



Índice, Year 3, No. 6, July-December 2023

ISSN: 2789-567X


e-ISSN: 27903435

Submission date: August 13th, 2023

Acceptance date: November 22nd, 2023

Original article reviewed by double-blind peer review

# A difficult problem: distinguish between good and bad education

 Carlos Eduardo Maldonado  
maldonadocarlos@unbosque.edu.co  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9262-8879>  
University El Bosque  
Republic of Colombia

Un problema difícil: distinguir entre la buena educación y la mala educación

## Abstract

Since ever, education has represented a strategic field vis-à-vis the development of a society or a country. The best bets have been placed both by Tyrians and Trojans, for education. This paper sets out a problem and tries to solve it. Education is not enough. It is necessary to distinguish between an education that states, exalts and cares for life, and any other form of education. It is all about tracing demarcation criteria between good and bad education; this is the one that benefits or harms life. This is a problem that has not been openly formulated, as yet. This paper argues that such a distinction is compulsory. Four arguments are set out to support the claim. Such a distinction is necessary vis-à-vis developing capacities and learning about the complexities of life, and the world.

**Keywords:** teaching, learning, complexity, life, history, politics.

## Resumen

*La educación representa, desde siempre, un ámbito estratégico en el desarrollo de una sociedad o un país. Las mejores apuestas han sido hechas, tanto por*

*Tirios como por Troyanos, por la educación. Este texto formula un problema y busca resolverlo. La educación no basta. Es preciso distinguir entre educación que afirma, exalta y cuida la vida, y cualquier otra forma de educación. Se trata de establecer un criterio de demarcación entre la buena y la mala educación; esto es, aquella que es beneficiosa y la que es perjudicial. Un problema que no ha sido identificado abiertamente a la fecha. La tesis de este trabajo consiste en distinguir la enseñanza del aprendizaje. Se aportan cuatro argumentos en favor de la tesis señalada. La distinción es necesaria de cara a las capacidades de adaptación y aprendizaje para las complejidades de la vida y del mundo.*

**Palabras clave:** enseñanza, aprendizaje, complejidad, vida, historia, política.

## Introduction

Education has always been a strategic factor in the development of society or state. In the origins of the Western civilization, in ancient Greece, education was strongly intertwined to democracy; education was directed towards free men for them to be free. Its name was *Paideia* (Jaeger, 1992). Before, education was a privilege for only a few, at best, for some people. Greeks make education the agora's matter, the public square. Arguments are discussed in public, and each one is required to provide reasons or to request motives for the acts, decisions, among other things. *Logos didomai*, it was said technically. The verb *didomai*, in Greek, meant to request or ask, as well as ordering or demand –*logoi*; implying reasons, arguments. The *logos didomai* was the specific concern of philosophy; and its result was an *episteme*. The rest were entirely subjected to the process of *learning* (*paideia*). Indeed, the *paideia* didn't design strictly education, but formation.

In English, making a distinction between *education* and *formation* is common. Originally, someone is formed in a discipline or a degree; subsequently,

is educated at another university or another scale. In French, it exists a similar distinction; something in Spanish is highly deluded. Rather, education provides every conventional process that goes from pre-school to the level of higher education; until getting to a doctorate.

The history of education has always been associated with the deployment of each one's best capacities through a process – eminently selective– articulated or directed by a teacher. Thus, the teacher teach(ed), and the student learn(ed); the dynamic was education itself. It exists a vast literature about the history of education, as well as the history of pedagogy. However, it is not the aim of this work. Rather, this paper is defined by the identification of a problem, which is: the distinction between good and bad education.

At first glance, from an institutional point of view, this would refer to the assurance of quality, which nowadays would be constituted in accreditations, scales, and selection systems guided, supposedly, by academic excellence. Whatever it is, *cum*

*grano salis*. Good education would be guaranteed by accreditation –national, first, and international, after–, and by the subsequent hierarchy of scales of every type; scales of universities, faculties, administrative systems’ programs; of their own teachers.

Behold, an open secret: all universities –and schools– work entirely for scales; just a few –or none– dare to admit it. Everything else is simply administrative engineering; with a name or another. This article endeavors to support that this is not where the demarcation criteria between good and bad education is exclusively established. By derivation, bad education would be those not accredited universities –and schools–, and badly or not graded. Certainly, accreditations and scales involve the quality criteria; but these are not exhausted in them.

This paper aims to direct our gaze in another direction. The thesis of this work states that bad education consists in teaching. In contrast, good education, in learning. As it is appreciated, I’m not talking about teaching-learning, but the necessity of separating them. Thus, it is evident that before solving the problem in terms of management, the subject is of a truly profound scope. Complex problems cannot be addressed or solved in terms of mainly management. Not only is that wishful thinking, but it is a perfectly wrong strategy. The best distinction is the radical separation between teaching and learning, an authentic philosophical dilemma. Ultimately, every discussion about concepts is a philosophical debate.

Four arguments emerge to understand the thesis. The first consists in the

recognition of strategical, historical, structural importance of education, since the beginning. Education, however, is nowadays found to be overrated. Moreover, its own conception has changed structurally on the frame of the society of information and the society of knowledge. The second argument states and demonstrates why bad education is based on teaching. It exists a very serious ambiguity as result of history and atavisms, on one hand; and on the other, facing the incomprehension of the times we are living today and towards the future. The third argument is widely the most important and constitutes the true thesis of this work, explore: good education is founded on life; in the care, exaltation, enabling, and gratification of life. The first consequence immediately appears before the sensible gaze of what education is today, for the first time, is not an eminent or distinctively human matter. Ultimately, the fourth argument states that in the society of information, the society of knowledge, and the society of networks, no one teaches anyone; instead, we all learn. In the final analysis, conclusions are drawn.

### **Importance of education, its challenges and problems**

The ancient Greeks have the merit of making the education a common matter, basis, and consequence at the same time of democracy. It is worth recalling that Greek humanists were sophists –significantly Plato, and Aristotle, too– they established their philosophies as a refusal and opposition to humanism. “The sophists are the first Greek teachers, in the proper sense of the term. ‘I admit that I am a sophist, and I teach the men’ Plato makes Pythagoras say” (Llanos,

1969, p. 15). Before Greeks –at least in the standard history that has been made by the western civilization–, education was selective, exclusive, particular (today we would say, private). Even Pythagoras imposed in the ancient Greece the idea of Egyptian cut of the division between education and esoteric knowledge and, the education and the exoteric knowledge.

Education was conceived and aimed to freemen precisely to make the men free, verbatim. Subsequently, this foundational idea is deluded. Education, gradually, is guided to glorify intellectual and cognitive capacities, but not to the cultivation of liberty. The phone broke too soon, so to speak. It was exactly what happened between the ancient Rome –remember, for Greeks, the Romans were barbarians; similarly, as Nordic villages were to Romans–. Promptly, the articulation of education in the Middle Ages surrounding the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* was anything else but the acclamation of liberty. Evidently, in the sociocultural, spiritual, and political context of the Middle Ages, freedom was impossible. It would have to wait for the end of the XVIII and start of the XIX century for freedom to return to being situated as a subject of worry for education.

It is a recognized fact, since modernity up to these days, the development of a nation is directly proportional to the type of science –and technology– produced in a country, to which the education results *conditio sine qua non*. Succinctly put, between the XVI and XIX centuries, education is found in the service of science and leading-edge research. It would be in the XX century when, in a truly contrary manner, education will be placed at the service of work.

Science and technology –euphemistically, science, technology, and innovation– are only subsidiaries of the productive and labor system.

In sociological terms, education is assumed by society and *strata* as a social mobility mechanism. Explicitly, higher and better education, higher and better quality of life conditions (Nussbaum & Sen, 1996).

In the higher knowledge scale, countries are related to each other in function of the science and technology they produce and consume. On the level of universities, these are related through knowledge, in terms of the Nobel prizes they have, or their equivalents. Ideally, in Latin America universities define each other, and in front of the State and society, by their accreditations and the place they occupy on the different international ranking systems (or, in the worst-case scenario, nationals); incidentally, they are also related to each other according to the percentage of teachers who have master's degree or doctorates. A clear sign of subdevelopment.

Explicitly stated: the most important countries in the field of knowledge worry if the number of Nobel prizes, or their equivalents, is low or if it has been a long time since they have received one. It's a matter of national pride and international goodwill.

Some scientific research programs clearly show it without difficulty. For instance, the countries that have launched spaceships to the Moon; or have made robot landings on Mars; or the topics related to quantum computing, and many more. This is an expression of the knowledge tip, therefore, the tip of education too.

The fact is that Tyrians and Trojans recognize the *strategic* importance of education. The adjective must be read with all the depth charge of the word. Systematically, the countries, nations, universities, and schools are scanning the national, regional, or worldly overview in search of referents, learnings, indicators, proceedings, decisions, and forms of articulation and implementation of educational systems. Some emulate others; others imitate the rest, and some try to do their best in function of their own capacities.

The result is the generation of a wide range of forms, systems, and subsystems of education. For example, depending on the technical and technological needs, or the basic investigation; or in terms of the employment needs, and so forth. The inversion of the demographic pyramid in several countries has even formulated the need of education for the third age. Therefore, we assist a large stage and in incessant movement.

Not in the last instance, particularly in Latin America –and by derivation, of pedagogy– are truly simple in form, and management. The own structure of education has not changed, at least since the Middle Ages. Verticality is the characteristic –in the best sense of ancient: *magister dixit*–, the assumption, explicit or tacit, of hierarchies –for example: hierarchies of forms of knowledge–, and distancing. It led to the compartmentalization of education. The precise expression consisted in the famous debate of faculties, to which even Kant (2020) refers. In the University, students are formed within faculties, schools, and departments. Then, knowledge appears and is structured fragmentarily.

Recently, the development of artificial intelligence has been debated and –I would

like to highlight– overthrow the structure, and own design of the systems of education conceived, structured, and managed the way appreciated as shown above. In a word, it is about education founded on teaching.

However it is, education is found in the center of strategic politics in an unsuspecting sense of the word. Everything else is on the list; this is, the political horizons, work structures, programmatic or philosophical ideals, and many other similar considerations. Education defines the attitude of beings, communities, and societies.

Up to this point, it hasn't seemed to be a serious problem.

### **Bad education is founded in teaching**

Aristotle deeply harmed humanity, specifically knowledge and education. Inherited from Pythagoras (Hernández de la Fuente, 2019), Aristotle imposed the belief of the existence of better paths of knowledge and, consequently, a need for hierarchy of organizational structures. Thus, a hierarchy of the social organizational structures of knowledge (Aristotle, 2020).

The immediate effect of a similar assumption is expected. If the idea of better ways of knowledge is sustained, it means there are better human beings than others; some who know and dominate said knowledge and those who don't. All conditions are thus established for inequality, inequity, and violence.

Explicitly or implicitly, the whole educational system was based on a sturdy asymmetry: on one side, the students, and on the other,

the professor; on one side the student, and, on the other, the book or books. Historically, the invention of the printing press by Gutenberg strongly contributes to partially leveling said asymmetry (Burke, 2012). However, it is at the end of the XX century and the start of the XXI when the history of education, alongside knowledge, changes drastically.

Sociology has placed it in evidence as well as other sciences, and social and human fields. In 1990 we assist globally to the transit from postindustrial capitalism to informational capitalism. Thus, the society of information surfaces. In the first decade of the XXI century, the society of information transmutes to the society of knowledge. And in the following years this transforms into the society of webs. The society of information, the society of knowledge and the society of webs: three moments in one dynamic (Castells, 1998).

We assist a unique transition in the history of humanity; it is about the transit from an analog world to a digital world and society. There is a duplicitous determining factor in this process. On the one hand, it is about the computer and computation emergency. And, concomitantly, the birth and deployment of the internet, born in 2008, in CERN (Conseil Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire). Consequently, the world becomes vastly rich.

In fact, the digitalization of knowledge –an unfinished phenomenon–, does not imply the disappearance of the analogical dimension of reality. Rather, what once were variables in research terms –for instance, independents, dependents, aleatory– are transformed into data. In 2010 is officially declared the birth of big data science. For the first time in the

history of the human family, knowledge no longer belongs to someone. On the contrary, knowledge is a common good and is within reach for everyone. The digitalization of books, articles, the inception of academic webs – such as academia.edu or reseachgate.net– achieves a democratic role.

It is with a fundamental assumption that there is knowledge and appropriation of the informational and computational systems, and digital literacy, in all the lines of the word. Unequivocally: the main form of contemporaneous illiteracy is technologic illiteracy.

It is this instance when it should be stated what bad education consists of: in *teaching*. In the belief and structure of someone who teaches (because they know), and others who learn (because they do not know). Semantically, it is in this scheme where students have always been alluded to (in English, *pupil* designates someone who lacks a home, the homeless; in French, *élève* is someone who is formed and taken care of because they know nothing; in German, *Zögling* means someone who lacks a home or a house and, in Spanish, the one who lacks light. All, one idea only).

Education consists in teaching, and this is the perfect asymmetry in the process of cultural, politic, and ideological learning. Teaching isn't anything other than indoctrination. It is a way of life and thinking founded in algorithms. Every scenario is about compliance, obedience and submission, and total absence of criticism, construction of personal criteria, independence or autonomy. We find ourselves in the antipode of the original *paideia*, to convey it in some way.

Education teaches anything, even less to think. At best, it teaches only to know. Knowledge is not enough for the acknowledgment, care and enablement of life. It is an essential condition.

Every teaching is unequivocal, unidirectional and disciplinary, or from a Foucauldian perspective, in the epistemological sense that behaves the exaltation of education in compartments, segments, divisions. At school level, this is referred to as a lineal curriculum and, generally, consists in the curricularization of education. Essentially, institutionalism is imposed, the teacher nominally has all academic freedom, but the program and curriculum are already designed and mandated. Everything ends in the administration of knowledge as life's administration. Education relies, is guided and established in the work system, which is a subject to the capital; methodologically, financially or conceptually speaking.

Bad education is forced teaching. Regarding this, justifications are the least of it. Before it was the *magister dixit*; today is power with any attire. Education has been transformed into an institution, along with institutionalism and neo-constitutionalism, being introduced to society, from the years 1970 and 1980, to the present. A sensitive gaze can understand the dangers of similar positions that are largely predominant; semantically, to say the least.

Schools and universities have come forth to be labeled "institutions" (*horrible dictu*) and lost their original essence. It's about the performative function of language (Austin, 2009). Institutions think (Douglas, 1996), an astonishing revelation. This is what bad education consists of. Evidence presents no subtleties.

I would like to highlight the consequences of bad education. It forms bad people. Bad people are indolent –institutionalized–, insensible to human suffering. It exists a solid catalog on this regard. Bad education forms gregarious people. Plainly, bad education forms psychopaths and sociopaths (Hoffman, 2014; Greene, 2013; Dixon, 2006). Certainly, a hard conclusion, where there are.

In contrast with the previous overview and is possible to develop a good education.

### **Good education knows about life**

Before our eyes stands –even if the expression is tough: against us–, an institutionalized education system entirely built in function of the work organization, not for freedom or (free) thinking. The ethics spread, from the earliest age of education, as follows: "you have this task; an obligation. You must do it. We all have to do things we do not like", as if life is composed of sacrifices every day, embedded in the term: homework, or obligation. They are disguised as: "compromises". Education's conception and experience of life has always been sacrificial. The three main religions of the western civilization vastly know about this. As Graber (2014) stated, combining religion, anthropology, history, and linguistic history, duties and tasks, sins and debts are one and the same thing.

The society of information, first; the society of knowledge, later; and, finally, the society of nets –three movements of the same composition–, declared information, and knowledge are not heritage of anybody for the first time in history. They have become common good. I would like to highlight: a common good, not a private

good, and undoubtedly not a public good. After all, the society of networks asserted the true value of society is relations and networks. This is the cooperative system (*networking*). Cooperation is the genuine value of existence, immediately redirecting to mutual help, solidarity, friendship, companionship, camaraderie, neighboring, and cooperative agreement.

The above finds a definite expression. We live day by day, a different world of zero score, in where the games –interactions– are different from scoring zero. When someone wins, someone else also wins, even with variations. If someone loses, someone else loses, even with differences.

Acknowledging the dynamics, relations, and associations, it is apparent we live a perfectly separate experience to education. First, education no longer coincides at all with schooling. Secondly, even more notably, education transmutes to learning.

Good education is learning; but learning, strictly, is no longer education, is life. Learning involves collaboration, implying mutual learning. It goes beyond simple semantic changes; it is about transformations or ontological relations, if desired.

While education is asymmetrical, ranking, and is established on responsibilities and tasks, learning steers its gaze towards fruition, and the gratification of experiences, spaces and interactions. Structural and dynamically, it regards displacement of competencies, skills, and abilities, towards likes, sensations, and knowledge (Maldonado, 2022). What promptly emerges before a sensible gaze is enjoyment. The enjoyment of learning; the delight of the educational process.

Traditional education, or bad education, in a Kuhnian or Napoleonic connotation, consists of turning human beings into normal beings. Essentially, Th. Khun distinguishes two types of sciences: normal and revolutionary. Normal science can be understood as the current paradigm, hegemonic, which function is not solving problems, but displace them, adjourning them. One of the most prominent work forms of normal science is the study of cases: studying already solved problems. Numerous examples in diverse areas of knowledge could be mentioned effortlessly. Normal science turns human beings into normal.

On another level, Napoleon referred to normal people –regardless of its connotation– as “worthy idiots”; they do things, know how to do them well, are quite pleased with what they do; but don’t understand what it is they are doing or where they are going with what they do. The environment or atmosphere consists of institutionalism as well as neo-institutionalism. Both shape submissive people, lacking critical spirit, obedient, efficient, with a sense of longing. Essentially, passive and solely reactive subjects. The reengineering (social) forms have been specially tailored for them; the periodical or regular reassessment and redesign of institutions to achieve better performance and productivity, in every aspect.

Bad education is founded entirely on the importance of algorithms. An algorithm is a procedure to solve problems or do things; manual functions, Mission, Visions, Himn, Flag, Objective, Plans, Programs, Leadership, Strategy, and other tools, strictly, of reengineering. It is precise to consider the contemporary meanings: it will



always be necessary to return to Austin's work, and the importance of pragmatics. *Ditto*: bad education. Without further ado, an algorithmic thought is no other than a form of an algorithmic existence.

An observation is imposed, a sensible gaze before the state of the surroundings highlights the language in vogue is eminently conductivist. All algorithmic systems –sociology, politic, educative, historically speaking, for instance–, possess and display conductivists languages; conductivists languages and conducts. A wide-range reflection of broad-spectrum surfaces at this point. Everything will depend on the sensibility of each person, and each one's critical capacity. This way is acknowledged the strategic importance of education, for Tyrians along with Trojans.

Plainly spoken, good education is not algorithmic and *a fortiori* by any means, neither conductist. Simply, no reengineering. The conclusion does not wait: good education is found, it is reaped in the antithesis of institutionalism and neo-institutionalism. Verbatim: good education is not *education*. It is life, and life is not the object of education, but of learning, joy, gratefulness, coexistence, no hierarchies, since the nucleus of hierarchies does not exist in nature. These are (false) anthropological, anthropomorphic and anthropocentric notions.

Education is a human dimension. It does not exist in nature –the educational system; for which it is necessary to return to the very rich history of education and pedagogy–. Furthermore, learning exists. And, in learning, what is at stake is life itself.

Certainly, education is directed to work, and most human beings work to pay debts in the capitalist system: this is not life. It is a very sophisticated social control system. The bancarization is the smartest and perverse weapon Power has ever deployed, evil in its greatest expression.

Without dualism, good education elucidates this –and other processes and dynamics– equivalents, elaborates a thorough critic and formulates alternatives. No one thinks well if all possibilities are not considered; not because all possibilities are fulfilled, rather contemplating any could be carried out. Learning is crucial, not for criticism itself –a tautological statement–, but for the function of life, the care and enablement of life. Making life possible in every form imagined or however possible.

Concluding this section: worries about curriculums, programs, plans, systems and subsystems, politics and strategies, methods and methodologies, tools and dynamics of education that openly and immediately do not place life in the center is a disguised control system. Everything, absolutely everything else is auxiliary.

**Today, nobody teaches nothing to anyone: we all learn**

This work advocates for an education for life. It should not, in any way, assume a sacrificial of itself. In stark contrast with the history of western civilization, education for life is grounded in fulfillment. Knowing how to enjoy oneself, the company of others, small details and instants, everything. Essentially, enjoy time in its briefness and insignificance.

This position is not obliged to be assimilated to something akin to stoicism, a philosophy of crisis and exhaustion periods, a call to resist as the world sinks. We only learn from things we enjoy. The Western never knew how to enjoy anything, a fearful civilization (Delumeau, 2002). There is a new civilization surfacing that knows about magnificent and dense times, life and health (Maldonado, 2023), and, therefore, can learn about delight and enjoyment.

True knowledge –which exalts and cares, enables and gratifies life– is not built, it is sown. Sowing involves a lifestyle different from construction. Beyond discussions –eminently academicist, between constructionism or constructivism. It makes no difference. Sowing brings *wisdom*. We must ask earth for consent to be exposed and plowed. Seeds are watered, covered in soil, watered, and await good weather and conditions. When the crop is sown, it is cared for, but things do not depend on us. It fundamentally depends on nature.

Every education was and is largely concentrated around knowledge. Therefore, all concerns for didactic; from the wandering walks and the maieutic, even memory and repetition exercises –specific to academics–, even the inflated ludic approach. History is extensive and understands the rewriting of programs and updates, the administration systems and reengineering –very consistent in classical schools and universities–, and other aspects. Unfortunately, Latin American is a prolific land in these practices, beliefs and authorities.

Knowledge is important for life but is never enough. Fundamentally, it requires a lot of imagination for life, a high capacity for improvisation and games, ideational games,

intuition and some change. Learning about chance, indefiniteness or uncertainty is key for life's capacities. Before competencies, skills and abilities, it's about the construction of capacities. We must learn for life; not for the current economic, politic or social system. Since these are always provisional. Life remains and is made possible against all odds. Regarding the science of complexity, this is said specifically: living systems do not obey entropy.

Life wants us as learners, much more and better than simple cognizant. Evolution always has a place on a local scale. Then, we must learn to *think* in function of changing surroundings, defined by fluctuations, instabilities, perturbations.

I would like to propose some learning pathways perfectly unknown to the existent and predominant education. These are nurtured from non-classical logics, one of the sciences of complexity (Maldonado, 202). Table No. 1 illustrates the connection between diverse ways of learning and some of the non-classical logics, facing an education that knows about life, of not-institutionalized character, and carried out horizontally, from below; from the group experience, of the meeting, and not the curriculum program, plan or educational program (institutional) (horrific expressions, remote from good taste).

The first column presents some of ways of fundamental learning for the cultivation of critic and free spirit. The second contains non-classical logic that corresponds to their pairs.

The observation of the second column is about punctually characterizing each one of the mentioned non-classical logics.

An expansion of these logics and their relations exceed the grasps and expanses of this work.

The erotetic logic is the logic of asking. *Erotein*, Greek, means inquire, question. Specifically, erotetic logic shows that a question is not answered. Moreover, one question concedes another question: a question can be addressed through another question. The typically institutionalized thinking has taught every question implicates an answer. In the scientific investigation methodology –eminently positivist–, this way it has been stressed.

It exists a proximity between erotetic logic and the pedagogy of asking according to P. Freire (Freire, Faundez, 2014). The worth of Freire and Faundez’ works lies in stating the engineering of bad education demands answers to non-existent questions, since they did not emerge from the community of learning; rather above, outside.

The fictional logic demonstrates there are things that do not exist and do not need to exist to be real. All the best nutrients to life do not exist –in the empirical sense of the word–, yet still are the most important: love, friendship, solidarity, music, poetry, dreams, hopes, stakes and risks, to name a few. Against everything that rationality exalts focused on efficiency, efficacy, growth, productivity, obedience, and consumption.

The multivalent logic –it exists tri, tetra, penta, exa and even heptavalent logics– promptly placed the world, society, nature woven on more than a single narrative, an only truth, a superb form of life (over the others) at the center. From non-classical logic, it certainly is the one that has the most freedom impetus, from afar. In other words, against

the classical formal logic, things are not instituted and are used on binary systems: believers-atheists, day-and-night, buyers-consumers or whichever translations you may desire. There are other values, such as uncertainty, or not even true or false things, and others. In lifelong learning, polyvalent logic is highly suggestive and promising.

Closely related to the previous ones, fuzzy logic has the merit of drawing attention, before and above the absolute values – accuracy or fallacy, in the realm of logic– in degrees or gradients. All the immense range between 1 and 0; for example, 0,16 or 0,38 or 0,81–. Fuzzy logic revealed several values between the ones usually adopted as absolutes: truth, and falsehood. There are true (or false) things in 0,42 or in 0,99, but never in 1. The history of technology has stated accuracy of fuzzy values allows a highly stringent accuracy than traditional values 1 or 0 of 1 to classical formal logic. Prudence is the first learning fuzzy logic allows.

Free logic, on the other hand, allows us to live, work and think with immensely less budgets of existence than classical formal logic. It allows us to free ourselves from the

**Table 1**  
*Ways of Learning and Use of Non-classical Logics*

WAYS OF LEARNING	NON-CLASSICAL LOGICS
Importance of the question. Connected questions.	Erotetic logic
Imagination, fantasy	Fictional logic
Multiplicity, diveristy	Multipurpose logics
Details, particularities	Fuzzy logic
Intuition	Free logic

Own Work

positivistic spirit of science in the wide sense; reduced to facts, data, tests, evidence, and experiments. This logic allows us to work with empty domain models, regarding experimental and experiential approaches. We can refer to terms –phenomena, systems and behaviors–, that do not denote to any object. I consider free logic to align with the learning of intuition bubbles, both a method and a research heuristic not positivistic and of learning, never of education.

Nobody teaches anything to anyone. Today for the first time in the history of the western civilization, we all learn from each other; even if with differences. Learning corresponds to a different world of zero sum. In other words, it is about a process –a story, a reality– in which everyone contributes, even with differences, and everyone wins.

We live in a highly interdependent world, sensible to innumerable dynamics, all non-lineal, given the systemic character of the economy and mostly of technologies. We must develop capacities in the face of life and the world. Particularly, in the face of growing complexities. Learning is not merely a matter of intelligence; not even the dull multiple intelligences, and emotional intelligence (Once again, a lot of reengineering). Learning is fundamental to life itself. Not only to resist, but also to create worlds, possibilities, realities, anonymous before.

Imagination, intuition, game, challenging capacity, dare and stake, the importance of fantasy and games, and the always important ability of improvisation. Everything while having a certain dose of chance, is truly main in the affirmation, gratification, care, delight, and the enablement of life.

We do not control things and certainly not the environment. This has a connotation at the same time natural, social, cultural or historical. The environment is always unsteady and shifting. The times of nature are of majestic complexity, unlike human times. Life is defined in the face of nature, not in the face of human matters.

In synthesis, learning means acknowledging life is a game played in the long run. It is then when things are judged with wisdom. Memory is feeble, with everything and how necessary it is. Knowledge becomes unused after some time, even more in the human scale, alleged as Moore's law. However it is, the subject is not educating oneself at all. It is learning. In this consists good education.

## Conclusions

Good education cannot be titled as education. Perhaps the kindest way is learning. The political, social, historical changes also entail conceptual and semantic changes. Things cannot always be named identically.

In this paper a problem has been formulated and resolved. The identified problem has been solved against education, favoring learning. The reason does not depend on the terms or dimensions mentioned. The reason relies on the same support of life.

There is one assumption this work must have made explicit. We, the living systems, must be able to have a basic but solid idea of what life is. The subject overflows the frames of a merely anthropologic, anthropomorphic, and anthropocentric comprehension of life. Life neither

starts nor finishes as human beings. Scandalous as it could be, the human form of life is not the most important, from any angle. However, life places a light on the tragedy of learning. There are people, collectivities, societies, even civilizations that never learn; particularly, there are Churches, Parties, Companies, Armies, Corporations, that do not learn. (This way, in capitals, how they like it).

Not for educating oneself (a lot), you learn. The cost of not learning is comprised, biologically, in which an organism or species specializes. And when it is specialized, it becomes endemic. Ultimately, it becomes endangered and disappears. Nothing is more dangerous in the process of education than the specialties. Specializing: also, what bad education consists of.

A good education is nothing other than the relentless capacity of learning permanently. Curiosity is the true nutrient of a good education, not utility. The educational systems must be able to wake up and stay alert, curiosity is but the most elegant name of true freedom.

Nowadays we assist the death of a civilization. Yet, at the same time, there is a new civilization being born. Thus, a good education must bet well, and their compromises. The true project of a good education is, currently, of civilizational dimensions.

Language, values, styles, ideas and occidental forms and structures, in any meaning, has been revealed today as outdated. Even, once again, Tyrians and Trojans know it, all the same. The difference is, some are still betting on

the Western, already in palliative care, because they are unable to do anything different. Others, however, risk themselves for a new civilization, exhibiting enough signs of life. Only the times we talk about are of high density, dozens, thousands of centuries beyond.

The living systems –including human beings– can deploy, even in the most unthinkable conditions, the most and best creativity. Education, as it seems, is one of the most suitable ways of *preparing for* an activity.

Learning is a condition of the possibility of adaptation, what it is all about. It is the true name of the game. Except, the adaptation measures in a time perfectly different from humans. The Western never understood it; therefore, it is in its last rites.

## References

- Aristóteles, (2020). *De Anima*. Madrid: Gredos
- Austin, J., (2009). *Cómo hacer cosas con palabras [How to do things with Words]*. Barcelona: Paidós
- Burke, P., (2012). *Historia social del conocimiento [Social History of Knowledge]. Vol. I. De Gutenberg a Diderot. Vol II. De la Enciclopedia a la Wikipedia*. Barcelona: Paidós
- Castells, M., (1998). *La era de la información. Economía, sociedad y cultura. Vol. 1: La sociedad red. Vol. 2: El poder de la identidad. Vol. 3: Fin de milenio*. Madrid: Alianza
- Coser, L., (1978). *Las instituciones voraces [The ravenous institutions]*. México, D. F.: F. C. E.

- Delumeau, J., (2002). *El miedo en Occidente [The fear in the Occident]*. Bogotá: Taurus
- Dixon, N. F., (2006). *Sobre la psicología de la incompetencia militar [About the psychology of military incompetence]*. Barcelona: Anagrama
- Douglas, M., (1996). *Cómo piensan las instituciones [How institutions think]*. Madrid: Alianza
- Freire, P., Faudez, A., (2014). *Por una pedagogía de la pregunta. Crítica de una educación basada en respuestas a preguntas inexistentes [For a pedagogy of the question. Critic of an education based in answers to inexistent questions]*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores
- Graeber, D., (2014). *Debt. The First 5000 Years*. Brooklyn-London: Melville House
- Greene, J., (2013). *Moral Tribes: Emotion, Reason, and the Gap Between Us and Them*. Penguin Press
- Hernández de la Fuente, D., (2019). *Vidas de Pitágoras*. Girona: Atalanta
- Hoffman, M. B., (2014). *The Punisher's Brain: The Evolution of Judge and Jury*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Jaeger, W., (1992). *Paideia*. México, D. F.: F. C. E.
- Kant, I., (2020). *El conflicto de las facultades [The faculties conflict]*. Madrid: Alianza
- Llanos, A., (1969). *Los viejos sofistas y el humanismo [The old sophists and humanism]*. Buenos Aires: Juárez Editor
- Maldonado, C. E., (2023). *Indicios de la emergencia de una nueva civilización [Signs of the emergency of a new civilization]*. Bogotá: Ed. Desde Abajo
- Maldonado, C. E., (2022). De las competencias, destrezas y habilidades a los gustos, sensaciones y el conocimiento. De la educación para el trabajo a la educación para la vida [Of the competencies, skills, and abilities to likes, sensations and knowledge. From education for work to education for life]. *PRA*, 22(33), 226-245. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.22.33.2022.226-245>
- Maldonado, C. E., (2020). *Pensar. Lógicas no-clásicas [Think. Non-classical logics]*. 2a edición. Bogotá: Ed. Universidad El Bosque
- Nussbaum, M. C., and Sen, A., (Eds.), (1996). *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press