

- bal-economy-into-worst-recession-since-world-war-ii <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv233p84.7>
31. Siede JA. *Determinates Health and disease social: PHC-based health systems*. PAHO, editor. 2012; 48.
 32. Anjel M. On the new vaccine. *www.elcolombiano.com*. 2020. [Accessed on July 27, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.elcolombiano.com/opinion/columnistas/sobre-la-nueva-vacuna-IH13369247>
 33. Ortega y Gasset J. *Meditations on Don Quixote*. 70.
 34. Cordeiro JL, Wood D. *The death of death*. Vol. 1. Deusto; 2018. 320 p.
 35. Cruz J. Carolin Emcke: The pandemic is an authoritarian temptation that invites repression. *El País*. 2020. [Accessed on July 30, 2020]. Available from: <https://elpais.com/cultura/2020-04-19/carolin-emcke-esta-es-una-tentacion-autoritaria-que-invita-a-la-represion.html> <https://doi.org/10.24275/uami.ff3655257>
 36. Jonas H. *The Responsibility Principle: An Ethics Essay for Technological Civilization*. 2nd edition. Barcelona: Herder; 1995. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvt9k2sz>
 37. History Channel. Napoleon's most outstanding phrases. *History*. 2015. [Accessed on July 30, 2020]. Available from: <https://canalhistoria.es/blog/las-frases-mas-destacadas-de-napoleon/> <https://doi.org/10.33588/rm.3001.99276>
 38. Bude H. *The society of fear*. Herder; 2017.
 39. Corominas J, Pascual JM. *Spanish and Hispanic critical etymological dictionary*. CE-F 1st ed., 7th reprint. Vol. 2. Gredos; 2010.
 40. Estrada MRB. For an ethic of compassion in education. *Theor. Educ.* 2006; 27. <https://doi.org/10.14201/3218>
 41. Harari YN. *Sapiens: from animals to gods*. Debate; 2011.
 42. Singer P, Casal P. *Animal liberation*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta; 1999.
 43. Rifkin J. *The race towards a global conscience in a world in crisis*. Barcelona: PPC; 2009. 688 p.
 44. Kwok-bun C. *Both sides, now: Culture contact, hybridization, and cosmopolitanism*. In: Vervotec S, Cohen R, editors. *Conceiving cosmopolitanism I: theory, context, and practice*. UK: Oxford University Press; 2002. 204 p.
 45. Fraser N, Honneth A. *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical debate*. Madrid: Morata Editions; 2006.
 46. Rifkin J. *Empathic Civilization: The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis*. Spain: Paidós; 2010.
 47. Rorty R. *Contingency, irony and solidarity*. Spain: Paidós; 1991. 224 p.