

Fourty two essays on miscellaneous subjects of 42 pages each.

We argue that social science is not only made by its hard core but also by its relationship with other sciences, the natural sciences, literature, philosophy. I have cultivated this relationship and shaped it into 42 two 42-page essays, as if I were running a marathon. My time was good, and if it weren't for the "hot" biographical data of the moment, I would have a good treatise on the philosophy of social relations, but I did use philosophy and philosophical anthropology, the object of my original doctoral thesis in Philosophy at the University of Lisbon. My recent return to religion has brought the interest and pertinence of theology in these fields to a more vertical view of the field. Thus, the binomial subject (social actor)-society (group) is pivotal in my analysis and also refers to the fractioning of meaning in today's society, introduced by the virtual, by the robotization of business life and even of relationships in the field of daily life, the virtual has replaced the real, ceasing to exist. It is not real to watch TV, the options of choice, to constantly change our destiny, as if we were running away from deaths, the small and the big, are patent, and the mind is a movie camera. It remains to be seen what will happen when we are blind and lose our senses, in a forest fire, in a car accident, or when we step on the street after the door. We need a philosophy that is not hermit-like, and an anthropology and sociology that is not orgiastic, because it is towards this great common feast that humanity seems to be heading, towards a civilizational clash arising from the Ukrainian War, the threats from Korea, here is the feeling of an accidental westerner that plunges every day into relationships, from the subway to the street, to the garden and the mall and replicates them in the domestic sphere of the house, tenements, hermitage, in his intimacy, without a destination, without a great objective, as if man had become, again, a social and political animal, as if the observer were also the anthropologist being observed.

Thus, the most diverse authors come to our aid in the comprehension of the real through the social, of the relations that the human atoms imply among themselves, that is, not only religion delimits and accentuates the sphere of action, giving it feeling and filling it out, but also the task of the social scientist is to generate a better society, which means, more functional, happier, where there is more well-being, and we cannot regard war and human conflicts as a terrain that must not be worked on, so we doubt the naturalness of Evil (and banality) and commit ourselves as social scientists and philosophers, to build a better world, to convert individuals to a certain well-wishing therapy towards the other and towards themselves, raising and questioning issues like suicide and euthanasia, not without a certain art (and joie de vivre) and a certain psychology that This same discourse is the object of social anthropology, at least of that which was taught at ISCTE-IUL in the 90s of the last century, and which produced the first generation of social anthropologists in the country. On the other hand, if anthropological knowledge is always under construction, deconstruction does not mean to destroy, but to see differently (Derrida, Lévi-Strauss), to see the social as intimately part of reality, in fact, the only reality that exists, that IS by itself, since reality-real no longer exists, it was replaced by the virtual, which became, in turn, the Real...

Psychology and psychiatry solve individual problems, the problems of the subject, while sociology

and anthropology, solve human problems. But...isn't what is psychological the realm of the human, that is, isn't unreason something that, throughout the ages, is intrinsically part of the human condition? And aren't the great mental problems social problems? And what about hunger, which never ends, about Covi-19, which never ends, about the variety of stray voices within the same spirit, within the same Being? Why the social inequalities, in terms of status, of access to housing, to education? Philosophy has a role to play in this regard, as anthropology does, and what should prophylactically be favored in the name of a better science, a more useful social knowledge is the impression in these fields of a certain pragmatism, in the various academic contexts in which they are taught and developed. Because hunger and affective deficiency can never generate good philosophy, good social science, good literature...

At the same time, we keep cultivating the relation between theory and practice, one of these two is more important is yet still to prove, because we can face philosophy as merely theoretical and anthropology as mere practical. That's why we should do an philosophical anthropology based on ethnographic fieldwork as method to a discourse on man and mankind.

Victor Mota

Lisbon University

January-March 2022

References

Michel Onfray

Gilles Lipovetski

João Bragança de Miranda

Michel Serres

Paulo Borges

Carlos-João Correia

Derrida

Claude Lévi-Strauss