

CEREMONIAL FEAR

Fear is innate to man. However, it is also a social, psychological, ideological construction. Fear, however, can have a pathological facet when democratic structures fail through the cracks of control and political action. With fear, man loses his identity, political, social, territorial, identitarian. First of all, physical fear, then psychological fear. In the safest countries in Europe, one feels fear. And why is that? One feels fear because man is not fulfilled, that is, he is afraid of what he has and of losing what he has, first of all the material goods that give him the illusion of happiness. Man, first of all, is afraid of happiness, besides a wrong idea of happiness. And it all stems, not from genes, but from education. Man is afraid because he has lost religion, his evil is spiritual, that is, in the past God protected him from everything, today to be a believer is to defy strange and unheard of forces. Man, finally, is afraid of dying, because he doesn't want to lose the happiness he has achieved and thinks that everything will end with the individual death that will happen one day, sooner or later around the corner.

In western democratic society, fear has taken the form of extreme left and extreme right political parties, which instill this feeling of fear and danger towards the Other, and a strange form of mobilization that looks more like a fight for life, against death. The sense of balance has been lost, and voting itself, a tool for democratic legitimization, is the object of this ceremonial fear that has moved from the churches to the public square. Thus, there is a kind of osmosis between the individual, subjective, and the social, objective. And everything becomes subjectivity, even the social, public space becomes private space, just like the body that is violated, gutted, turned inside out, from the inside to the outside. All this based on the belief that libido is public. Hence the fear, I have lost my interiority by projecting it into the social and I can no longer recover it, no matter how hard I try.

So I advance two new concepts: the vote as a tattoo on the social body and, furthermore, in the public space. In fact, voting has so much power to transform society that it may be the last resort of democratic society, that is, if we accept the legitimacy of

government as a form of leading social organization. O, why is the citizen afraid? It's not just for VOX, for CHEGA or for Le Pen, it's because the judicialization of society has made people judgmental, almost Kantian... Everyone thinks they have a say, but the majority should be silent, someone said, because really, democratic society is just a stage of totalitarian society. Because for half injustice, injustice and a half. Because the people, when they have freedom, abuse it. This is the state America has reached, for example, a country of extremes. If we don't have social freedom, we are left with individual freedom. And the subject returns to himself, to his inner self, to religion, where he is truly democratic.

I spoke of the judicialization of society, because politicians, for the most part, are bureaucrats, that is, they execute the laws according to certain principles. Only when the training of deputies and politicians is diversified will there be, how can I say, more social justice, more representativeness, and extremism, totalitarianism, which is much more harmful than representative democracy, because it is purely ideological, can be avoided. Just as society is extirpated from religion, so ideology is extirpated from it. However, the people are purely ideological and whenever it is stifled, it always comes back again. Therefore, voting as a tattoo on the social body, the weapon of transformation of society, will be by elections whether by referendum. Therefore, the politics of political correctness, of friends, when nobody understands each other in democracy because the dissenting voices don't understand each other and only increase fear. In totalitarianism, there is one voice; in democracy there are countless voices. Fear, in most cases, comes from the threat to private life, from subjection to Big Brother, that is, the introspective cannibalization of the subject within the framework of a society that wants to know how I think, what I think, what I let or don't let think. It is pure rhetoric, but also malignancy in social relations. Social scientists want to know everything, but they rarely go to the media to give information, either because of television programmers or people, who are after excessive pleasure and fame. So there is a social reproduction of the craft of politics, usually "just" lawyers who were never good at mathematics, when there is an emphasis on research, which is then not made public. Months can go by without a social scientist going on television, because the common man just wants to have fun and forget that he lives on this planet. Just as an economy of the temporal is possible, an economy of the transcendental is indispensable. For a better society.

Because, there is an ongoing transformation of the society based on technology is underway, while some flee to the countryside, from the radiations of the cultural Being leaning against culture, against their culture. There is a sign of social transformation through anomie, a small instillation in the social brain of the small perceptions that disturb the modern subject. Multiculturalism is not innate, I defend my group, be it black or white, but religion teaches me to respect all races, multiculturalism comes from the economy, one is afraid of what one doesn't know, after getting to know one accepts and negotiates with the Other. This, then, is religion at the limits of interest.

Then, I would like to advance some more notions: the notion of transformation of society through voting, given its importance in the management of the public and private space, see the issue of domestic violence. And I return to the theme of the dissonance of voices in a democracy, which sometimes jeopardizes the lack of dialogue (see António Guterres' constant willingness to engage in dialogue at the UN) and sliding towards totalitarianisms where evil is banal, the control of consciences is the instrument for manipulating bodies and minds in the face of a dystopian destiny (see Putin and the invasion of Ukraine).

As for multiculturalism, what is at stake is an economy of context, hence the management of differences is contextual, that is, the distribution of wills on a given spatial plane. Hence, it becomes relatively difficult to arrange the cultures in a given space, because they are embedded in their own culture. But there is no other way, we have to admit. And there religion helps, except that religion is traditionally right-wing and the extreme left is seen as more tolerant in a sphere of culturality. How to proceed? Through dialogue, get social scientists involved in the public discussion of these issues on TV, for example. Thus, the management and administration of resources in a territorial context can release the virtues of the tolerant social being, of the politician who has some lights of anthropology, philosophy, sociology, and religion can help in the manifestation of this feeling of plural identity. All in a context of globalization. So, back to the question of fear: if fear is ignorance, knowledge can be a weapon, which can kill if it is not in good hands. A psychotic logic of punishment is maintained, which can be seen in American channels and even in Hollywood movies, not to mention the proliferation of paraphilias associated with sex. Totalitarianism, in Spain, France, Portugal, is born from a certain form of injustice felt by the social actors, and what the democratic regime must do is to make dialogue proliferate, based on diverse principles,

already established in the Law and in the Constitution of these countries, but reality is always adapting, just like the letter of the law. Dialogue can be a solution, an "evasive", distracting rhetoric of peace, while policies are applied and some social awareness work is done. This is why it is said that democracy is the best of the worst regimes. Because you have to try hard, but only within it can you get some sanity of the spirit of the social...

Victor Mota

Lisbon, 07/05/2022