



REVISTA DE FILOSOFÍA

... LUIS OQUENDO: *Lectura intertextual de la Analítica en la Crítica de la razón práctica* ... GABRIEL TORRES, CRISTIAN PEDRAZA, LINO MORÁN Y DOUGLAS GUDIÑO: *Ludovico Silva: ideología y educación* ... GUILLERMO ARIEL D'ATRI: *Kant y el cuerpo propio como condición de posibilidad de toda experiencia estética sublime* ... JOSÉ MANUEL LÓPEZ: *Schopenhauer, Wagner y Nietzsche: aproximaciones filosóficas y musicales* ... JUAN HORACIO DE FREITAS: *Espiritualidad y tecnificación de sí en Nietzsche. Una lectura foucaultiana del Ecce homo* ... SILVIO MOTA PINTO: *La interpretación de una práctica y el fundamento de la moral* ... CARLOS AGUIRRE AGUIRRE: *Contrapuntos coloniales: Frantz Fanon, Jean-Paul Sartre y el problema existencialista y colonial del Otro* ... INGRID SILVA ARROYO: *Libertad y oportunidad. Consideraciones sobre justicia distributiva en Amartya Sen y Philippe Van Parijs.* ... ANA ISABEL HERNÁNDEZ RODRÍGUEZ: *Una reflexión sobre la educación desde una perspectiva ético - filosófica: profesión vs. vocación* ... CHRISTIAN PAÚL NARANJO NAVAS: *The Post Truth and God* ...

Universidad del Zulia
Facultad de Humanidades y Educación
Centro de Estudios Filosóficos
"Adolfo García Díaz"
Maracaibo - Venezuela

Nº 94
2020 - 1
Enero - Abril

Revista de Filosofía, N° 94, 2020-1 pp. 199-211

The Post Truth and God

Los problemas de la post verdad y cómo visualizar la idea de Dios

Christian Paúl Naranjo Navas,

Ph.D. Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo - Ecuador

cnaranjo@unach.edu.ec

Abstract

The article attempts to visualize the dangers of the post-truth era, while relativizing the relative to argue that the postulates of this era are irrational. The only way to understand a moral structure in a post-truth society is through imposition, persuasion or manipulation. In all cases, morality is relegated to the subjective. The argument is constructed based on the law of non-contradiction, stating that the truth exists, and its characteristics are universal, static and logical.

Keywords: Post-truth; Christ; morality.

Introduction

Postmodernity presents us with a Christianity that is built as a nest intertwined between customs and myths, intertwined between perceptions adaptable to circumstances, a Christianity built in a culture ready to justify any use and belief that arises from the peoples, from the “wisdom ancestral”. It is easy to see how the western culture of post-modernity has seen itself ready to adapt, to intuitively accommodate itself between truth and post-truth, as it suits them, as it wishes, as it feels. The post-truth era presents us with an adaptable, changing Western culture and a cultural Christianity ready to justify all these changes, soon to be built as a platform of acceptance to all use, to all beliefs, to all cultural adaptation.

The post-truth era has created a wide space for tolerance of everything, with groups that have taken Christianity as a platform to justify their new positions, in a kind of act of atonement: everything is justifiable, everything is adaptable, everything

is useful to justify. The post-truth era gives us a vague vision of reality: the conception of truth has gone from being a static principle, relevant to everything and everyone, to being a dynamic, adaptable idea, almost an unnecessary vision. At the same time, everything and nothing is justifiable, everything and nothing is accepted, it depends on the interlocutors, it depends on the circumstances. Everything is relative, in this way, nothing can be affirmed because cultural relativity only accepts, while sometimes trying to justify itself with the adaptation of a post-modern Jesus.

In this way, this essay tries to visualize the dangers of the post-truth era, it tries to relativize the relative, so that it can be shown that the “logic” of this era finds no foundation, but only an adaptation to each circumstance, and a growing acceptance of all cultural uses. At the same time, the essay aims to recreate the rational justification for the existence of truth, justified in the existence of God. This involves the existence of universal principles, neither adaptable nor useable, found by contrasting truth with post-truth. The claims of the essay are presented as a colossal task, however, we find encouragement when reviewing the works of Dr. Ravi Zacharias (2000; 2008; 2012), Dr. John C. Lennox (2007; 2011; 2015), Dr. Turek (2010; 2014), and MA Gregory Kousser (2011; 2017), who have worked systematically to understand the truth in a rational way, while exposing the irrationality of the postulates of the post-truth era.

1. Material and Methods

In 2016, Oxford Dictionaries chose to choose the word “post truth” as the word of the year, that is, the word of greatest use and opinion (Oxford University Press 2017). The news did not lose us by surprise, it was to be expected, since its use has increased exponentially. The publication truth does not refer to one event after another, the composition of words does not have a perception of subsequent events, but of relevance, that is, the truth has lost relevance over time.

Oxford Dictionaries (2017) believes that word composition may have been used for the first time in an essay by Steve Tesich, published by *The Nation* in 1992. However, Ralph Keyes (2004), in his book “*The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and deception in contemporary life*”, popularized the term referring to it as the quality that something seemed true, or could be perceived as true, even if it is not. To this definition, he adds that one researcher after another has confirmed that it has become as common as scratching the stitches (2004, p. 4). The true publication is configured as statements, arguments or events that may not be real, no matter, what is relevant is that these arguments or events feel true, although the evidence shows otherwise.

The true publication is made and remade according to the need, insofar as the need requires its use to justify cultural uses, individual reasons, or even public impositions. Thus, it is not difficult to find examples that clearly represent these cultural and individual uses, specific or ethnic impositions. For example, female genital mutilation, death penalty for adultery, fellatio performed by children, state authoritarianism, etc.

On female genital mutilation the World Health Organization (2013) shows data that are chilling¹. Between 100 and 140 million girls and women worldwide have undergone female genital mutilation; in 27 African countries, and Yemen; more than 101 million girls over the age of 10 live with the consequences of mutilation; Immigrants from Africa and Yemen continue these practices in countries such as Australia, Canada, the United States, Europe and New Zealand (2013, p. 2).

Female genital mutilation is carried out for various cultural reasons: initiation of adulthood; enter the public life of the community, expecting discrimination for those women who do not do it; In various populations, this practice has been linked to local pre-Islamic traditions; for reasons that involve sanitary beliefs and beauty; control of sexuality, “to curb the supposed intrinsically exacerbated sexual desire of women [...] there is a belief that if the clitoris is not removed it will grow too much, looking like a penis” (Asociación Mujeres entre Mundos, 2016, pp. 21- 22).

Another example of cultural uses is built around the death penalty, one of the most visible cases, death by adultery, it is common to find it in certain cultures of the Middle East. Debates about this use are very common in different human rights commissions, in fact, during the debate on the death penalty in 1994, at the United Nations forum, the countries that opposed any resolution on the subject were Malaysia, Bangladesh, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Egypt, Iran, and Jordan. Sudan described capital punishment as a divine right according to some religions, in particular Islam (Schabas, 2000, p. 229). Any attempt to debate such practices receives a fierce denunciation, alluding to respect for cultural values.

On the other hand, in Strickland-Bosav, located in the north of Papau Nueva Guinea, there are several indigenous groups, among them, the Kaluli perform various rituals, one of them recreates neighboring environments with songs and dances. These rituals try to remember memories of lost beings. For this, there are two types of people, the dancers and the hosts, who, grieved by the pain, begin to cry and cry violently, until some of them vent their pain by grasping torches. of burning resin and

1 The word chilling has been used with a specific intention: the word connotes the existence of a universal idea of good and evil, of just and unjust, goodness and cruelty, concepts that cannot justify their existence in the post-truth era.

dipping them furiously on the shoulders of the singing dancer (Knauft, 1985, p. 324). The ritual is considered successful when the hosts have been lost in despair and the dancers have been severely burned.

In the same Strickland-Bosav, all indigenous groups in the area believe that children must be “inseminated to reach adulthood, but the mode of transmission of semen is different in each society” (Knauft, 1985, p. 328). Anal sex is practiced among the Kaluli communities, fellatio is practiced in the Etoro community, and semen is spread among the novice in the Onabasulu community. At the same time, the customs of the Kaluli and Onabasulu seem repulsive to the Etoro.

Finally, the most visible example of state authoritarianism is that of North Korea, the dictatorships of the Kim family and the Korean Workers’ Party have created a state of systematic repression. The Kim Jong-Un regime has been characterized by public executions, arbitrary arrests and forced labor; tighten travel restrictions to prevent North Koreans from escaping and seeking refuge abroad; and systematically persecuting those with religious contacts inside and outside the country (Human Rights Watch, 2017). In the same report, the systematic use of murder, slavery, torture, imprisonment, rape, forced abortion and acts of sexual violence is mentioned.

2. Results and Discussion

Cultural differences move and frighten many, yet these reactions open the door to relevant questions: Why should these cultural uses scare us, if the post-truth advocates cultural tolerance? Why judge those cultural uses, if there are no absolute truths, if there are no absolute standards? By what right can moral standards be imposed if they are not absolute? These questions expose the biggest problem of argumentation in the post-truth era: there is no truth, therefore, there are no moral principles, so there is no justification for judging any person or culture, in short, there is no need for laws punitive.

2.1 A Post Truth Christ

In the post-truth era, many people have tried to justify themselves by adapting a “Christ” who tolerates and does not judge, who accepts and does not deny, a “Christ” who adapts to cultural changes. In the same way, an attempt is made to build a church that adapts, that tolerates, that accepts, and simultaneously demands a community that also adapts to different lifestyles. The clearest cases of these attempts at justification and pressure for adaptation are homosexuality and abortion.

The case of homosexuality, as an accepted way of life in some Christian churches in Great Britain, has been studied by Hunt (2002) who, citing Robert Nugent and Jeannine Gramick, mentions that homosexuality can be compared to a thorn caught in the throat of the church that cannot expel or swallow completely (2002, p. 1). Gramick's study shows that the acceptance of homosexuality in Christian churches unfolds as a sociological event, as the achievement of pressure from some social movements. Christian homosexuality as a result of social pressure, and not by acceptance of universal principles, or by acceptance of the existence of truth².

Social and cultural pressure reveals the second problem in argumentation in the post-truth era: the affirmation that everything is a social construction and, therefore, as a social construction, the affirmation of the strongest, the most adapted, or of the majority, it becomes the moral standard, which involves, again, the adaptation of the standards. The problem of the majorities is evident: the majorities are mobile and changing, then, the consideration of something true depends on the construction of the majorities and, like these with mobile and changing, the true is also mobile and changing.

On the other hand, abortion has become the battle flag of several feminist movements, which have based their arguments on the freedom of women to decide on their bodies, on the health and life of women, and discrimination against women. gender (Center for Reproductive Rights 2011). These arguments have served to create certain justifications for legally accepting abortion. However, in the case of the structures of international legality, Tozzi (2010, p. 6) mentions that no United Nations treaty contains the word "abortion", nor can a "right" to abortion be inferred from "common sense" From the words of any treatise.

Social pressure has caused Christian groups, such as the Presbyterian Church of the United States, to accept abortion. In his statement of principles he mentions that: a woman's considered decision to terminate a pregnancy may be a morally acceptable decision, although certainly not the only or required one. Possible supporting circumstances would include medical evidence of severe physical or mental deformity, conception as a result of rape or incest, or conditions under which the physical or mental health of a woman or child would be seriously threatened (Central Presbyterian Church, 2013).

The world map on abortion laws (The World's Abortion Laws, 2018) shows that the world is divided into two, a first group made up of those countries that have fully legalized abortion, and a second that prohibits abortion of one or another

2 Both the Old Testament (Leviticus 18:22; 20:13) and the New Testament (Romans 1: 26-28; 1 Timothy 1: 9-10) refer to homosexuality as acts contrary to the will of God for the Humans.

way. The second group includes most of Latin America, Africa and Asia Minor. In addition, these regions are added to Ireland, Great Britain, Poland, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Japan. These countries prohibit abortion except in cases such as incest, rape, or possible death of the mother, and most require father's permission.

Social movements in favor of abortion have tried to build the idea of legality synchronized with the idea of morality. In this conception, it is intended to suggest that the legality of abortion shows the morality of the nation. However, this argument hints at the third problem in argumentation in the post-truth era: legality does not necessarily represent morality. This statement is presented as a no-brainer when analyzing the historical development of the legal precepts of nations. The problem of legality, then, frames the post-truth within a dynamic development of legal standards, frames the post-truth within a changing historical evolution, an evolution that is sometimes seen as contradictory, and sometimes, as coherent.

These two examples, homosexuality and abortion, have served as pressure to build a version of Christianity adapted to post-truth, which evolves in the same way as societies, which walks the same paths as post-modern cultures. This version of Christianity, adaptable to cultural dynamism, becomes one more cog in the post-truth era because its precepts are changing, adaptable, submissive to culture, its principles fall into subjectivity, opinion, and tastes.

The examples also present the paradox into which certain social movements fall: the need to be justified by the same tendency that their behavior accuses. This justification shows the need to be accepted, but, at the same time, the will not to change but, on the contrary, to make Christianity change and adapt to its conduct. This paradox shows the need for a spiritual justification, for this, the most viable option is social pressure to achieve an adapted Christian faith.

2.2 The Post-Truth Problems

The writing has presented three post-truth arguments that fall into logical problems, namely: cultural respect; social pressure; and, legality. All these problems point to the same argument: the relativity of truth, the relativity of morality and, therefore, the nonexistence of both. On the one hand, cultural respect leads to accepting any cultural use such as rape, murder, castration, etc. Why freak out, if the post truth defends cultural tolerance? The judgment of any cultural use falls into absurdity, because there are no absolute truths. Since there are no absolute moral principles, the post-truth cannot justify the judgment of any act, the judgment of any human being.

On the other hand, social pressure is built as an instrument that aims to build the idea of morality through imposition. If everything is a social construction, the truth is constructed in the context of the strongest, that group of people who manage to impose their visions on the rest. In many cases, the ideas of the majority become the standard of morality. In other cases, it may be the force of the minority that prevails over a population. In both cases, be they majorities or minorities, the imposition shows the truth as a relative, changing idea. Thus, the truth and, therefore, morality is relegated to a struggle of forces. The consideration of something true is relegated to the construction of the majority and, like these with mobiles and changers, the truth is not absolute, but depends on the strongest.

Finally, the post truth presents morality in relation to the legal system. The post truth frames morality within legality, behaviors are moral or not as long as they can be legalized. In this way, the post truth is developed within a historical evolution of legality, within a changing, dynamic, contradictory evolution. The problem with this argument is obvious: legality for some is illegality for others, who is moral and who is not? On what legal parameters do we base our judgment of morality? The dynamics of legality show the same problem: a changing morality and, therefore, a non-existent morality.

All these attempts to understand morality from the post-truth lead us to consider the same problem: the dynamics of society have constructed historical parameters that are diverse, changing and, therefore, non-existent. If the truth moves from one side to the other, changes without problem, adapts to each culture, then the truth has disappeared. Therefore, there is no justification for entering value judgments, there is no reasonable argument to justify the judgment, the criticism, the way of thinking or acting. There is only the law of imposition, of persuasion, of manipulation. As long as social groups can impose, persuade or manipulate cultural conceptions, truth continues to be relegated to the field of opinion, pleasure, and the subjective.

As there are no objective parameters to consider that something is true, to consider that something is moral, the post-truth is lost in its attempt at tolerance. There can be no tolerance in the post-truth spectrum for an obvious reason: if everything is tolerable, the reasoning set forth in this essay should also be tolerated, but, if that were to happen, if the reasoning in this essay is also tolerated, the post Truth contradicts itself because truth and non-truth cannot coexist in the same space. Therefore, in the post-truth context, if social groups do not tolerate the argument of this article, they contradict their principle of tolerance; on the contrary, in the post-truth context, if social groups do tolerate the argument in this article, they contradict themselves because truth cannot coexist with non-truth.

The arguments put forward in the post-truth era fall into logical contradictions. The only conclusion of this era is the systematic irrationality in which its “principles” have been built. Without objective parameters, the absurd governs reason. Without objective parameters, cognition is lost and inconsistency appears as the primary element. Thus, the post-truth lives on the unintelligible, lives on the subjective.

If the above has any logical value, the next question is obvious, what is the truth? and how to get there? These questions also lead us to consider the existence of the immaterial, a truth and a morality that are not built in society, are not built in the material, but are found in the field of metaphysics (from the Greek μετὰ [τὰ] φυσικά, “beyond the physical”).

2.3 What or Who is the Truth

If we accept that the truth exists and is objective, then we are accepting that the truth is outside of cultural constructions, it is outside of material forces, it is in the field of the immaterial. Truth lives in the realm of the immaterial because it was not built or created by material entities, and yet it emerges in the realm of the material because we can appreciate it, even if we do not fully understand it.

The laws of logic lead us to appreciate the truth in its tributes: the law of non-contradiction, the law of the excluded medium, and the principle of identity (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2018), lead us to visualize the truth and deny the lies or relative truths. Through the laws of logic, we can observe the attributes of truth, to say: truth cannot deny itself (law of non-contradiction); truth has no intermediate or relative (law of the excluded medium); And, the truth is always the same (identity principle).

Attributes of truth can be visualized as follows: p and $\sim p$ cannot be true at the same time, or, p is true and $\sim p$ is not true, or, p is not true and $\sim p$ is true (law of non-contradiction); p and $\sim p$ have no intermediates, there are no tertiary propositions ($p \vee \sim p$); and, p is identical with itself, ($p = p$), p is always p . Although Aquino proposes the “*principia essentialia rerum sunt nobis ignota*” (Rogers, 2013, p. 27), that is, that the essential principles of things are unknown to us, the truth can be known in its attributes using the laws of logic.

The laws of logic lead us to appreciate that truth is exclusive, absolute, static and transcends material construction. Truth is exclusive because it does not accept relative negations or truths, it is absolute because it cannot change, it is static because it is always the same, and it does not come from material construction because it is not part of cultural processes. These attributes provide information that necessarily

eliminates claims of relative, dynamic, or material truths. In this sense, any statement that bases its conception of truth on cultural, dynamic or relative constructions falls on the terrain of the illogical and, therefore, on the terrain of non-truth: if it is not true, it is a lie, there is no intermediate spaces. Thus, truth and post-truth cannot coexist. For Tahko (2009), the exclusivity of the truth is evident, the emphasis is on the mutual exclusivity of having a certain attribute and lacking that attribute at the same time; in fact, the idea can be expressed without using negation at all: the mutual exclusivity of certain properties is evident even without the concept of negation (2009, p. 34).

In addition to recognizing the attributes of truth through the laws of logic, truth, being essentially non-material, is not accessible through material processes, but through non-material processes. The non-material processes to know the truth are known as religion, that is: ways of approaching God or divinity. In this sense, God, or divinity, becomes the Truth that transcends material processes, the Truth that is absolute and exclusive. The exclusivity of Truth is an inescapable characteristic. To illustrate this characteristic, it is very useful to refer to the parable of the blind and the elephant. In this parable, a king asks six blind men to determine what they are touching by feeling different parts of an elephant's body. A blind man feels a leg and says that the elephant is like a pillar; the one who feels the tail says that the elephant is like a rope; the one who feels the trunk says that the elephant is like a branch of a tree; the one who feels the ear says that the elephant is like a fan; the one who feels the belly says that the elephant is like a wall; and the one who feels the tusk says that the elephant is like a pipe. Then the king explains: you are all right.

The parable of the blind and the elephant is used to argue that all ways of approaching Truth are acceptable, that all religions are true, and that all come to the same God. However, the parable presents several problems, saying that I don't know which religion is true is an act of humility. Saying that none of the religions has the truth and that no one can be sure that there is a god, assume that you have the kind of knowledge that you simply said that no other person does, that no other religion does. How dare you! It is a kind of arrogance to say that no one can know the truth because it is a universal affirmation of the truth. Say: No one can make universal statements of universal truth. That is a universal statement of truth. No one can see the whole truth, you couldn't know that unless you think you see the whole truth. And so you're doing the same thing that you say religious people shouldn't be doing (Keller, 2018).

It is common to find the idea that all religions lead to the same God, however, this statement falls on a deep problem: it is assumed that all religions have the same conception of God, while, at the same time, it is assumed that the ways to get to God they are not exclusive. The problem is indisputable: while Jesus is God to Christianity, Jesus is only a prophet to Islam, Jesus is not God, but the son of God, to Jehovah's

Witnesses, and there are thousands of different gods. Religions have different conceptions of God, therefore, not all religions lead us to the same God: different paths lead us to different gods.

The statement that all paths lead to the same God behaves as a parallel to the statement that there are relative truths that lead us to visualize the Truth: in both cases, the multiple paths, like relative truths, fall into a problem of logic: if there are relative truths, the Truth does not exist; if there are multiple paths, the path does not exist: truths, like paths, are different, with different conceptions of who/what God is, and with different conceptions of origin, destiny, morality and purpose. Therefore, it is illogical to propose that $p = \sim p$. The exclusivity of Truth, as the way to reach it, follows from the acceptance that Truth is absolute, God is absolute, and the way to find it is unique. Thus, there is only one Truth, and only one way.

If the post-truth arguments are illogical, because there cannot be multiple truths, but only one, as it has been tried to demonstrate in the previous epigraphs, then, the Truth, exclusive in its essence, must necessarily be logical. If Truth is logical, we implicitly accept the existence of a logic that is immutable, absolute, that is outside of time and space. So, since this logic could not have been created in matter, it must exist outside of time and space, it must be an infinite, immutable, absolute logos.

Truth is the absolute logos, which is appreciable through the laws of logic. The logos is God, and this can be appreciated by every human being because every human being has been provided with reason, and reason works through the laws of logic. Thus, God is the absolute logos: Jesus is conceptualized as an infinite, immutable and absolute logos, he is the “verb” in the Gospel of John (1: 1). In the beginning the Word [Λόγος] already existed, and the Word [Λόγος] was with God, and the Word [Λόγος] was God. Λόγος (logos) enjoys the attributes of truth: a logos that is outside of space and time because it exists before the creation of matter, is absolute and immutable. John lets us know that this logos is outside the limitations of time and space, that this logos was with God, in an intimate relationship, and that this logos is God.

In this way, the only possible way to justify morality is through Truth, that is, through the existence of logos, through the existence of Jesus. Without Truth, morality is relegated to the relative. It is only through logos that morality can be sustained, can have justification, morality cannot exist outside logos. Thus, morality has become a useful argumentative instrument to come to appreciate the existence of logos that are free from the limitations of time and space.

Final Remarks

This essay has tried to show the dangers of the postulates of the post-truth era, while trying to relativize the relative, so that the irrationality of these postulates can be argued. The irrationality of the postulates is evident because cultural respect, social pressure, and legality lead us to the same point: the impossible justification for any conception of morality.

The problems of post-truth postulates point to the relativity of truth, and hence the relativity of morality. The only way to understand a moral structure in post-truth society is through imposition, persuasion, or manipulation. In all cases, morality is relegated to the subjective.

Thus, it has been proposed that the post-truth arguments are illogical, because there cannot be multiple truths, but only one. This Truth is the logos, which is outside of space and time because it exists before the creation of matter. This logos is God.

References

- Asociación Mujeres entre Mundos. (2016). Guía para la conciencia sobre mutilaciones genitales femeninas. Andalucía: Junta de Andalucía Consejería de Igualdad y Políticas Sociales.
- Center for Reproductive Rights. (octubre de 2011). Reproductive Rights. Recuperado el marzo de 2018, de Briefing Paper: https://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/documents/pub_fac_safeab_10.11.pdf
- Central Presbyterian Church. (2013). Our Beliefs- abortion. Recuperado el 03 de 03 de 2018, de http://www.cpcmiami.org/AboutCPC/OurBeliefs_Abortion.html
- Davies, B., & Leftow, B. (2004). The Cambridge Companion to Anselm. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Durkheim, E. (s.f.). The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. (K. E. Fields, Ed., & K. E. Fields, Trad.) New York, 1995: The Free Press.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. (2018). Encyclopedia Britannica. Recuperado el 10 de July de 2018, de Laws of thought: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/laws-of-thought>
- Human Rights Watch. (2017). North Korea Country Summary. Washington D.C.

- Hunt, S. (2002). The lesbian and gay Christian movement in Britain. *Journal of Religion & Society*, Vol. 4, 1-19.
- Keller, T. (2018). Nathan Creitz helping disciples make disciples. Obtenido de The Parable of the Blind Men and the Elephant: <http://nathancreitz.net/the-parable-of-the-blind-men-and-the-elephant/>
- Keyes, R. (2004). *The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life*. New York, EE.UU.: St. Martin Press.
- Knauff, B. (1985). Ritual form and permutation in New Guinea: implications of symbolic process for socio-political evolution. *American Anthropological Association*, 321-340.
- Koukl, G. (2017). *The Story of Reality: How the World Began, How It Ends, and Everything Important That Happens in Between*. Zondervan.
- Koukl, G. (2011). *Faith is not wishing*. EE.UU.: Stand to Reason.
- Lennox, J. (2007). *God's undertaker: has science buried God?* Oxford, England: Lion Hudson plc.
- Lennox, J. (2011). *God and Stephen Hawking. Whose design is it anyway?* Oxford, England: Lion Hudson plc.
- Lennox, J. (2015). *Against the flow, the inspiration of Daniel in an age of relativism*. Grand Rapids, EE.UU.: Monarch Books.
- Organización Mundial de la Salud. (2013). *Comprender y abordar la violencia contra las mujeres. Mutilización genital femenina*. Organización anamericana de la Salud, Washington D.C.
- Oxford University Press. (enero de 2017). *Oxford living dictionaries*. Recuperado el 2018, de <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-2016>
- Rogers, E. F. (2013). *Aquinas and the Supreme Court*. (J. Gareth, & A. Lewis, Edits.) Roma: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schabas, W. (2000). Islam and the Death Penalty. *William & Mary bill of Rights Journal*, Vol. 9(N. 1), 223-236.

- Tahko, T. (2009). The law of non-contradiction as a metaphysical principle. *Australian Journal of Logic*, Vol. 7, 32-47.
- The World's Abortion Laws. (2018). (C. f. Rights, Editor) Obtenido de <http://worldabortionlaws.com/map/>
- Tozzi, P. (2010). *Internacional Law and the Right to Abortion*. New York: International Law Group Organizations.
- Turek, F. (2014). *Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case*. EE.UU.: NavPress.
- Turek, F., & Geisler, N. (2010). *I don't have enough faith to be an atheist*. Wheaton, Illinois, EE.UU.: ReadHowYouWant.
- Zacharias, R. (2000). *Jesus among other gods: the absolute claims of the Christian Message*. Nashville, Tennessee, EE.UU.: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Zacharias, R. (2008). *The end of reason. A response to the new atheists*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, EE.UU.: Zndervan.
- Zacharias, R. (2012). *Why Jesus? Rediscovering his truth in an age of mass marketed spirituality*. New York, EE.UU.: FaithWords.



UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA

REVISTA DE FILOSOFÍA

Nº 94-1 _____

*Esta revista fue editada en formato digital y publicada
en abril de 2020, por el Fondo Editorial Serbiluz,
Universidad del Zulia. Maracaibo-Venezuela*

www.luz.edu.ve
www.serbi.luz.edu.ve
www.produccioncientificaluz.org