Self-Care (*selbstsorge*) in Times of Pandemic: Hermeneutical Research of COVID-19 Disease

Arturo G. Rillo[1], Beatriz Elina Martínez-Carrillo[1]
[1] Faculty of Medicine / Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, Mexico
Corresponding Author: dr_rillo@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT: *The human being is-in-the-world carrying out his life project; But since December 2019, the SARS-CoV-2 virus has generated changes in the world's perception of it. Given the current challenges in a world in a pandemic, what possibilities does self-care (selbestsorge) offer to understand the world of life during and after the COVID-19 pandemic? Reflecting on this question, the study was carried out with the purpose of analyzing, from the scope of philosophical hermeneutics, self-care in times of the COVID-19 pandemic. Philosophical reflection is directed towards understanding self-care as the ontological-existential structure of actions to transcend the human crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic; In such a way that a horizon of meaning opens up to the responsibility of moving from the inauthentic existence to the authentic existence. The ways of being-there are analyzed to understand the world of oneself, the scene where self-care takes place. Through awareness of health and the deconstruction of medical tradition, self-awareness and self-care of health are uncovered as bonds of a moral nature that imply responsibility and solidarity with oneself. It concludes in the responsibility of the human being to advise himself a good life through self-care, practical solidarity, self-accompaniment; concretely, in advised assent.*

KEYWORDS: *Self-care; COVID-19 disease; hermeneutic; self-awareness; health awareness; solidarity.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The human being is in the world of life engaged in a constant process of realization through which, he specifies the desire to be and exist; that is to say, the human being is in and through life; of a life that is characterized by the possibility of being comprehensively appropriate when traveling through the world where the human being is thrown; a world that surrounds it, surrounds it and links it.

Since December 2019, the human being began the recognition of a world that now seems strange to him, a world that was not the world known to recent generations; a world that is heading for a crisis, but it will not be economic, social or environmental; it is a world in crisis due to the pandemic of the COVID-19 disease [1]. Now he is immersed in a world that is exposed as an environment delimited by the latent risk of becoming ill and even dying, after acquiring the disease produced by the SARS-CoV-2 virus [2]. Preventive [3], diagnostic [4], therapeutic [5] and rehabilitation measures [6], both at the individual and the population level, have generated different impacts on the daily life of human beings. Under these conditions, how is life lived?

The effects produced by limiting the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus go beyond mental health or socioeconomic implications [7]. Now, the use of face masks [8] prevents looking at the other's face; respect the physical distance between people [9], prevents the fraternal feeling of the sensation of perceiving the other; implementing social distancing [10] prevents connivance as a substrate for human solidarity and is leading the human being to value voluntary social isolation as an instrument of survival.

We can agree to implement these measures [11], but if they are insufficient and COVID-19 disease is acquired, what does it mean to be sick? The COVID-19 pandemic is motivating understanding of health and disease in existential and ontological terms [12]. How does the patient with this disease live his life? Faced with the pandemic, society begins to recognize the spiritual dimension of the health-disease process [13], and recovers the suffering of the patient, as a substantive axis for the medical-care treatment of the patient with COVID-19 disease. What about the fear of getting sick from COVID-19? Fear has neurobiological and evolutionary foundations that allow the conservation of the species [14]. But access to mass media, where the presence and evolution of particular cases affected by the COVID-19 disease are exposed in real time [15], have exacerbated the perception of fear in its social, physical and metaphysical dimensions; to such a degree that overinformation is exposed as an element linked to the fear of becoming ill [16]. What happens to the anguish of finding hospital care in case of illness? Linked to fear is anxiety, but now it is about the emotional state determined by having timely access to health services and therapeutic resources that make it possible to achieve a cure [17]. How do you deal with the waiting time to be vaccinated? Vaccination schemes against the SARS-

---

CoV-2 virus have started worldwide. Now, the human being is integrated into a waiting liquid society, where hope is linked to the event in the future of the possibility of maintaining an optimal state of health, hope that makes conscious the perception of time in its conjunction of past, present and future.

It is possible to continue the dialogue circumscribed by the question and answer dialectic, but we must understand that the reflection of the questions that derive from being-in-the-world during a pandemic can lead the dialogue in multiple ways. Among these paths, lines of reflection have been opened from the social, psychological, biomedical, sociological, anthropological and philosophical scope.

In the field of philosophy, the analysis is confined mainly to ethical reflection [18], although other lines of reflection have also been explored [19-21]. For Gadamer, philosophy means asking questions about the truth and the good that allow the human being to direct the need to seek the truth, but not in a contemplative way, on the contrary, it is a dialectical activity between the modes of existence and the consciousness of being-in-the-world, in this dialectical game, the human being carries out a living exchange with the world of life. Thus, philosophy is the process that enables the dialectical exchange between the different ways in which human life is articulated and that is specified in the elaboration of those questions that arise from the interaction with the world of life and that have not yet we understand [22]; so, philosophy has the sense in which it "encompasses the mysteries of the beginning and the end, of being and nothing, of birth and death, and above all of good and evil." (p. 181) [23]. Following this line of reflection, the horizon circumscribed by the teachings provided by the COVID-19 pandemic to understand the world of life in times of pandemic shows the ability of human beings to take care of themselves. How is self-care (*selbstsorge*) structured? What possibilities does self-care (*selbstsorge*) offer to understand the world of life during and after the COVID-19 pandemic? To explore these questions, the study was carried out with the purpose of analyzing, from the scope of philosophical hermeneutics, self-care (*selbstsorge*) in times of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The thesis that is developed is that self-care represents a fundamental line of reflection to understand the actions that human beings carry out to transcend the human crisis caused by the pandemic of the COVID-19 disease; so that he is faced with the responsibility of traveling the existential path that begins with the impropriety of life and ends when it is located in the property of life. In this sense, he begins by identifying the existential response that human beings can implement in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic in its two forms: self-existence and improper existence. The characterization of both modes of existence provides the basis for exploring the understanding of the world of the self, a fundamental antecedent to venture into the analysis of self-care. Finally, health awareness is analyzed in times of pandemic through the deconstruction of medical tradition, which makes it possible to open the horizon of understanding to self-awareness and self-care of health as a link of a moral nature that implies responsibility and practical solidarity with himself.

II.   EXISTENTIAL RESPONSE TO COVID-19: PROPERTY AND IMPROPRIETY

The COVID-19 pandemic has modified the social patterns to which the human being was accustomed; that is, the world is being interpreted in another way to respond to the conditions that are becoming everyday in the praxis of life. For example, considering the scenarios that have prevailed in the course of the pandemic [11], the work centers function partially [24], the meeting centers for social coexistence and physical health care have closed their facilities intermittently, the centers Religious have practically closed their facilities to religious worship practices [25], educational centers have switched to virtual teaching modalities to maintain social distancing among students [26], means of transport have regulated the number of people in each unit of transport; the distribution centers for basic necessities have implemented home deliveries and reduced the number of people inside the commercial premises [27]. Hospital centers have closed complete sections to allocate them to the hospitalization of patients with COVID-19 disease, to the detriment of care for patients with other diseases [28]. How to carry out the life project that each person has when the world is no longer as it was known before the pandemic?

From the analytic of being, it is recognized that the human being is-in-the-world to be realized as a project in the evolution of the daily happening of being-there (*Dasein*). To realize yourself in the world, you need to appropriate it. This appropriation, Heidegger points out [29], manifests itself in two existential modes of being-there: the improper mode of existence (inauthentic life) and the own mode of existence (authentic life). Considering these two possibilities of existence, how to appropriate the world to carry out the project that is the human being?

Own existence, related to authentic life, is the basic form of human fulfillment [30]; so that the way of being proper to human life resides in the here (*Da*) of being (*Sein*) and is within the reach of those who are resolutely projecting themselves towards their own death. This does not imply that the human being has the death wish, on the contrary, it is an existential determination of the human being as he transits in his becoming towards death [31]: he is born to die and lives to die. Being for death refers to the process of being aware of the death of oneself. Thus, in his own existence, the human being moves actively in the world that he inhabits, projecting himself towards the multiple possibilities that he finds in becoming him towards death. In his longing

to carry out the project he is carrying out, he takes charge of his own existence and becomes aware of his death. In its *ex-sistence*, it acquires the awareness of being-healthy and knowing-healthy by linking both processes in self-care and self-awareness of their health that derives from medical tradition, because in their own existence, the human being takes charge of the tradition through awareness of effective history [32].

The improper existence, linked to the inauthentic life in which the human being can fulfill himself, implies passive mobility when he is-in-the-world [30]; he lives in an uncritical way because he does the same thing that others are doing; he sees with the eyes of others, what others see; he talks about what others are talking about, without confronting his ideas and opinions; By tacitly accepting the opinion of others, it exists subject to and governed by the will of others, regulated by the normativity of the public opinions of the mass, of civil society, of the One (*das Man*), Heidegger will say [29]; and, in relation to the pandemic, because of the scientific dogmatism and the anonymity of the scientific authority that is expressed through disinformation and conspiracy theories [33-35].

Among the characteristics of improper existence, there is the difficulty with which the human being takes care of himself, even avoiding the encounter with himself [36]; for this reason, the being-healthy is daily in the impropriety of life, because the human being does not take charge of the real conditions in which he is existing. In the improper existence, being-healthy and knowing-healthy implies traveling through the world ignoring the movement of historical gestation of the relationship with oneself; that is, the human being lives, simply, life. In this existential condition, the human being in a state of health or illness appropriates the world of health through referents imposed by the environment in which it operates, an event that makes it impossible for it to appropriate, through its construction and critical assimilation, of the previous horizon of understanding in which the world of each one moves (*Selbstwelt*). For the human being in the improper existence, being-healthy and knowing-healthy is a passive process, where the movement between self-care and self-awareness of health is subject to the passivity of being-in-the-world.

Under the Heideggerian scheme of proper and improper existence, what does this perspective imply to understand the events of the COVID-19 pandemic from the field of philosophical hermeneutics? Undoubtedly, the relevance of the pandemic lies in the fact that it is encouraging the human being to rediscover the ability to make a new way of life, understood as a project, movement and realization in time. The human being is a being under construction, that is, it is a being that, existentially, is a doing-it through time to the extent that he lives life, be it improperly or properly. Doing yourself in time implies a movement between the authenticity and inauthenticity of life that can be passive or active [37]. The result of the movement of the human being in the historicity of his being is shown in factual life through self-awareness and self-care of health.

In this scenario, the movement of the human being between the improper existence and the own existence, implies a topological and temporal distance. Topologically, the distance is reflected in the transmission of the medical tradition that determines self-awareness and self-care of health. Temporarily, the human being is in time; For this reason, self-awareness of being-in-the-world is determined, on the one hand, by the finiteness of the human being, of being-for-death; and on the other, for the responsibility of being his, self-care of health to be healthy. The COVID-19 pandemic takes place in a specific place, time and group of people, so the self-awareness of the health of the self is exceeded by the factuality of existence.

In these two modes of existence to face the COVID-19 pandemic, the passive movement of the impropriety of being-healthy exposes the need to undertake the deconstruction of the stereotypes transmitted by the medical tradition to gain an understanding of pre-theoretical existence and reflexive human being who is anchored in inauthentic life. What is the possibility of understanding through the deconstruction of the medical tradition? Deconstructing the medical tradition when the human being is-in-the-world existing in an inauthentic way, means seeking the truth of the facts that are hidden by fake news, half-truths, false beliefs and conspiracy theories. In this sense, the self-awareness and health care that develops in authentic existence, allows to reveal the authenticity of being-healthy in the facticity of life and enables access to the horizon of understanding of the existence of being-there. The possibility of accessing the understanding of existence and keeping it open to the gaze of the human being, directs reflection towards the concrete relationship between a self and his world: the world of oneself.

III.   A WORLD IN PANDEMIC: THE WORLD OF THE SELF

To continue defining lines of philosophical reflection related to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to specify a fact and a reality. It is a fact that COVID-19 disease is a pandemic; It is undoubtedly affecting all regions of the world to a greater or lesser extent. It is a reality that the pandemic has invaded the individual world of the human being; that is, the world of life where the self is in relation to his world.

It is scientifically recognized that the global distribution of COVID-19 disease is significantly important in determining global, regional and national policies that make it possible to contain the transmission and impact of the disease [38]. But when the human being feels his world threatened, the information in other

geographical levels acquires relevance and begins to determine his behavior and actions [39]. Hence the importance of thinking in terms of the world of the self.

Following Heideggerian thought [29,40], the world appears before the human being to be understood, apprehended, internalized; so that the human being can carry out the project that is and can exist. In other words, for every person to realize their desire to be and exist, the world has to show itself to the consciousness of the person who by necessity has to interpret it, so that at the moment in which the interpretation of the world that surrounds him begins, he opens the possibility of being and existing. The appearance of the world takes place in three ways [29,40]: the surrounding world, the shared world and the world of the self. The surrounding world is the world of factual life where the human being deals with the physical, objective and concrete world, made up of objects and different situations linked to the interaction with objects [40,41]. The shared world is the social environment where the human being develops and interacts with other people who share the world of life synchronously and diachronically; it also includes relationships between people that derive from social interaction [40,42]. The world of the self is the individual and subjective world of human experiences. From the world of oneself, the relationship between factual life and the world of life to which the self is referred is established [40,43]. It is not the receptacle of everything that exists for itself, nor does it limit itself to describing the objective content of the world of factual life that surrounds it and involves it in its desire to be and exist; rather, it allows to specify a certain particular and contingent way of being, so that the human being is projected to the world as an event. Thus, the human being in the world of himself is every time he is.

In this context, what possibilities are opened to understanding when it is identified that the COVID-19 disease has invaded the world of the self? When the SARS-CoV-2 virus knocks on a person's door, the dynamic nature and historical character of factual life is activated. From the dynamic nature of the world of factual life, reality is shown to the human being as a pre-interpreted reality; reality that appears before the human being as a previously interpreted reality, from which prejudices and pre-understandings will derive. That is, when the person recognizes that he has the COVID-19 disease, all the information that he previously acquired operates in his consciousness and the existential anguish of knowing himself ill arises. On the other hand, the historicity of factual life opens up to the horizon of meaning where it is articulated with the medical tradition that is familiar to the person who has lost their state of health. It is from this horizon of meaning, from where the patient immediately understands the world of life; and in this case, his relationship with COVID-19 disease. This relationship can also translate into the risk of getting sick; or, in the probability of recovering the initial state of health, the probability of recovering the state of health and presenting sequelae, or the risk of dying.

Understanding that the human being is, simultaneously, spectator, actor, and victim, requires interpreting the world of the self, to understand the relationships of the self with the world that links it to factual life, and generating actions that, when applied, lead to take care of the world. How to enable the understanding of the spectator-actor-victim triad so that it is articulated with the Gadamerian hermeneutical circle of interpretation-understanding-application? To enter into the analysis of this question, the structure of the world of the self is reviewed below.

The world of the self, possesses the structure of being-in-the-world in its possibility of being able-to-be and in the desire to be and exist, so that this formal structure has to be realized in each case, it must unfold each time, it has to be executed each time in a different way [29,40]. In this context, the sense in which the world of the self is understood is the one that corresponds to it on each occasion when being-occupied-in-something, the horizon in which the care of life moves and existence is understood human [44]. Gadamer [45] clearly states that human existence has its authentic being in the mobility of its care, with which, by worrying about its being, it becomes its own future. What, then, is the relationship that the self establishes with its individual world to be-in-the-world as spectator, actor and victim? Heidegger points out that "the world is there as something from which we always and in some way take care of ourselves" (p. 35) [40], and in the case of the self, it is specified in the concerns of each one or the concerns of the self from which the take care of yourself.

IV.   TAKING CARE OF YOURSELF

The pandemic of the COVID-19 disease has required that the human being will have to the horizon of understanding of being-in-the-world in the possibility of being-occupied-in-something, of caring about the world that surrounds him and of do something about it for the care of life. In this horizon of understanding, the philosophical reflection on the care of life transcends the humanitarian, solidary and altruistic sphere, fundamentally of the professionals who provide care and care to patients suffering from COVID-19. This line of philosophical reflection stands out for locating the analysis in the concept of care (*Sorge*).

In Being and time, Heidegger defines care (*Sorge*) as "anticipating-itself-being-already-in- (the-world) and in-the-middle-of (the entity that appears within the world)" (p. 344) [29]; in other words, care consists of the possibility that the human being has to understand, take responsibility, worry about and take care of his experiences that occur when he is in the world, integrating the temporality of the past, the present and the future. Thus, in care, the reference to the future (anticipating-oneself) is articulated, with the reference to the past

(being-already) and with the reference to the present (in-between-the entity that appears). Following this line of Heideggerian thought, Gadamer [45] points out that care is taking care of oneself, in the same way as conscience is conscience of itself; then, caring for oneself is taking care of oneself, in which "concern for the means of subsistence, for the profession, for pleasures, for tranquility, for survival, for familiarity with things, for knowledge about of, for the consolidation of life in its ultimate goals" (p.35) [40].

The existential analytic of being-there shows that care has the following structure: existence, facticity and fall [29]. In the case of take care of oneself, it will be indicated that it has this same structure; thus, the structure of take care of oneself is integrated through existence, facticity, and fall. But when advancing in the ontological-existential analysis of the temporality of the human being, Heidegger [29,40] refers to the formula: caring for oneself = anticipating oneself, to express the affective disposition (*Befindlichkeit*) that the human being tends to manifest the pre-occupation by the subjective world of the self. This pre-occupation is specified in the direct experience of the individual world that the subject has, giving meaning to the responsibility and practical solidarity with himself; well, in the individual world, the human being plays his existential condition at every moment.

Taking care of oneself, when interpreted as the possibility of anticipating oneself, opens the horizon of understanding towards the sense of power-being, where the possibility of realizing the existential project that is proper to each human being lies [46]. In caring for himself, the human being is beyond himself, not in relation to others, but facing the power-being that he himself is, which allows the human being to anticipate the factuality of his own future through consciousness of its finitude and, according to which, its being is [47].

In factual life, self-anticipation is determined by the freedom offered by the possibility of realizing, voluntarily or involuntarily, the desire to be and exist [48]. The involuntary realization of the human being is linked to the involuntary behavior of the being-there and the impropriety of existence. In this case, the freedom to realize itself happens in an immediate and regular way in the daily life, so that in impropriety, Dasein also anticipates itself. On the other hand, the voluntary realization of the human being is linked to the voluntary behavior of the being-there in the property of existence. Thus, the freedom to realize oneself occurs when the human being becomes aware of his finitude and assumes his existence in the daily reality of factual life, as a being for death; in such a way that it anticipates-itself-being-already-in-a-world, but the property of the self remains without assuming [31], that is, "the project of the power-being of the self is left at the disposal of the one" (p. 215) [29].

When reflecting on the temporality of care that occurs in self-care, Heidegger [29] emphasizes that caring for oneself (*Selbstsorge*) is a tautology, so that through care and through the inclusion of anticipating-oneself as the achievement temporal more original of itself, the ontological narrowness of the saying-I and of the constitution resulting from the identity of the subject are overcome [45]. If self-care is the sense of care referred to the world of the self, why is it the tautology of self and care? The Heideggerian position in *Being and Time* regarding the tautology of the self and care is based on the first structural moment of care: anticipating-oneself, that is, existence, an essential moment that is present in the thrown human being in the world and that cannot be suppressed in any case and under any circumstance since the being-there of man always exists by himself [49]. Furthermore, Heidegger [29] explains that self-care is implicit both in the concept of solicitude (*fürsorge*), in caring for the other, and in that of occupation (*besorgen*), caring for things; since in both cases the possibility of being power is implied in the realization of the project that is already the human being. So how will self-care come to be accessible and targeted for comprehensive interpretation?

In the equality between self-care and self-anticipation, two referential components must be kept in mind to access the world of the self: the self that understands and that which is understood; this does not imply that it is conceptualized as a simple activity of the comprehensive consciousness [50]. These referential components refer self-care to the hermeneutical task of interpretation-understanding-application as a fundamental activity of the self in relation to its personal world and circumscribe it as a mode of happening of the same being.

The self that understands is the subject in his permanent pre-occupation for his individual world that appears before the being that is there, it is the understanding-with-his-being of human existence [29]. In other words, the accessibility and openness to the world of the self is determined by the historicity of the being in its there, so that if someone wants to reach "a true understanding of himself it is because something happens to him and something has happened to him" (p 47) [45]. Self-understanding in self-care is dominated by modern science and its methodology, so when considering the self that understands, it is not intended to justify that self-care is a self-mediation of self-awareness that binds the person with his world. It is about limiting oneself to the experience of oneself that happens to someone and that happens especially in praxis, which can eliminate from the care of oneself the false pretense of a culture based on technique and technology and thus seek the property of factual life [51-53].

What is understood as a referential condition of self-care is the relationship that is established between the natural image of the world that we have and the elusive and anonymous authority of science. Let us

remember that the image of the world derives from the experience of the world that has been permanently constructed by participating in both our life history and our life destiny [54,55]; experience that reconfigures what is transmitted by the tradition to which we belong and gives meaning to all of our concrete experience in each hermeneutical situation [32]. From the philosophical hermeneutics, what is understood refers to the inhabiting of the human being, where the self, reveals itself as itself in all its capacity and possibility of realizing itself in the existence of its dwelling in the world of life. To dwell, which is to inhabit, which is to find oneself in a place, in a house, where the human being identifies himself by existing there, not as a space that contains, limits and circumscribes him to a region or a site, but a place where the I can. "Dwelling is the very way of sustaining itself" (p. 61) [56], but also the modality of the self that allows it to differentiate itself from the other in the world and the other in the world.

The true relationship between a self and its world, which occurs when being-in-the-world, refers to the care of oneself as transparency in which it seeks to reconcile the use of the human capacity to know and to do with the whole of our life experience. This relationship does not refer to knowing oneself as expressed in the Hegelian spirit; It implies keeping in mind the set of individual and concrete experience of general and human life in which the vital experience of science has been integrated.

V. HEALTH AWARENESS IN THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

With what has been said so far, it is shown that being-healthy as a human existence in times of pandemic, is not only consciousness and self-awareness of health, but understanding them-with-respect to being-healthy; that is to say, actively take care of your health through an authentic existence. In this line of reflection, the following question arises: what is health awareness in the face of the threat posed by the COVID-19 pandemic to the fullness of what we always perceive in life?

To understand health consciousness, it is important to recognize that the consciousness of the body, the constitution of the other self (the problem of intersubjectivity) and the historically variable horizon of the world of life, are systematically opposed to the intentionality of the actions of health that gives meaning to the constitution of self-consciousness [45,57]. Recognizing this opposition, the consciousness of health that the human being acquires in the occurrence of factual life is the consciousness of the present and its anticipations, that is, the subject looks at himself here and now projecting towards his future life, the desire to be and exist. The consciousness of health is then, on the one hand, the consciousness of assuming responsibility for oneself and for oneself; and on the other, the awareness of the intention of practical solidarity for oneself. In health consciousness, intentionality, as the structure of every act of consciousness, opens the horizon of understanding to the recognition of a self that thinks, listens to, sees itself as another, as a stranger, as someone that he is out of himself, that he moves away from himself, and that he is for himself the other of the other [56,58].

Both self-awareness of health and self-care of health are limited to the preontological understanding of health and are part of the prejudices that give meaning to the structure of pre-understanding of the medical tradition; for this reason, awareness of health is subject to the technical application of scientific knowledge proper to medical science (57). The experience of the medical tradition occurs both in the property and in the impropriety of the existence of the human being.

If self-awareness and self-care of health are located in the here and now of being-there in its state of improper existence [29], they are revealed as an event that characterizes the impropriety of factual life in its daily life. That is, the intentionality of self-awareness and self-care of health in improper life, suppose a being that always remains himself, immutable in his biopsychosocial and spiritual constitution, a self that is devoid of identity and unable to access property of factual life; a human being who cannot access the authenticity of his existence, so that the consciousness of health is unable to open to the horizon of understanding where care actively moves to deal with the desire to be and exist.

This desire to be and exist in healthy conditions, is distinguished from any need, because it does not refer to something that, due to its lack, is to be satisfied, but it derives from what is desirable, that is, from the possibility of recovering its identity through everything that happens to him [58]; thus, the patient with the COVID-19 disease aspires to regain the ability to project themselves into the world of life through their desire to be-healthy and to exist healthily, overcoming the event of the disease. Health happens and this happening is something that first of all makes it possible for the entity to be uncovered and to be known correctly; In such a way that health is situated in the historicity of the human being, which is accessed through the understanding of oneself that derives from the basic approach of hermeneutics through the medical tradition [23,59].

The medical tradition also involves the conception of the clinical method used by clinical medical sciences [60]. This method does not reveal the entire reality of the health experience in its biopsychosocial and spiritual dimension, so that self-care and self-awareness of health that is promoted from the field of medical science, is subject to the biomedical needs of the patient. patient, to the needs required to obtain a biological well-being [61]. In this line of reflection, the question arises, what is the possibility of understanding the dialectic that underlies the two-way transit of self-existence and improper existence, when the human being

acquires the consciousness of health for himself and closes in itself? Exploring this question has two lines of reflection that are linked to the proper and improper existence of the human being.

In conditions of improper existence, the subject with health needs acts as if he were the owner of himself and his existence, but his project of himself is defined by the anonymity of the authority of medical science [62], which, under these conditions, is shown as pseudoscience, false news, or distortion of scientific publications when communicating them to the general population [63,64]. For this reason, the subject perceives that he is subjected by the collective demands of public health [65]; so that the intentionality of health actions contribute to guaranteeing the health security of society [66,67]. When the subject is-in-the-world existing improperly, the realization of his project is limited by institutionalized coercion through codes and norms of conduct to reduce risks to public health [68]. This is the case of subjects who deny the existence of the COVID-19 disease [69]; therefore, they experience the measures proposed to contain the transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus, as a subjection that transcends human freedom and places them in contexts of slavery and self-alienation determined both by the pressure of objectivity that dominates everything, and because of the monotony of our managed and systematized world in which everything is done as it has already been shown to be done [70].

When the human being is living his own existence, he acts to take charge, responsibly and in solidarity, of the health needs that occur in his existence [29]. The intentionality of his actions, promote health awareness through practical actions that he critically argues from the authority of medical science [62,71]. This motivates adopting the collective demands of public health to guarantee their safety and preserve their state of health [65,72]. The subject understands that by taking care of himself, he is consequently taking care of the other. Thus, the intentionality of health actions contributes to guaranteeing the health security of the world of life that surrounds it. When the human being is-in-the-world existing in his own way, the codes and norms of conduct that have been institutionalized to reduce health risks, contribute to the desire to be and exist, showing a path that enables him to open up to understanding of factual life. This is the case of the subjects who adopt sanitary protection measures against the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus [68], such as the hand washing [73], use of face masks and masks [74], keep a safe distance [75], stay at home when it is not essential to go out; They experience the measures proposed by the State authorities to contain the transmission of the SARS-Cov-2 coronavirus, such as the possibility of exercising human freedom to anticipate their project of being, placing them in open conditions to understand the world of factual life.

The horizon of understanding that directs the human being's gaze to the world subjected to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, has made it possible to understand the world through an organized social response supported by a "new normal". What implications does the "new normal" have for self-care? The measures implemented to stop the rate of progression of the COVID-19 pandemic have been grouped into what has been called the "new normal". These measures promoted by the World Health Organization are being adopted in each region at different rates. The same happens at the individual level, so we have people who perform hygienic-sanitary actions to reduce the risk of contagion [76], while other people emphatically deny the reality of the pandemic [77]. In this scenario, three types of existential approach to the "new normal" can be identified: the banal new normal, the primordial new normal and the rational new normal.

The "banal new normal" is confined to inauthentic existence, where the human being does not take charge of the real conditions in which he finds himself while inhabiting the world of life. From this perspective, the horizon of understanding has the sense of novelty, but they hide a propensity for dissatisfaction with the present, and build beliefs that foster hatred, subversion and social discontent [78]. They consider that the measures adopted to reduce the risk of contagion of the SARS-CoV-2 virus are aimed at limiting their freedom and circumscribing it to "conspiracy theories" [79,80]. To deepen the analysis, we would have to resort to empirical and scientific evidence from the context of the thought of José Ortega y Gasset (*The revolt of the masses*) [31] or Hannah Arent (the banality of evil) [82].

The "primordial new normal" recovers the historical conception of the determination of human life. Amid the longing for past times, they observe the events of the present as the vector resulting from human acts on the world of life [83]. In this sense, Talha Burki points out: "The fact that severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 derived from bat coronavirus highlights inherent issues of the way we interact with the environment" [84]. The horizon of understanding is based on a historical perspective to promote activities that contribute to solidarity and support for patients and the population at risk. This is the case of researchers, health personnel, but also of those sectors of the population that are considered of strategic interest for the care of the general population. The perception of existence seeks the historical analysis as an analogy, as is the case of the comparison of different pandemics that have affected humans [84], or the use of preventive measures to contain the spread of the disease [85,86]; also providing elements to continue the search for the multiple origin of the SARS-CoV-2 virus [87].

The "rational new normal" is closely linked to the authentic mode of existence. In this normality, the human being deals with the conditions that are determining his existence in the world, is also aware of his

finiteness and understands the possibility of opening up to the future to travel through the world of life. The horizon of understanding acquires the meaning that the awareness of effective history gives it [32]. This horizon is configured in the context to carry out actions that promote self-care, from a responsible and supportive perspective to live the good life where values are shared that help to mitigate suffering, strengthen hope and mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic [88]. In this context, it understands that the normality it faces is determined by the set of social behavior norms that will help reduce the risk of acquiring the SARS-CoV-2 virus infection; but, above all, to build a full life on the foundations of hope and hospitality.

Now, going through the "new normal" from an ontological-existential perspective, leads the path of philosophical reflection towards the position of the human being in a post-COVID-19 pandemic world.

VI. THE SELF IN A POST-PANDEMIC WORLD

The deconstruction of the medical tradition to understand self-awareness and self-care of health in times of the pandemic of the COVID-19 disease, opens the world of life towards a horizon of meaning that had not been there in this way. In this opening, it is not intended to give norms or recommendations; it aspires to show lines of reflection that explore the possibility that the human being has when he is in the middle of multiple entities, as well as to travel through the consciousness of himself to assume himself as he rediscovers himself: as a project thrown into the world of life. In this possibility, the human being has the task of making decisions about himself. The decisions you will make to maintain your level of health during the COVID-19 pandemic will have an impact on your environment, but will be guided by the hope of regaining the strength to care for both your own well-being and that of others. When making decisions, the human being becomes aware of himself, in a process of hermeneutical nature where dialogue with himself is inspired by the conception of his freedom and emancipatory social competence, as internal motivations to seek, promote and realize himself in the building a life that is good for everyone.

In this context, the human being has the responsibility of leading his life from the factuality of the fall to the property of factual life, so that the relationship between the self and its world is an ethical relationship that will provide the arguments to carry out the choice and make life decisions. Gadamer [45] recalls that it is Kierkegaard who had characterized the idea of the choice of "either this or that" as the properly ethical character of existence. In this choice, the dialogue with oneself is shown as the recognition of a self that is a you, to which its choice is exposed as if it were a confession. The person will confess the choice made under the protection of the circumstances of his existence. Being-in-the-world is an event where the human being will be making decisions on a daily basis.

Making decisions in factual life is not a random event, as it is determined by different underlying factors immersed in the tradition to which the person is ascribed to make their decisions. In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, decisions are made in individual and/or social contexts, either to mitigate the progression of the disease, accompany the suffering of oneself or of another, or provide hope through promoting solidarity hospitality, but also to regain transit through the world of life, revitalizing relationships with others and with himself, so he learns to be measured, to maintain a balance between personal interests and the common good; In other words, the choice that is made when making decisions is underlain by the experience of dealing existentially with the things of life. In these lines of reflection, does the experience of the COVID-19 disease contribute to reaffirming the care of oneself when dealing existentially with life?

The deconstruction of self-awareness and self-care of health that are part of the medical tradition, opened the way to understand that health in the existence of the human being is an experience and rehabilitates the understanding of care for life from a self that exists by identifying himself, that is, by recovering his identity through everything that happens to him, his own experiences that appear before him in his existence. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the experience fulfills its epistemological function by making it possible to recognize, interpret and give meaning to everything that exists for us in the world. In *Truth and Method*, Gadamer recognizes that what is lived (*dar Erlebte*) is what each person experiences when interacting with the world, so that the subject assigns an existential content to the symbolism that he incorporates in language. The experience then, expresses in language, the existential meaning of the subject, and is constituted in units of meaning that, when exposed to consciousness, no longer require interpretation because they no longer contain anything strange; that is, the units of meaning are units of meaning that enable the subject to integrate experiential units through memory, through which he looks at himself. The experience of looking at himself, of caring for his own life, of recognizing himself as the being that is there daily and of recovering his identity from his life experience, co-originally founds solidarity with himself. Caring for oneself and solidarity with oneself require that the self that understands and that which is understood (knowing subject and object to be known) be articulated in a horizon of understanding, whose fundamental path of access is human morality. The link between self-care and solidarity will be the experience that occurs when being-in-the-world, articulating the life experiences that occurred in the past with the experiences of the present to give meaning to the future experiences that the subject will internalize.

It is not enough for the human being to understand himself in his state of health as a knowing-being-healthy, but rather that his being-possible given to himself must exercise his being-free for his own power-being. This means that in the world of the self, the openness of the human being who seeks the good life through the decision and rational choice of the means and the ends to lead his life towards the property of the factual life takes place. This is the dimension of self-care and practical solidarity with oneself that configure the world of the self.

Self-care was the center of ethical reflection in ancient times [89]. The Cynics [90], Epicureans [91], and Stoics [92] focused their understanding of morality on finding and putting into practice what is best for oneself. However, when thinking about morality in terms of actions that define their goodness or badness in terms of the coexistence that derives from the dialogue and conversation of the being-who-is-there-with-another, the care of himself opens up to the comprehensibility of the human being in terms of friendship with himself so that it is necessary, first of all, to be in solidarity with himself [93]. Let's clarify this point.

Practical solidarity with oneself, like self-care, is originally shown as a fundamentally different way of considering factual life in the possibility of being and existing that are concretized in the world of life. This solidarity is based on the scheme of knowledge, recognition and communication; through which the assumption of a reality resounds as an ethical commitment rather than as a situation or acceptance of conditions as determinations of one's own freedom. How is knowledge, recognition and communication possible in solidarity with oneself?

Let us first remember the importance of the slogan of the Oracle of Delphi: "know yourself", and the relevance it had, both in Socratic philosophy and in classical Greek times, where the examination of conscience and the control of one's thoughts, the same was common to Pythagoreans, Platonists, Epicureans, and Stoics [94]. In this sense, the *incubation* process stands out in Hellenic Greek medicine, through which the patient was healed, for which an examination of conscience and the interpretation of the dream were required; in other words, it was necessary to know oneself, a knowledge of oneself for oneself [95]. The history of medicine shows that scrutiny and examination of the self is an area prior to actions, so that the self, referred to in this age, is not something given to knowledge but something to be built, something that is subordinated to the care, to the continuous and active elaboration of the subject. This practice of Hellenic medicine was fundamentally private and when it was shared with the doctor, what was sought was advice and help, within the limits of a discreet shared intimacy; situation that persists in our days in the modality of both professional medical secrecy and informed consent [23,59,96].

In this context, knowledge in solidarity with oneself is knowledge of oneself, that is, knowing who they are and what happens within themselves, which in Heideggerian terms refers to anticipating-oneself. Recognition is recognizing oneself as a subject. Gadamer [97] has pointed out that you can only recognize what has been previously known, so that in recognizing yourself, knowing yourself multiplies your role, since it is now about looking at yourself from the outside, as the other from the other, to understand the horizon of the other within oneself. This recognition establishes the relationship with oneself; Thus, it offers the possibility of understanding oneself as the other of the other, establishing a relationship between a self and a you, which underlies the world of the self. The I that designates the you in its exteriority, recognizes that it is strange to it and that it does not belong to it. [56].

Recognizing oneself from the exteriority of the subject requires accepting oneself in the factuality of the finiteness of the human being, in addition to showing oneself, presenting oneself, exhibiting oneself in the world of life, in order to open up both to the other and to oneself [55]. For this reason, the recognition of solidarity with oneself is the element that allows understanding in relation to the world of oneself and from which the accompaniment of oneself derives directly, thereby facilitating the possibility of advising oneself before the possibilities of decision and choice for a good life. In the communication that the human being carries out to advise himself, he tries to express himself and expose the being of himself. This means that the ego tries, on the one hand, to say something about itself and, on the other, to show itself; but it is in this saying something about oneself that the relationship of the individual with his own self is assured, a relationship that by its nature is hermeneutical [93].

For the solidarity with oneself that will be specified in the accompaniment and counseling, it is not enough that the knowledge, acceptance or presentation of oneself is realized in consciousness. An act is required that manifests the condition of oneself in the world of life and that is based on the general disposition of being-in-the-world, care. The realization of the factual execution of solidarity with oneself in existence must leave behind the anticipatory character of transcendental subjectivity and think about it in terms of the historicity of being, so this act is speech, through which the self is it shows, reveals itself, exhibits itself. Thus, communication in solidarity with oneself represents the dialogue and conversation that the individual has with himself in which he expresses his concerns, thoughts and actions that derive from the examination of conscience and the accompaniment of himself, and which is specified in an assent advised before the restlessness of each one and the own worries of the same one.

VII.   CONCLUSION

The human being is becoming aware of living under the conditions that are being installed in the world to face the COVID-19 disease. One year after the appearance of the SARS-CoV-2 virus on the world stage, the generations that converge in the first twenty years of the 21st century are spectators, actors and victims of the devastating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. A year in which the scientific, philosophical and humanistic disciplines have made contributions to control the pandemic and continue into the future where hope for a healthy world is glimpsed. In this context, the intention that underlies this article is to promote debate and philosophical reflection to understand the reality that is being shown to the human being; In such a way that the analysis of self-care, carried out from the perspective of philosophical hermeneutics, allowed the outlining of different lines of reflection that show the relevance of active participation in philosophical analysis and enable the understanding of the new normal.

The philosophical task is being configured with the elaboration of questions that do not always have satisfactory answers for everyone, especially when the philosophical task is very far from the doctor's office, but philosophical thought, Gadamer will say, makes it possible to bring to consciousness, what already everybody knows. In this sense, two questions have guided the analysis: How is self-care structured? and what possibilities does self-care offer to understand the world of life during and after the COVID-19 pandemic? Attending to the first question, self-care, is structured by articulating the existence, facticity and fall of the human being in the world of life, characterized by the possibility of anticipating-self, which will manifest itself through self-awareness of health and self-care of health. In relation to the second question, the analysis of self-care from the scope of the world of the self and delimited by medical tradition, allows recovering the self-care of health, practical solidarity, self-monitoring and the assent recommended in making decisions that will determine the transit through the world of life.

The analysis also opens avenues for reflection, among which the articulation of the essential determinations of solidarity with oneself (knowledge, recognition and communication) stands out, since it offers a horizon for the action of the human being from the universality of the human as a proposal of a way of life, of an individual ethos that is based on the freedom to decide a good life and dissolves the differences in the community of patients by recovering the set of needs for recognition, help and harmony. For this, it is necessary to orient the ontological-existential analysis of practical solidarity to new possibilities of understanding in a horizon where love and friendship (with oneself and with the other) open the understanding of the human being in the possibilities of being-healthy and knowing oneself-healthy from the property of being-healthy of being-in-the-world, instead of generating existential tensions that lead it to preserve the impropriety of its being-in-the-world of life.

REFERENCES

[1].   Balkhair AA. COVID-19 pandemic: a new chapter in the history of infectious disease. Oman Medical Journal, 2020;35(2):e123. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7171815/

[2].   Wu YC, Chen SC, Chan YJ. The outbreak of COVID-19: an overview. Journal of the Chinese Medical Association, 2020;83(3):217-220. Retrieved from: https://journals.lww.com/jcma/FullText/2020/03000/The_outbreak_of_COVID_19__An_overview.3.a

[3].   Güner R, Hasanoglu I, Aktas F. COVID-19: prevention and control measures in community. Turkish Journal of Medical Sciences, 2020;50:571-577. Retrieved from: https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/medical/issues/sag-20-50-si-1/sag-50-si-1-13-2004-146.pdf

[4].   Boger B, Fachi MM, Vilhena RO, Cobre AF, Tonin FS, Pontarolo R. Systematic review with meta-analysis of the accuracy of diagnostic tests for COVID-19. American Journal of Infection Control, 2021;49(1):21-29. Doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2020.07.011

[5].   Liang T (ed.). Handbook of COVID-19 prevention and treatment. Hangzhou, China: The First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejian University School of Medicine, 2020. Retrieved from: https://covid-19.conacyt.mx/jspui/handle/1000/25

[6].   Baker-Davies RM, O'Sullivan O, Senaratne KPP, Baker P, Cranley M, Dharm-Datta S, Heliss H, Goodall D, Gough M, Lewis S, Norman J, Papadopoulou T, Roscoe D, Sherwood D, Turner P, Walker T, Mistlin A, Phillip R, Nicol AM, Bennett AN, Bahadur S. The Stanford Hall consensus statement for post-COVID-19 rehabilitation. British Journal of Sport Medicine, 2020;54(16):949-959. Retrieved from: https://bjsm.bmj.com/content/bjsports/54/16/949.full.pdf

[7].   Subedi M. COVID-19: Anthropocene and Capitalocene caused pandemic. Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 2020;14:15-21. Retrieved from: https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/DSAJ/article/view/32752

[8].   Worby CJ, Chang HH. Face mask use in the general population and optimal resource allocation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Nature Communication, 2020;11:4049. Retrieved from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-17922-x

[9].   Jones NR, Qureshi ZU, Temple RJ, Larwood JP, Greenhalgh T, Bourouiba L. Two meters or one: what is the evidence for physical distancing in covid-19? British Medical Journal, 2020;370:m3223. Retrieved from: https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m3223

[10].   Banerjee D, Rai M. Social isolation in Covid-19: the impact of loneliness. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 2020;66(6):525-527. Retrieved from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0020764020922269

[11].   Sah R, Pokhrel N, Fathah Z, Ozaki A, Bhandari D, Kotera Y, Shah NP, Sigdel S, Vora KS, Natesan SK, Patel SK, Tiwari R, Malik YS, Yatoo MI, Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Dhama K. SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19: salient facts and strategies to combat ongoing pandemic. Journal of Pure and Applied Microbiology. 2020;14(3):1663-1674. Retrieved from: https://microbiologyjournal.org/sars-cov-2-covid-19-salient-facts-and-strategies-to-combat-ongoing-pandemic/

[12].   El Maarouf MD, Belghazi T, El Maarouf F. COVID-19: a critical ontology of present. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 2021;53(1):71-89. Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00131857.2020.1757426?needAccess=true

[13].   Del Castillo FA. Health, spirituality and Covid-19: themes and insight. Journal of Health Public, 2020:Oct, 12:1-2. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7665609/pdf/fdaa185.pdf

[14].   Asok A, Kandel ER, Rayman JB. The neurobiology of fear generalization. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 2019;12:329 Retrieved from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00329/full

[15]. Casero-Ripollés A. Impact of COVID-19 on the media system. Communicative and democratic consequences of news consumption during the outbreak. El Professional de la Información, 2020;29(2):e290223. Retrieved from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3594133

[16]. Hong H, Kim HJ. Antecedents and consequences of information overload in the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2020;17:9305. Retrieved from: https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/24/9305

[17]. Weissman GE, Crane-Droesch A, Chivers C, Luong T, Hanish A, Levy MZ, Lubken J, Becker M, Draugelis ME, Anesi GL, Brennan PJ, Christie JD, Hanson III CW, Mikkelsen ME, Halpern SD. Locally Informed Simulation to Predict Hospital Capacity Needs During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2020;173(1):21-28. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7153364/pdf/aim-olf-M201260.pdf

[18]. Kramer JB, Brown DE, Kopar PK. Ethics in the time of coronavirus: recommendations in the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of the American College of Surgeon, 2020;230(6):P114-P1118. Retrieved from: https://www.journalacs.org/article/S1072-7515(20)30309-4/pdf

[19]. Sfetcu N. COVID-19 pandemic. Philosophical approach. MultiMedia Publishing 2020. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345687550_COVID-19_Pandemic_-_Philosophical_Approaches

[20]. Metz T. More eyes on COVID-19: Perspectives from Philosophy - How philosophy bears of COVID-19. South African Journal of Science, 2020;116(7-8):8494. Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/sajs/v116n7-8/04.pdf

[21]. Vandekerckhove W. COVID, existentialism and crisis philosophy. Philosophy of Management, 2020;19:127-132. Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs40926-020-00140-2

[22]. Gadamer HG. El alma entre la naturaleza y el espíritu. In: Gadamer HG. El inicio de la filosofía occidental. 2ª ed. España: Ediciones Paidos Ibérica, 1999, pp. 61–71.

[23]. Gadamer HG. The enigma of health. Stanford University Press, 1996.

[24]. Kniffin KM, Narayanan J, Anseel F, Antonakis J, Ashford SP, Bakker AB, Bemberger P, Bapuji H, Bhave DP, Choi VK, Creary SJ, Demerouti E, Flynn FJ, Gelfand MJ, Greer LL, Johns G, Kesebir S, Klein PG, Lee SY, Ozcelik H, Petriglieri JL, Rothbard NP, Rudolph CW, Shaw JD, Sirola N, Wanberg CR, Whillans A, Wilmot MP, van Vugt M. COVID-19 and the workplace: implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. American Psychologist, 2021;76(1):63-77. Retrieved from: https://content.apa.org/fulltext/2020-58612-001.pdf

[25]. Quadri SA. COVID-19 and religious congregations: implications for spread of novel pathogens. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020;96:219-221. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1201971220303131

[26]. UNICEF. COVID-19 Education: Contingency Planning Risk Reduction, Preparedness and Response Framework. 2020. Retrieved from: https://www.unicef.org/lac/en/media/12531/file

[27]. Aday S, Aday SM. Impact of COVID-19 on the food supply chain. Food Quality and Safety, 2020;4:167-180. Retrieved from: https://academic.oup.com/fqs/article/4/4/167/5896496?login=true

[28]. Cuadros DF, Xiao Y, Mukandavire Z, Correa-Agudelo E, Hernández A, Kim H, MacKinnon NJ. Spatiotemporal transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on critical healthcare capacity. Health and Place, 2020;64:102404. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829220309400

[29]. Heidegger M. Being and Time. State University of New York Press, 1996.

[30]. Anowai E, Chukwujekwu S. The concept of authentic and inauthentic existence in the philosophy of Martin Heidegger: the "Quarrel" of communitarians and libertarians. Review of European Studies, 2019;11(2): Retrieved from: http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/res/article/view/0/38839

[31]. Shariatinia Z. Heidegger´s ideas about death. Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Science, 2015;1(2):92-97. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405883116300077

[32]. Gadamer HG. El problema de la conciencia histórica. España: Editorial Tecnos, 1993.

[33]. Barua A, Barua S, Aktar S, Kabir N, Li M. Effects of misinformation on COCID-19 individual responses and recommendations for resilience of disastrous consequences of misinformation. Progress in Disaster Science, 2020;8:100119. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590061720300569

[34]. Aharon AA, Ruban A, Duvobi I. Knowledge and information credibility evaluation strategies regarding COVID-19: a cross-sectional study. Nursing Outlook, 2021;69:22-31. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0029655420306618

[35]. Ali S. Combatting against COVID-19 & misinformation: a systematic review. Human Arenas, 2020,oct:1-16 Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42087-020-00139-1

[36]. Critchley S. Being as Inauthentic as Possible. In: Schuback MSC, Ruin H. (eds.) The past's presence: essays on the historicity of philosophical thinking. Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2005; pp. 111-122. Retrieved from: https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:217469/FULLTEXT01.pdf

[37]. Critchley S, Schürmann R. On Heidegger's Being and Time. New York: Routledge, 2008.

[38]. Franch-Pardo I, Napoletano BM, Rosete-Verges F, Billa L. Spatial analysis and GIS in the study of covid-19: a review. Science of the Total Environmet, 2020;739:140033. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969720335531

[39]. Gupta PK, Aishwarya K, Sudhanshu J. A review of knowledge, attitude, and practice towards COVID-19 with future directions and open challenges. Journal of Public Affair, 2020;e2555. Doi: 10.1002/pa.2555

[40]. Heidegger M. Interpretaciones fenomenológicas sobre Aristóteles. Indicación de la situación hermenéutica. [Informe Natorp]. España: Editorial Trotta, 2002.

[41]. Leidlmair K. Being-in-the-world reconsidered: thinking beyond absorbed coping and detached rationality. Human Studies, 2020;43:23-36. Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10746-019-09531-5

[42]. McMullin I. Time and the shared Word: Heidegger on social relations. Evanston Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2013.

[43]. Bubbio PD. Self and nature in Heidegger. Research in Phenomenology, 2018;48:175-196. Doi: 10.1163/15691640-12341390

[44]. Garrido Periñán JJ. En busca del sí mismo perdido del "Dasein": un diálogo entre Kafka y Heidegger en torno a la cuestión de la culpabilidad y la mismidad. Endoxa, 2017;40:159-182. Retrieved from: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/157762231.pdf

[45]. Gadamer HG. Heidegger's ways. New York: State University New York Press, 1994.

[46]. McNicolls MF. Self-undestanding and the care of being: Heidegger's ethical thought. Open theses, McMaster University, 1998. Retrieved from: https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/13907

[47]. Fynsk C. The self and its witness: on Heidegger's Being and Time. Boundary 2, 1982;10(3): Doi: 10.2307/302786

[48]. Richardson WJ. Heidegger on the quest of freedom. Theoretical Studies, 1967;28(2):286-307. Doi: 10.1177/004056396702800204

[49]. Vattimo G. Introducción a Heidegger. España: Editorial Gedisa, 2002.

[50]. Babor ER. The path to human understanding in Heidegger's Being and Time. Lumina, 2011:22(2):1-22. Retrieved from: http://lumina.hnu.edu.ph/past_issues/articles/(20)baborOct11.pdf

[51]. Rillo AG. Ilusión tecnológica de la medicina. La Colmena, 2008;57:85-92. Retrieved from: https://lacolmena.uaemex.mx/article/view/6027/4630

[52]. Rillo AG, Jaimes García J, Vega-Mondragón L. Desilusión de la tecnología médica. Revista Habanera de Ciencias Médicas, 2009;8(4). Retrieved from: http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/rhcm/v8n4/rhcm27409.pdf

[53]. Rillo AG, Arceo Guzmán ME, Ocaña Servín H. Elementos para articular la medicalización con la tradición médica occidental y la koiné de la salud contemporánea. Revista Habanera de Ciencias Médicas, 2013;12(2):275-285. Retrieved from: http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/rhcm/v12n2/rhcm15213.pdf

[54]. Heidegger M. La idea de la filosofía y el problema de la concepción del mundo. España: Editorial Herder, 2005.

[55]. Heidegger M. The fundamental concepts of metaphysics: world, finitude, solicitude. Indiana University Press, 2001.

[56]. Levinas E. Totality and infinity. An essay on exteriority. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

[57]. Young GB. Self-Awarnes. In: Darof RB, Aminoff MJ. (eds.) Encyclopedia of the neurological sciences. Vol. 4, Elsevier, 2014, p. 123.

[58]. Escudero JA. Heidegger on selfhood. American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 2014;4(2):6-17. Retrieved from: http://www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_2_February_2014/2.pdf

[59]. Schramme T, Edwards S. (eds.) Handbook of the philosophy of medicine. The Netherlands: Springer, 2017.

[60]. Schwartz M, Wiggins OP. Scientific and humanistic medicine: a theory of clinical methods. In: White KL. (ed.) The task of medicine: dialogue at Wickenburg. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 1988, Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228333043_Scientific_and_humanistic_medicine_A_theory_of_clinical_methods

[61]. Stewart M, Brow JB, Weston WW, McWhinney IR, McWilliam CL, Freeman TR. (eds.) Patient-centered medicine: transforming the clinical method. 3rd ed. United Kingdom: Radcliffe Publishing, 2014.

[62]. Dohle S, Wingen T, Schreiber M. Acceptance and adoption of protective measures during the COVID-19 pandemic: the role of trust in politics and trust in science. Social Psychological Bulletin, 2020;15(4):1-23. Retrieved from: https://spb.psychopen.eu/index.php/spb/article/view/4315

[63]. Duplaga M. The determinants of conspiracy beliefs related to the COVID-19 pandemic in a nationally representative sample of internet users. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2020;21(21):7818. Retrieved from: https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/21/7818

[64]. Jokic-Begic N, Korajlija AL, Mikac U. Cyberchondria in the age of COVID-19. PLoS One, 2020;15(12):e0243704. Retrieved from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0243704

[65]. Sobol M, Blachnio A, Przepiórka A. Time of Pandemic: Temporal Perspectives Related to Compliance with Public Health Regulations Concerning the COVID-19 Pandemic. Social Science & Medicine, 2020;265:113408. Doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113408

[66]. Jovančević A, Milićević N. Optimism-pessimism, conspiracy theories and general trust as factors contributing to COVID-19 related behavior – A crosscultural study. Personality and Individual Differences, 2020;167:110216. Doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110216

[67]. Kim S, Kim S. Searching for general model of conspiracy theories and its implication for public health policy: analysis of the impacts of political, psychological, structural factors on conspiracy beliefs about the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021;18(1):266. Retrieved from: https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/1/266

[68]. Kim G, Kim S, Hwang E. Searching for evidence-based public policy and practice: analysis of the determinants of personal/public adaptation and mitigation behavior against particulate matter by focusing on the roles of risk perception, communication, and attribution factors. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021;18(2):428. Retrieved from: https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/2/428

[69]. Imhoff R, Lamberty P. A bioweapon or a hoax? The link between distinct conspiracy beliefs about the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak and pandemic behavior. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2020;11(8):1110-1118. Retrieved from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1948550620934692

[70]. Gadamer HG. Elogio de la teoría. Discursos y artículos. España: Ediciones Península, 2000.

[71]. Saitz R, Schwitzer G. Communicating science in the time of a pandemic. JAMA, 2021;324(5):443-444. Retrieved from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/article-abstract/2768397

[72]. Pfattheicher S, Laila N, Böhm R, Sassenrath C, Petersen MB. The emotional path to action: empathy promotes physical distancing and wearing of face masks during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychological Science, 2020:31(11):1363-1373. Doi: 10.1177/0956797620964422

[73]. Mieth L, Mayer MM, Hoffmann A, Buchner A, Bell R. Do they really wash their hands? Prevalence estimates for personal hygiene behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic based on indirect questions. BMC Public Health, 2021;21(12). Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12889-020-10109-5#citeas

[74]. Howard J, Huang A, Li Z, Tufekci Z, Zdimal V, van der Westhuizen HM, von Delft A, Price A, Fridman L, Tang LH, Tang V, Watson GL, Bax CE, Shaikh R, Questier F, Hernandez D, Chu LF, Ramirez CM, Rimoin AW. An evidence review of face masks against COVID-19. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2021;118 (4):e2014564118. Retrieved from: https://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/118/4/e2014564118.full.pdf

[75]. Huynh TLD. Does culture matter social distancing under the COVID-19 pandemic? Safety Science, 2020;130:104872. Doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104872

[76]. Jamaludin S, Azmir NA, Ayob AFM, Zainal N. COVID-19 exit strategy: transitioning towards a new normal. Annals of Medicine and Surgery, 2020;59:165-170. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2049080120303514

[77]. Uscinski JE, Enders AM, Klofstad C, Seelig M, Funchion J, Everett C, Wuchty S, Premaratne K, Murthi M. Why do people believe COVID-19 conspiracy theories? The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review, 2020;1(special issue). Retrieved from: https://misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu/article/why-do-people-believe-covid-19-conspiracy-theories/

[78]. Castro Sánchez A. Ontología del tiempo y nacional-catolicismo en José Pemartín y Sanjuán (1888-1954). Genealogía de un pensador reaccionario. Tesis Doctoral. Facultad de Filosofía: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, 2014. Retrieved from: http://e-spacio.uned.es/fez/eserv/tesisuned:Filosofia-Acastro/CASTRO_SANCHEZ_Alvaro_Tesis.pdf

[79]. Stoica CA, Umbres R. Suspicious minds in times of crisis: determinants of Romanian's beliefs in COVID-19 conspiracy theories. European Societies, 2020; Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14616696.2020.1823450

[80]. Stein RA, Ometa O, Shetty SP, Katz A, Popitiu MI, Brotherton R. Conspiracy theories in the era of COVID-19: a tale of two pandemic. The International Journal of Clinical Practice, 2021;75:e13778. Retrieved from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/ijcp.13778

[81]. Ortega y Gasset J. The revolt of the masses. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1957.

[82]. Arent H. Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil. London: Penguin Books, 2006.

[83].   Hoiby N. Pandemics: past, present, future. Journal of Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, 2020, Retrieved from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apm.13098
[84].   Burki T. The origin SARS-CoV-2. The Lancet, 2020;20(9):P1018-P1019. Retrieved from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30641-1/fulltext
[85].   Institute of Medicine (US) Forum on Microbial Threats. Ethical and legal considerations in mitigating pandemic disease: workshop summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US), 2007. 1. Learning from pandemics past. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK54167/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK54167.pdf
[86].   Tognotti E. Lessons from the history of quarantine, from plague to influenza A. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 2013;19(2):254-259. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3559034/
[87].   Opriessnig T, Huang YW. Third update on possible animal sources for human COVID-19. Xenotransplatation, 2021;00:e12671. Retrieved from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/xen.12671
[88].   Wolf LJ, Haddock G, Manstead ASR, Maio GR. The importance of (shared) human values for containing the COVID-19 pandemic. British Journal of Social Psychology, 2020;59:618.627. Retrieved from: https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjso.12401
[89].   Parry R. Ancient ethical theory. In: Zalta EN. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2014.* Retrieved from: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/ethics-ancient/
[90].   Schutijser D. Cynicism as a way of life: from the classical cynic to a new cynicism. Akropolis: Journal of Hellenic Studies, 2017;1:33-54. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332839858_Cynicism_as_a_way_of_life_From_the_Classical_Cynic_to_a_New_Cynicism
[91].   Konstan D. Epicurus. In: Zalta EN. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2018,* Retrieved from: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/epicurus/
[92].   Seregin A. Stoicism and the Impossibility of Social Morality. ΣΧΟΛΗ, 2019;13(1):58-77. Retrieved from: https://classics.nsu.ru/schole/13/13-1-seregin.pdf
[93].   Gadamer HG. Acotaciones hermenéuticas. España: Editorial Trotta, 2002.
[94].   Lloyd-Jones H. The Delphic Oracle. Greece & Rome, 1976;23:60-73. Doi: 10.1017/S0017383500018283
[95].   Lain Entralgo P. Historia de la medicina. España: Salvat Editores, 1978.
[96].   Bunge M. Medical philosophy. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2013.
[97].   Gadamer HG. Truth and method. Wiltshire: Continuum, 2006.