

## **Feminism as a gender condition for global bioethics**

### ***El feminismo como condición de género para una bioética global***

***Camilo Andrés Vargas-Machado\****  
***Claudia Faviola Vargas Sepúlveda\*\****

---

Recibido el 15/11/2022 - Aceptado el 12/01/2023

#### **Abstract**

With the objective of corresponding the political and social movement of feminism with the bioethical discipline, a systematic review of literature produced and generated in the Spanish, English and Portuguese languages in the period from 1970 to 2021 was carried out. With exploration in search engines and databases. Of virtual data, where a qualitative method was applied, with a descriptive approach, with the design of a review matrix instrument to apply a correlational method, from which two emerging categories were determined: complex thinking and neo-atheism. As a result of the review, it was concluded that feminism is a mass movement of a different nature, which germinated from the current defending the will and self-determination of women, whose theory has adapted to the changes in the situation that has allowed it to accept more equitable positions, to break patriarchal schemes where global bioethics has changed, supported by the theories of complex thought and neo-atheism, to invigorate its critical-revisionist nature and framed to produce changes, they will be recorded in the everyday reality.

**Keywords:** Bioethics, global bioethics, feminism, complex thought, neo-atheism.

#### **Resumen**

Teniendo como objetivo corresponder el movimiento político y social del feminismo con la disciplina bioética, se efectuó una revisión sistemática de literatura producida y generada en los idiomas español, inglés y portugués en el periodo de 1970 a 2021. Con exploración en motores de búsqueda y bases de datos virtuales, donde se aplicó un método cualitativo, con enfoque descriptivo, con diseño de un instrumento de matriz de revisión para aplicar un método correlacional, a partir del cual se determinaron dos categorías emergentes que fueron: el pensamiento complejo y el neo-atéismo. Producto de la revisión se concluyó que el feminismo es un movimiento de masas de distinta naturaleza, que germinó de la corriente defensora de la voluntad y autodeterminación de la mujer, cuya teoría se ha adaptado a los cambios situación que ha permitido acoger posturas más equitativas, para romper esquemas del patriarcado donde tiene cambiada la bioética global apoyada en las teorías

---

\* Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0993-358X>. Email: [camilo.vargasma@campusucc.edu.co](mailto:camilo.vargasma@campusucc.edu.co)

\*\* Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0772-9315>. Email: [claudiaf.vargas@campusucc.edu.co](mailto:claudiaf.vargas@campusucc.edu.co)

del pensamiento complejo y, por su parte, el neo-atéismo, para vigorizar su naturaleza crítico-revisionista y encuadrada para producir cambios, se registraran en lo real cotidiano.

**Palabras claves:** bioética, bioética global, feminismo, pensamiento complejo, neo-atéismo.

### **The Feminist Movement**

Feminism was not only a theory of the feminist movement as is often speculated, it is also a theory of human society that eventually led to a planetary movement; but with emphasis on the gender condition, in this case, reassessing and revalidating the human condition of being female. The woman is a human condition, for which it is suggestive to remember the theoretical approach and the epistemological look that Fernando Mires provides with his article, *The Feminist Revolution* published in the *Nueva Sociedad Magazine* of 1996.

Since not all feminist movements sought to overthrow Patriarchy per se, or cause a revolution with the established status quo (Stablismnt), nor did they seek to combat Patriarchy and Masculinity installed in the human mind and praxis at all costs since the subject is subject and the woman lives with the man.

Feminism was born to be a mass movement, to later be widely disseminated throughout the planet, except for non-Western cultures. Feminist theory is interesting not only for the revisionist contributions, about the social roles of both men and women, but also for the duration in time and for having had the ability to be permeated and mutate with its passing to establish contributions to western societies, basically. Relying on his theoretical set, to date he has provided not only initiatives for other social movements, which are translated into concrete collective social actions as defined by Tilly & Wood (2012), revolutionary collective actions -without wanting to be- as happened with the murder of the three Mirabal sisters<sup>7</sup> by the Dominican dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo in 1960. Where from this cruel murder the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women is commemorated or also called the International Day of Gender Non-Violence, which was promoted by the Movement Latin American Feminist.

Feminism has been an important movement, because for a social action to last over time, taking the French Revolution as a starting point, and going through the sociopolitical movement of the Suffragettes, it can be quantitatively deduced that there are almost 220 years of actions and struggles. of marked confrontation, which to date has also sponsored and promoted social action movements, with its most concrete and contemporary achievements such as the LGTBI, Anti-Racism groups, among others (Oliveira, 1995).

The mere fact of mentioning them implies an analysis of a social totality subdivided into historical and social partialities, as is evident in the footer (That is to say, each movement, even when it started from initiatives of the feminist organization, not all of them arose based on the same reasoning, causes and historical justifications). To which Mires gives us the academic and historical reason when he affirms that feminism is not only about the feminist movement, but also the struggles

---

<sup>7</sup> Ciriaco de la Rosa, one of the murderers, would later recount it: «After capturing them, we led them to the place near the abyss, where I ordered Rojas Lora to take sticks and take one of the girls away. He complied with the order immediately and took one of them, the one with the long braids (María Teresa). Alfonso Cruz Valerio chose the tallest (Minerva), I chose the shortest and chubby (Patria) and Malleta, the driver, Rufino de La Cruz. I ordered each one to enter a cane field on the side of the road, all separated so that the victims would not witness the execution of each one of them [...] I tried to prevent this horrendous crime, but I could not, because I had direct orders from Trujillo and Johnny Abbes Garcia. Otherwise, they would have killed us all. (ABC newspaper. ES).

and practices of women, even if they are not feminists. Therefore, this movement has been built as a theoretical link from a social movement, which adds both non-feminist women and those who are (Mires, 1999).

This theoretical set (of postulates, premises and other elements) served as the basis for other sociocultural movements as is evident. This conformation -sociocultural- gives it the vitality that time has obtained, even if not always with the same intensity. The feminine condition as a human condition allows agreements and disagreements to be part of the dynamics of humanity, due to its very human condition from the perspective of Hannah Arendt (Sanchez, 2012). That is why, within the infinity of feminist movements, none has been homogeneous in relation to their ideas and even less in approaches or causes of their undertaking against patriarchal domination or fight for their rights to equality (Mires, 1999).

But it is this coming and going of reasoning and positions that gives the most vitality and dynamic meaning to this reflective writing. Because debates and diatribes are forces that give dynamics to the fight (Mires, 1996). Its different positions inwards on the one hand, and on the other, when they are shown to the rest of society, is what gives it the wealth of sui generis epistemological and ideological positions of great interest for its more detailed study. The number of positions around feminism throughout history makes gender one of the most diverse tools of struggle through identity and discursive construction (of a historiographical nature as well as others); which brings together interesting characteristics to be examined in greater depth. And like every social position that comes from feminism, it has its casuistic or original properties. Well, for this reason, it cannot be expressed that there is a position that is more feminist than another (Mires, 1999).

Feminism, even with an arduous and tiring task ahead, continues to fight not only against the forms of patriarchy, but as Mires rightly points out, its fight is more tenacious than that factor, it fights against the vastest fronts, towards an economic order, a culture, a system, a civilization. So, all the different forms and expressions of reality that feminism confronts are lumped together in the concept of patriarchy (Mires, 1996). Feminism does not consist, up to now, in denying patriarchy according to Mires's approach, but it is worth emphasizing that starting from this denial -almost outright- it also starts from a "dualistic scheme" of a binomial conception of pure positions - that sometimes they can become entrenched in their niches similar to the Marxists (Fonseca & Alvaro, 2015).

This philosophical and life dualism, specifically, generates reasonable properties for his own struggle of objectives -immediate or not-, as well as antagonistic relationships with his peers if he is approached from the premise of that patriarchy forges elements and concepts that are opposed to the emancipation of women in itself; validity criticism for our analytical purpose, since the north is to skip this dualism that often generates obstacles or complications for both genders.

It is a dualism, for example, where patriarchy as a philosophy of domination has managed to establish itself with unique forms and expressions, considering that the concept of patriarchy cannot be a localizable reality, nor a specific place, because it has various forms. To which it could be said that the construction of the concept of patriarchy is a power that is micro-physically represented in habits, people, institutions, people and places (Mires, 1996). And to combat a multidimensional reality such as patriarchy, an ideology with an explanatory and penetrating capacity for complexity was needed, such as feminism, according to Kate Millet, one of the most penetrating ideologies of our culture (Millet, 1971, p. 25, quoted by Mires, p. 3).

It is penetrating and combative also due to its essence and consideration now founded on the basis of Bioethics as a discipline of recent study. To combat the radical position and male predominance, she needs this. Boscán is certain when stating that bioethics has an ethical treatment of both biomedical and social factors, and from the focus on preserving biodiversity oriented towards the survival of Humanity, what is will be useful to gender theorists and feminists to glimpse the plausible dilemmas to these dilemmas brought by diverse gender and sex groups, but also for anti-patriarchal heterosexual people (Boscan, 2015).

In relation to this approach, it is that it makes room for the presence of Bioethics, but not just anyone, it is a Global Bioethics that intentionally allows addressing the enormous complexity of cognitive or knowledge alternatives such as bounded dualism.

However, Global Bioethics focused on our criteria obliges us to mention a specific case, for the purposes of our analysis the article on Women and Contraception has been selected. some brief Notes by Javier de la Torre; This deals with the controversial issue of contraception in men and women, how this human fact is understood, whose implications stand out due to the order established by the patriarchy of masculinity (Castañeda, 2007) undaunted by the advances of feminism (De la Torre, 2010).

Within the framework of reflections by Javier De la Torre, the following stand out: The fact that the responsibility for contraception falls almost exclusively on the female gender, there is a domestic solidarity of the feminine about this action where it is not conceivable that the man as such is responsible or co-responsible for induced human non-reproduction (MacArthur, 2001).

### **Bioethics and feminism: points to elucidate**

The condition of being female involves her once in which the exclusivity of contraception is in the hands of the woman: it is not the man who takes care of himself. And indeed, this is how Western human logic is structured, since most contraceptives are intended for women's bodies, despite the fact that some of them suffer hormonal or metabolic effects due to their use. For this reason, De la Torre points out how contraceptives harmed women, represented damage to their health, and affected their body image (De la Torre, 2010), but they are a preferable risk and damage compared to abortion or abandonment.

In this case, dismembering the woman's self-esteem, bearing the weight of a unique responsibility that in case of failure -one of them- would be blamed on her, her responsibility for an unplanned child, as if consummating the conception was one side (De la Torre, 2010). We see that in the historical development of family planning, the woman becomes responsible for reasons of imposition, economics or health. Also, if the woman continuously uses planning methods, it tends to symbolize that she is dangerous, or that she is an easy woman (De la Torre, 2010).

In conclusions nine and eleven of his book, De la Torre explains how patriarchy has been empowered to the extent that male children inherit this cultural matrix, as if the performance of birth control of a nucleus only depends on the women's value system. Sex and sexuality, according to the Judeo-Christian tradition, are only intended for procreative purposes, therefore, contraception methods and techniques are denied, and if approved, it must be the woman who takes charge without deciding neither does she alone (De la Torre, 2010).

From certain religions, especially the monotheistic and Abrahamic contraception is considered against the origin of life, it is unnatural as is known, and since it is not "it is against the will of God". This conclusion, like others, leads us to rethink the condition of being a woman in the new model of family and marriage attached to the era of modernity. De la Torre ends by stating why the feminist movement has truly defended a woman's will to be a mother. The theory of feminism, by adopting this position, denies the criteria of forcing women as an entity responsible for this human activity, she is forced by the establishment of the univocal scheme of patriarchy (De la Torre, 2010). In these examples, global bioethics intervenes and intercedes in order to review the role of each one.

There are multiple examples to point out when it comes to global Bioethics, but we are interested in the relationships between bioethics and feminism as a current of thought provided with fundamental changes worth considering if you want to transform real contexts with pre-eminence in patriarchy. But the theory of feminism has not only stopped at dismantling the artificial limits of the woman that threatens her authentic and unique voluntariness as a being and bearer of codes of thought, different views and cultural patterns that can offer us elements to break or crack paradigms. understood as modes of imposition that have deprived at this point of the present.

To the extent that bioethics takes place in historical time, it is exalted with its duration, it is part of the contemporary validity while the challenges increase, because the demands of the modern world border on postmodernity according to the historical context that is placed. Bioethics today is an anchor point, a cornerstone from which to start to question individualist positions rooted in the "masculine rationality" still prevailing in the enveloping globe of globalization of ideas that sustain a perfidious rationality based on overly ambitious universalist aspirations that they confiscate the dynamics of the real (León-Correa, 2008), that is, they are based on the well-known ethics of action established by the Chilean professor Francisco León.

Its aspirations are truly universalist because -as clinical ethics as perceived by Professor León- it has become a series of implications and impositions embodied in the daily reality that is built day after day. That they have imposed themselves by providing realities such as masculine exercises that are reified

If one starts from Bioethics as practical ethics according to the analytical view of León (León-Correa, 2008) it translates into a commitment to an unquestionable practice full of deontological layers that are forged from a rationality specified with individualistic human acts that propose only the masculine gaze of reality until now instituted. The foundation of the practical ethics of action (León-Correa, 2008) it makes it possible to revalidate or re/propose imposed masculinity as a flexible practical position for most societies around the globe. As he approaches it, Bioethics until the first ten years of the 21st century, has divided into 2 aspects: one of a practical nature based on masculine ethics.

Bioethics, being a discipline of recent date, has been erected with the common problems of the construction of subjectivities and intersubjectivities typical of modern ideology. But the stage of bioethical peace, which Lydia Feito questions -correctly- is one of the academic obstacles and the achievable development for this global disciplinary current of great help (Feito, 2010). That vital academic peace <in due time> is interfered with and intervened by the critical diagnosis that the author reiterates the minute she decides to broaden the voices that make up the feminist vision, seeing them as unquestionable contributions to the science of Global Bioethics. Becoming a dissenting

voice that cannot be silenced with the ease of other academic currents of thought that have become in the world history of ideas.

Said dissenting voice of Feito enters into a correlation of proposals conjugated with the reactions of feminism that as a current of action was raised by León-Correa, since he protests feminism in the ethical defense of the violated and unfair situation of the female sex (León-Correa, 2008) raised by the liberal civilization: economist and individualist. They are a series of critiques of enormous value due to their essential and inexcusable nature from the very moment in which they are forged in the dynamics of contemporary thought, I am referring to the moment in which Simone de Beauvoir writes her central work with which she contributes to the cracking and rethinking of the paradigm. masculine rationalist bounded above (Feito, 2010).

It is no longer just a superficial critique of the feminist current to the patriarchal society as a denunciation, where the male standard predominates, it is how the feminist approach, more than an option to take, is a feasible and credible bet for the search for solutions that bring them closer instead of distancing them sociologically and ontologically.

Nor is it just a critique of the alleged value neutrality that have been held as valid positions and deontologically established by patriarchal masculinity. For that, the ethical theories that only originate from the androcentric vision must be reviewed <as she rightly argues> when she asserts to do without half of humanity: the female gender. Since their criticisms are accurate in terms of their intention to break down patriarchal barriers by changing the structural and attitudinal aspects of the feminist vision in order to modify from the base of the prevailing reality in search of the emancipation of women as authentic and dignified beings.

To be heard as a different voice if the paradigmatic model of the male is to be overcome, where the ethics of care has an essential presence (Palazzani, 2008), be a contemporary bioethical possibility to be considered as a complementary proposal that allows us to ensure a better human condition between both genders based on the construction of a more equitable society (Feito, 2010). The opposite is starting from an incomplete perspective, without the possibility of meeting with the other half of the planet's inhabitant, it is a non-dialectical perspective of universal thought, without a true universal aspiration of human thought when a single version of the Bioethics; bioethics, until now, reductionist, with any other adjective that is not that of Global<sup>8</sup>.

Thus, contemporary bioethics faces the challenge of approaching, palpating combinatorial, establishing a credible dialogical relationship with which empirical and evaluative communication channels are allowed -which, although different from each other- complement each other dialectically and philosophically. It is the element of the universality of the empirical ethics of the human that makes it a complete vision of the human, since global bioethics is not the translation of a single version of the human condition, it is the complementary and dialectical interaction between man and the woman – regardless of gender condition – which redefines the challenge of being a better human for the planet and for oneself.

The mere fact of proposing the use of an empirical ethics of complementary exchange is already an original non-reducing premise consubstantiated with the genuine awareness of being for

---

<sup>8</sup> The Spanish Feito clarifies that the perspective of a local or partial Bioethics is already obsolete as when its causes were from the field of medicine and health as is still thought and believed: it is part of the artificial limits instituted by feminism of before; another of the criticisms established by her about those first steps of gender studies or biomedicine among others (2010).

what one is. Alluding to the complementary perception of what each one (a) represents without confiscating the essential (representative) contents of their ontological conditions.

A deontology of the global is needed that nourishes this perspective or analytical approach to the human condition, a dialectical combination of codes that complement each other to account for a dialogical ethics of the empirical, of the dialectic of different, but not incompatible, visions. nor intransigent of one gender in front of or next to the other. It is vital that gender condition provided with a willingness to open their own diversity conditions that define and redefine them within fairness, once again Feito points out that currently there is a need to open a cultural and social diversity and cultural (Feito, 2010) which is rather a claim for justice, where bioethics must be global.

The undoubted need for global bioethics whose undertaking is an immediate task for its realization that does not deviate from its genuine condition of its being of its kind is palpable. This essential condition of the genre is subject to the need for that opening of diversity of a social and cultural nature, as Feito assures, it is an opening with an intrinsic dynamic provided with changing definitions and redefinitions -within fairness- as a result of the same condition. human, is redefined to give rise to that opening and reopening of limited daily diversity. Specifically, in what is stated, global bioethics has its essential condition in the human capacity to be fair; It is in this sense of fairness that the element or piece of an empirical ethics of the universality of humanity is raised, an intrinsic dynamic that rescues part of the human condition as Arendt proposed it in order to become global (Sanchez, 2012).

Insofar as the conjugated meeting of different empirical ethics founded on social and cultural diversity brings us closer, borders us towards a complete vision of the human, to the dialectical condition of being more just with those who accompany it on the planet, the diverse interaction A more content approach to what it means to be fully human is part of the social. Said interaction is the dialectical conjugation that is based on the gender condition always in the search for a complete vision of the human, it requires encompassing and opening <and including> more people to the gender condition to be more just focused from the complement of humanity.

With a universalist ambition –such a human condition of gender- it stands as an initiative of sociocultural diversity that necessarily entails that named complementary and dialectical interaction between man and woman –or another gender condition-; of course, without denigrating any of its experiential angles that give the temporary place to the universal and the global. In this case, the global is not just a remembrance, it is not a snobbish position, nor is it an ephemeral intellectual claim. The global here is an active claim of the ethical, but it is an ethics of action aimed at complementing the missing ontological in the masculine rationality imposed by the duration of historical time.

From the contributions of Feito and León, global Bioethics contains practical implications that stem from an empirical ethic whose condition is the inclusive sense of being, being fairer with the diversity of others, it also contains the integration of empirical knowledge different from the structure patriarchal rationale imposed as indicated.

The global is a non-rhetorical adjective that disagrees with the traditional and practical man-woman dualism known, the global seeks to understand that empirical gender condition that is created and recreated by dissipating sexual, legal, social or other barriers sustained by patriarchal rationality. Global Bioethics dismantles the implanted discursive monologues, the non-dialogical monologues that

run the trail of feminism, which are viewed from a single disintegrating vision of the completeness of what is human.

In many aspects, other analytical approaches are necessary with certainties that allow clarifying the construction of a complexity that implies being dismantled for the development of global bioethics. It is from such approaches and intellectual certainties that the density of the roles and sociocultural roles of already instituted dualisms is reviewed, and of the dualist approaches of reflection and openness to the diversities empirically adopted by human interaction to the present.

### **The need for a dialogic dualism between E, Morin – M, Corbi and Neo-Atheism**

In relation to the dualisms and the validity of the cognitive contributions of Morin's complexity together with the Neo-atheism analyzed by Álvaro Castillo and Sergio Osorio, the following reflections are elaborated. It must be realized that the conception of the dual is not only reduced to the debate regarding patriarchy and gender, since it encompasses other human activities, as indicated by Sergio Osorio and Álvaro Castillo in *Complex Thought and Silent Knowledge: The Morin - Corbí Dialogue*, the real role of dualism is also translated into an ontological relationship of philosophical and integral importance, and due to the complexity of the subject it is essential to address the ideological field and that of positions related to the belief systems of religions (Alvaro & Osorio, 2014).

Both, beyond a simple analysis, have emphasized the certainty of new positions arising from the theoretical-practical reflections of Edgar Morin where he establishes with certainty that religious insufficiency in a deep context of man, incapable of pursuing the forms privative tied to this or that faith and/or dogma, church or which, should cause it to be integrated into many activities considered non-religious (Morin, 1968, Quoted by Alvaro & Osorio, 2014).

His reflective knowledge reveals how he is incapable of being tied to any religious position in itself, but he admits that an intrinsic necessity to the human being that cannot be submitted to the simple analysis of unilateral positions provided by the religions themselves, since there are a multiplicity of forms religious assumed by men that are necessary for both believers and non-believers as a result of the conclusive metaphor which I use to unravel how one is not possible without the other, since no light will dissolve the shadow.

It is the human reflection of the essential of one without the other: there is no atheism without dogma and vice versa in equal conditions and perspectives. It is a coexistence of positions that are unraveled and delivered from a unique dialectical form, it unravels a human dialectic that should not ignore or set aside those other activities considered non-religious located in those underground regions for many religious or Westerners (Alvaro & Osorio, 2014).

It is a dialectic of thought that is not installed on the construction of the innate binomial or dualism of our societies, since each light gives birth to another shadow that accompanies it (Alvaro & Osorio, 2014), without disdain and without hierarchies that deteriorate one another, knowing that one feeds on the other and they cannot coexist or coexist unless this ontological nutrition is understood, which creates the complex thought that each human being (subject to his nature of bio power to develop with his presumed stay of interaction in the balloon).

It is worth digressing, there are a variety of approaches to address the dialectic of the nature of biopower (a term originating from Michel Foucault), one of them is focused on the posthumanism of José A. Mainneti, to name a few of them, who defines it as a cultural techno-futurist movement,



which is between the ideological and the utopian since it pursues the self-transformation of the human race, from the complexion of its improvement, which will soon be a new goal for doctors, outside the traditional approach of opinion and disease treatment (Mainetti, 2014 cited by Pessini, 2017).

Continuing, unraveling this complex approach implies recognizing the repertoire of lights and shadows that dissect its complex nature, which subsumes it in the labyrinth of intersubjective relationships that feed its objective sense of taking positions and adopting systems that accredit it for its very human freedom of choose, the more orthodox or dogmatic a position (light) is, the more shadow it casts or emits over its own ontological existence built with the care of a Tibetan monk –just to mention one-.

Morin's complex-epistemological approach leads us to unravel intellectual darkness such as neo-atheism, which is that neo-atheism does not come to be a rational approach with which people can reasonably believe in a supernatural or superior reality; perhaps a more combined position that can show the existence of a magical, symbolic and mythical dimension of the real (2015). How men construct and construct their reality, filled with symbolic and mythical constructs that surround most of the societies known up to now, is an activity beyond study; this position gives us the intellectual possibility of believing or not believing, but what.

It is true that it is a starting point position that deserves to recognize the other from its symbolic dimension magical as both propose. It is this dimension that makes the human being real as it is and in what objectification it is, it is a position of human existence not only dual but of each religious position that appropriates the essence and the source of what it means to be human because it is structured from the libertarian sense, from the emancipatory content that each man and woman can become reciprocally without central hierarchies that disfavor the shadow instead of the light (idem). He is part of that mythical-religious dimension that inhabits his condition of being, which he does from a tactical logic of positioning the world that surrounds him, it is a structure of the real-human that covers him with complex reflections necessary to consider or be done at this time.

Despite being part of it, of what human existence is, that is, it should not be undertaken through a theoretical-conceptual elaboration because meaning is lost if it tends towards a perceptive angle of one or the other. It is difficult to start from a certain creed for the comprehensive level of what is wanted to be expressed as an ontological construct of the dimension of neo-atheism understood as a position of recognition and self-recognition of the other as its own existence populated by human conditions –whether orthodox or no- that pose the challenge of an order of a different dimension of reality, but similar to the position of those who prosecute or issue an opinion in front of a believer.

This is because neo-atheism does not mean the negation of the dogmatic religious, much less the damage or destruction of those who do not share our position <even in the same human acts considered non-religious ontologically there are and persist characteristics or constructs related to this mythical-religious dimension>. In itself, this position of neo-atheism reconfigures life positions to unleash a dialectic of beliefs that subvert complex elaborations; same that can be taken for granted as certain or true from an absolute referent, on the contrary, they rework it from a certainty with a revisionist sense willing to reconsider from a human condition provided with a critical fabric after the endless task of understanding ontologically what it is. Human is in itself for what it is, or ultimately for what it represents to itself or to others.

## Conclusions

Feminism has been a mass movement of a different nature, it is a current that defends the voluntariness of women, its theory is adapted without going out of style, with the purpose of accepting more equitable positions that make women a more responsible entity for yes and for others. It is in charge of breaking the patriarchal schemes to accommodate other approaches to life such as the aforementioned contraception and it is there that the capital role of Global Bioethics intervenes and intercedes.

This is possessed of universalist aspirations by its very critical-revisionist nature and framed to produce changes, since it has key meeting points with feminism by coinciding with the arduous task of detecting and delving into diverse implications that are registered in everyday reality. Likewise, if one starts from Bioethics as practical ethics according to the analytical view of León-Correa (2008). They are key because Together they signify and combine in a bet full of innovative deontological strata that are forged from a rationality that is neither masculine nor androcentric, but based on the practical ethics of action (León-Correa, 2008), more flexible as a position since it considers, from its inclusive character, the foundations of processes of subjectivities constructors of an active empirical ethics.

By considering this approach and its inclusive purposes of diversity, they make it a renewed Global Bioethics from its proposals -as a voice difficult to silence- since it dismantles rationalist monologues instituted without containing the essential human condition of the dialogic that disintegrate the completeness of the human as a necessary condition of being.

In addition to feminism, global bioethics -due to this same characteristic condition of being global- is linked to contributions such as Morin-Corbin's complexity, as well as the meaning of neo-atheism, whose position is not the denial of the religious world. -dogmatic, neither supports the prejudice by the other; it dialectically reconfigures life positions, considering them ways to subvert the realities established on unequivocal beliefs that are taken for granted, denigrating those who do not share their 'partial position'.

In effect, neo-atheism seeks to refocus from different certainties and with critical elaborations to reconsider human life and its interaction (from the Global), but provided with the human condition of understanding ontologically what it means to be human in itself, and what the representations social and cultural flows into the daily thoughts, words and actions of human beings.

## Bibliographic References

- Alvaro, C., & Osorio, S. (2014). *La Bioética a la Luz de las epistemologías de segundo orden. El aporte crítico de Edgar Morin, Marià Corbí y Carlos Castañeda*. Bogotá D.C.: Universidad Militar Nueva Granada.
- Boscan, A. (2015). *La Bioética Feminista y la Construcción actual del género*. *Revista Opción*, 31(5), 162-188.
- Castañeda, M. (2007). *El machismo invisible regresa*. Taurus. Penguin Random House Grupo.
- De la Torre, J. (2010). *Mujer, Mujeres y Bioética*. Universidad Pontificia Comillas.
- El Diario ABC de España. (2009). *España. Sucesos*. <https://www.abc.es>.
- Feito, L. (2010). *Aspectos Filosóficos de la Relación entre las mujeres y la bioética*. En J. Torres. *Mujer, Mujeres y Bioética* (pp. 19-58). Universidad Pontificia Comillas.
- Fonseca, E., & Alvaro, D. (2015). *El método Podemos: marketing marxista para partidos no marxistas*. *Líneas libres*.

- Fundación Macarthur. (2001). Ideas feministas sobre bioética. *Revista Estudios Feministas*, 483-51.
- León-Correa, F. J. (2008). Ética del cuidado feminista y bioética personalista. *Persona y Bioética*, 12(1), 53-61.
- Mires, F. (1999). La revolución femenina. En F. Mires. *La revolución que nadie soñó o la otra posmodernidad* (pp. 53.89). Nueva Sociedad.
- Oliveira, F. (1995). Feminismo, lucha antirracista y bioética. *Cuadernos Pagu*, 5, 73-107.
- Palazzani, L. (2008). La contribución de la bioética en femenino a la praxis del cuidado. *Azafea Revista de Filosofía*, 10, 145.157.
- Pessini, L. (2017). Bioética, humanismo e pós-humanismo no século XXI. Em busca de um novo ser humano? *Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, 77(306), 301-347.
- Sanchez, G. M. (2012). Lo nuevo en el mundo: La perspectiva de Hannah Arendt. *Revistas Anales*, 3, 189-196.
- Tilly, CH., & Wood, L. (2012). *Movimientos Sociales*. Londres. Inglaterra: Edit. Taylor & Francis.