Translated from Portuguese to English - www.onlinedoctranslator.com

## NEW TREATY ON UNDERSTANDING REFORM

By Victor Excelcius

Lisbonna, MMXXI

So what do we live for? What is the value of life? Is there a path through philosophy, like others such as biography, biology, the common sense path? Is finitude the defining criterion of "how to live life"? Does this awareness of finitude prevent us from living it? Yes, how should life be lived? And is there any moral purpose in this precept of the mind?

If science better seeks the human condition through the study of human discourses and behaviors, human and social science, where to insert and how to understand madness and unreason? At least we have these two variables, which, more or less accidentally, man attends to and scientist understands. But what becomes of the philosopher in this "social" frame? Society is subsumed under divinity, is it not also a totality of human manifestations? Is not man the forgotten, decentered center of philosophy?

Is not the journey of the spirit a strictly spiritual achievement? And what is is not also mental? Does man not need to run away from himself in order to find himself, without having to invent happiness in (minimum) traveled, recurring spaces, in a certain space of greater dimensions such as the city? The city, moreover, is a medina, in our view.

On the other hand, isn't the woman (or the man) the alter ego of the heterosexual or homosexual couple? Yes, the couple is a kind of incompatible aspect of the more or less solitary Ego and on this all the world is based, its moral dimension is taken to the extremes of consanguinity, with or without dowry, in the nuclear dimension of society, a micro-society that represents it and cheer. Even the writer who writes for himself is persecuted by the shadow of the Other, which he needs to nourish himself spiritually (which comes from his spiritual origin, from spirit), in himself and in the Other as himself, in the SI as Other.

Thus, in terms of a social philosophy, it is necessary to offer a method to philosophy, that is, the ethnographic method, through ethnographic fieldwork. that's where

we see man (and woman) in action in their spatio-temporal context. Is it not, therefore, necessary to go to traditional society to understand man, ie, to make philosophy about man and his condition in terms of a social, cultural determination?

And what is this construction of the society that awaits us? Why not liberalize in the face of suicide? See the problem in terms of social-philosophical and self-autonomy. If western society has conquered material freedom, it may well be a trap for those who, having conquered everything, are not happy and then think and see that there is nothing more to conquer, therefore, a ruinous cycle of unhappiness is generated that leads to drugs. , to death by suicide. But, since we are born, are we not dying in and for the world?

Then, in another way, life is not always a celebration, as some anthropologists would have us believe. It is also anguish, which is not to say that philosophy is necessarily anguish. But it takes the Being in decay and tries to understand, instead of lifting it, as if taking from it the strength to do one thing or another, giving it the space, in time, on the fringe of virtue, to rise and rise. , to walk again, because philosophy is first and foremost not the goal, but the path, therefore, happiness, instead of celebration in terms of the social and cultural.

We intend to refocus the debate of the human sciences on man, the subject of social action, of the discourse on the sciences, indicating that philosophy can be endowed with the method of social anthropology, that is, fieldwork of inquiry into the opinion of the Another about himself. In other words, it is about bringing maieutics back to the center of philosophical debates. This is equivalent to philosophy considering as useful, its own, the vocations of anthropology, art, science or merely activity, philosophical work. Not only does the subject's opinion matter, whether a philosopher, but the opinion of the Other, as well, as it usually is with anthropology and does not need to be primitive. On the other hand, the study of social psychology, ethology, sociobiology makes us more attentive to the development of social life, understanding the different aspects of which man is composed, what the human is made of and the way in which he challenges reality, social and physical, as he trains to it, adapts to it, and then transforms it for his benefit., say that man is, as religion tells us, the king of creation. It is among the others, including minerals and vegetables, and it is not the sound language that makes it superior, but the capacity for abstraction. Therefore, I have the opportunity to do philosophy. And, how to define Man? He has the gift of being part of a social, cultural context. It is this pre-determination that defines him and even though he was on the margins of society, he always has with him, carries with him, a certain identity, that is, he is the id of anyone, he is "that" anything, always in relation to the Other. what the human is made of and the way in which he challenges reality, social and physical, as he trains himself, adapts to it, and then transforms it for his benefit., It does not mean that man is, as religion tells us , the king of creation. It is among the others, including minerals and vegetables, and it is not the sound language that makes it superior, but the capacity for abstraction. Therefore, I have the opportunity to do philosophy. And, how to define Man? He has the gift of being part of a social, cultural context. It is this pre-determination that defines him and even though he was on the margins of society, he always has with him, carries with him, a certain identity, that is, he is the id of anyone, he is "that" anything, always in relation to the Other. what the human is made of and the way in which he challenges reality, social and physical, as he trains himself, adapts to it, and then transforms it for his benefit., It does not mean that man is, as religion tells us, the king of creation. It is among the others, including minerals and vegetables, and it is not the sound language that makes it superior, but the capacity for abstraction. Therefore, I have the opportunity to do philosophy. And, how to define Man? He has the gift of being part of a social, cultural context. It is this pre-determination that defines him and even though he was on the margins of society, he always has with him, carries with him, a certain identity, that is, he is the id of anyone, he is "that" anything, always in relation to the Other. to later transform it for his benefit. It does not mean that man is, as religion tells us, the king of creation. It is among the others, including minerals and vegetables, and it is not the sound language that makes it superior, but the capacity for abstraction. Therefore, I have the opportunity to do philosophy. And, how to define Man? He has the gift of being part of a social, cultural context. It is this pre-determination that defines him and even though he was on the margins of society, he always has with him, carries with him, a certain identity, that is, he is the id of anyone, he is "t So, does the philosopher have any role in society? If yes, which one? The one everyone else doesn't want, lost and strayed from the century? In order to mate do you need to be inserted in that century, in the times that go by? And what particular idea do you have about mating, if hormones are configured in that sense? Is the philosopher not just a living organism with an excess of rationalization? Therefore, we argue, the philosopher needs to be an anthropologist, to incorporate certain principles of social anthropology, namely, that is, to ask the Other what he thinks, whether primitive or not, so as not to be trapped in the Cave all the time, from which he only comes out. to breathe and satisfy basic needs...

They know the intellectual superiority of the philosopher. But not all philosophers are intellectuals, in fact, most of them are lazy and make a certain way of thinking depend on their minds, not to mention a certain number of people. So, what is the status of the philosopher in society, the sociologist, the anthropologist? Philosophy of science is taught and many engineers or mathematicians are philosophers without having had an academic background in the social and human sciences. A very disruptive ga is...

The importance of the philosopher is of intrinsic quality, that is, only the philosopher can feel the anguish and despair characteristic of the philosopher. Others, other than philoanthropologists, do not feel these feelings, so the social utility of these feelings is restricted to the condition of doing philosophy, rather than reading, therefore, the capacity for abstraction is an activity that not everyone can access and that it is achieved with time, with training in the most diverse dispositions of the human spirit that extends, distends and perceives in time...

Because if Being is important in philosophy, Belonging can be so in anthropology and sociology, that is, we are attached to each other and that decides any ethical enterprise, also with regard to finitude, that is, contingency over time. that can make us better people, even without much recourse to religion,

to religious explanation. Man is not human without, on the other hand, the mask, the **persona** of his personality, therefore, man is always an actor, whether in artistic terms or a social actor, in the shape of the human landscape of everyday life of what is conventionally called reality in generic terms and social reality in restricted terms.

How, therefore, to erect a science of the social if the object of study is always in motion, if not even literature or art can capture the immensity of what is human, of the human soul? It will be the philosophy to erect this edifice. Much philosophy does not build, but has a critical task. How, then, to understand man, in the desert or in the big cities? Will this task fall to religion? Is theology a science, a science of the indivisible, the unspeakable?

In fact, the common issue in all relationships is power, that is, what organizes and silences people is the power of something higher than them in terms of decision, so religion fits in this scope. We always believe in something (a totem) or in someone (a god, an authority) who is superior to us, never inferior, because we too, even in the smallest way, exercise power, even if it is in the face of a domestic animal. What is special about beings who are not used to hierarchical relationships of power, who see society as a power and locus of equality, egalitarianism, is that they are more contemplative than active, that is, their will hangs in the air before they make a decision. That's why they don't like to be criticized. Usually, in one way or another, this is a way of exercising power, that is, I am not an eminently practical subject because practicality generates equality and philosophical discourse generates instances and conditions of a somewhat symbolic power. In this way, it is easy for the philosopher, I mean familiar, to feel nauseated from his existence and to be close to extreme situations or even to abuse certain resources, such as drink or tobacco, because he is concentrated, he is busy, in a world that has no actors, in which he is with his mind, the only actor, so he feels nausea and loneliness that leave a dent in his personality, in his *persona* and make him a kind of untouchable of society, that is, "the one who cannot be touched", who imitates himself in behavior and whose opinion is respected, while the mob is in revelry he reads and writes philosophical treatises, somehow to perpetuate himself and the society that welcomes him as a thinker, a wandering thinker, where the instrument of his perception is not the senses, as in anthropology, gastronomy and wine, the pleasures of sex, but the vice of thinking, many of the sometimes generating a certain inferiority complex that he feels, precisely because he is not in the realm of the century, in the present, untouchable and at the same time the fruit of a society, of a cultural context, which at the same time circumscribes and makes him abandon his philosophical system of thought.

Thus, how current life is characterized by the mask in a context of plague. The mask, in the anthropological sense. The plague, in the philosophical sense, that is, what is threatened is the persona as the bearer of a mask that hides and dissimulates its true Self, we are all masks in the context of a plague that only the domestic sphere intends to elide or, at least, disguise. But while the mask is medical, therapeutic, it indicates the social function of health, in terms of the neurovisibility of the medical, medical, and society sphere, the plague highlights what is probably the greatest revenue that the national group has, in individual terms. and collective: the Last Judgment. That's why the Mass is still held, even if there are appeals with the celebrants, the clergy and the group of singers. Without an assembly, even God trembles, because he has no one to give him existence,

Because the Good God is the one who allows his authority to be questioned, as the head of the family in line with the fate of his children, his sheep, as voters and citizens in a democracy, that is, assessing the manifestation of the most basic rights, whether animals or humans, on the stage of differences and minorities, purified by so many centuries of philosophy and science.

Thus, what the poet reduces to the enchantment and training of mysticity, the philosopher reduces to the banality of the motor of thought: the everyday, between the dazzle and the punctuality of the celebration. The philosopher, then, sees no need to celebrate, because his success comes from his action-satisfaction extended in the time he fulfills for his status in everyday life. In the same way, he has the chance to breathe the supernatural of the immersion in culture, punctuated his day-to-day by waiting for the right thought and, if he writes, for the right concept and word, as if he were describing the undoing of souls, whether in death throes or in ecstasy. , still in this world and returning to it of which he is a witness. The philosopher's culture is, then, Time,

Thus, the sphere of practicality is, above all, that of building, building a world and adding worlds to this half-built world, making the globe domestic as in the globalizations of the Discoveries. But it is also a sphere of destruction, as demonstrated by the recent guerrillas for independence in Spain, Catalonia and the Basque Country. In social and individual, socio-individual terms. On the other hand, the sphere of contemplation has to do first of all with the context of religion, that is, contemplating, in another moment of practicality, the work done, that is, contemplating the action at second hand and preparing new action, so that action and contemplation, practicality and theory are just different moments of a process, on the threshold of human history and ingenuity. Hence the relevance of anthropology in the context of a

new understanding of Man and the Cosmos.

And, to put it another way, there will be room for solidarity between who does philosophy these days? Philosophy has become, like other social sciences, as a justification often for evil, to protect the dictatorial power of the media always given to the same people, to the same families, as well as in politics, in sport in general and in football in private. There is, therefore, a philosophical discourse that, among us, even has to do with the exaggeration of evil, in order to, as they say, understand human nature in the domestic sphere, in a context of maximum possibilities that end up making the senses sick. and the pure reason of the most banal circumstances, promoting a society of spectacle and romantic drips, instead of the old dream of the man who wants to build houses in his village and surroundings and who has in his DNA the same that entrepreneurs had of the industrial revolution, build, build,

evidently in a context where one has to earn money to feed and preserve certain life purposes in terms of individual and family existence. In all this, there is a period of time in existence, that is, moments of swamp, which correspond more to days and days of melancholy and almost inactivity, because what is most precious to social life, namely interaction, has been lost. and any philosophy cannot do without this, because even the hermit sees some people. Or he's seen it.

Then, after that, when social scientists or philosophers discover the isthmus, the link between common sense and philosophy, many answers can be fully given, that is, while we have on one side the majority of the population, in demographic terms, common sense thinking, we have another component, the intellectuals, whose way of understanding reality is scientific, erudite. This phenomenon can be seen in philology, that is, in the evolution of language, as happened with Latin, for example. In Rome there was an erudite form, that of the superior castes, and a vulgar Latin, for the use of the people. There are interferences from one side to the other, from one form of language to the other, communicating vessels, interferences, interpenetrations and both registers evolve, exchanging influences with each other, and the erudite feeds on the vulgar and this, in this case, ended up withering while that of the people gave rise to the Neo-Latin languages, better known as Romance. In that case, the Church

played a definitely important role in the composition of what Portuguese is today, shaped what was said, said what could be said and did not say what could not be said.

Collective, social life needs to be stoked by celebration and hence influence the subject's exteriority. But if this is not the sum of all and a few more, if it does not have an interchangeable flame, it will soon wither away. Therefore, both social and individual life need to be stoked, sometimes with the feasts of the saint of the earth, sometimes by the love relationship. Does the hermit, at the height of his transcendence, have memories of the previous life? Is he the one in the cave or is it all the others together, through bonds that are certainly fleeting in lovelessness, when existence in time perfects and makes wiser people, if we know how to find a different balance throughout the days? Even the monk has his community, which obeys a very specific rule. And, in the intense social life or in the convent, isn't happiness at stake? Isn't it the happiness we're all looking for on our more or less star-studded path?

Why does anthropology have one of its brightest fields in human sexuality, when philosophy has always seemed to be made, planted by men, in general full of flaws and, above all, sexist? The spirit, held in a body in different ways, has difficulty understanding sexuality, reason has always been the enemy of the senses. But will it really be so? Hedonism, logical positivism, vanguardism, which of the movements is right and what is the role of the intellectual in today's life, in this practically post-pandemic society? Yes, because human and social relationships are at stake and the virus, the disease, have changed the pattern of people's relationships with each other and, by dragging, the way of seeing sexuality and affections on the screen of everyday life, which has become banal banalized instead of festive celebrated...

So what is the meaning of life. Is being happy to discover this meaning? Or is there another more or less specifically mechanical way of extracting meaning for the mind and heart of our stay interrupted by time? Is it time that robs us of meaning and, therefore, of happiness? If we were eternal, would we be happy forever?

Likewise, forgetting and remembering are two devices that are part of and propel human action. What, then, is existential to human action? The phenomenology of truth, the fact, the exactness in the relationship with the environment, the production of meaning that helps you to progress within the social and natural space? What is essential to human action? The fact that his soul is always clinging to the space around him and beyond, contrary to the pathology that separates him from the world and makes reason the holder of the truth... Anyway, what is an existence? The object out of meaning? Or just the essence transformed into something that the subject apprehends and makes to relate to others, in order to effect a chain of meaning, overvalued at times and at others transformed into something absolutely banal? The philosopher, in order to be properly so, needs to leave the Self, the Ego,

If the monk cannot have Ter, the philosopher can. But the philosopher tends to nullify the monk's territories, to occupy them, before and after leaving himself in a nihilistic pessimism that characterizes many who do not even suspect the overwhelming role of depression and mental illness, perhaps because he has never gone through philosophical crises, those crises that make them grow and would have always given value only to material values and not to the Heideggerian Being-There. So why is the philosopher so prone to depressions and carrying the weight of the world? Because he worries, the world, in its possibility of eternity, is the fruit of anticipated worry. That's also why happiness, as if only he knew how to tame time, including the Time of the Other, and asked for nothing in return except the recognition of his writings and philosophical diatribe. But the philosopher lives in the world, the monk does not, even if we can see convents as replicas of society, of a certain form of society, where he is happy, I don't know if happier than the philosopher, deluded by capitalist consumerism and oblivious to the things of religion that are not only in ceremonial terms, as if to carry out a ritual that he soon gets rid of in everyday life, in the banal role of post-modern, hyperactive, hypertextual society, where there are many people producing on the same theme, many people producing on the most varied themes, in a society that corrodes the high for lack of ethics, even when there was ethics at the same time it, on the other hand, did not exist. So, can happiness be achieved these days with a lack of ethics? What is actually being happy? Is it like eating a good meal? It is to obey the classic authors, even knowing that most of them are sexist and patriarchal in their thoughts? Hence the fact that there are few women philosophers, in my opinion.

Sadness and melancholy take possession of those who seek the reasons for existence, who do not rest until they generate more and more questions about the real, and then, later on, realize that these feelings are proper to each and every person and solve the problems, problems, yes, because philosophy also answers, it is not only a given realm of questions, of questions, but also a "realm of whys". But it takes the issues more seriously, trying to see what is under a pebble in the street where it passes, that is, it sets out the ultimate reasons for Being, for being (here and there), for Belonging...

Why, then, is Man unworthy of living life, of moving forward, raising questions for everything and nothing. Is it a lack of God? No, perhaps God is still present in the heart of many people's interior, while to others he says nothing. And, on the one hand, putting pressure on this inaugural moment, man is impelled to action, even without reflection, even without meditation, like a spring in the face of reality. And so how should life be lived? The philosopher knows the same frustrations as the man of common sense, but in a more acute sense, for he easily frees himself from them, from the affections of the soul, taking refuge now in food, now in the flesh, despising the things of the spirit, as if camouflaging himself in the face of the danger of the passing of Time. On the other hand, the motto "a healthy mind in a healthy body" seems to be, again, after the Greeks and Romans, the motto of modern, western civilization. It's that *modus vivendi*it spreads to the rest of the world, even if the master, trained by consumerism and orgiastic communism of mixed bodies, flees upwards, to the side, out of reality. But, to understand this mismatch, psychiatry is erected as the highest of wisdoms, dethroning philosophy, which in fact was never queen in an age of technique in Western society, even if mental health is the most despised domain of the politics of health...

We are, therefore, at every moment on the verge of forgetting who we are, taking new feathers in our spirit and adapting it to new reality, to a new great reality which is the Life of the spirit. Yes, the mind is demanding and small perceptions go against the religious ideal of perfection of the mind, not knowing that it comes with time and the bulges of doubt better delineate what the past is than a vision of the idea of God, where everything, including the landscape, is perfect. God is all? The whole? Yes, for those who believe in it, and yet in different degrees.

The peak of Western civilization, America, is an imagery achievement, taking the risk to forget, therefore, being remembered through forgetting, in the foundation of death and *potsmortem*, as if undertaking a visual and conceptual saturation that is achieved, in the realm in which the screen is the almost supernatural and what occupies the space of the Church is not the same as in Europe, at least in Portugal and Spain, but it is something different, beyond in the diatribic register of the mind. To be American is, then, to be metaphysical. Perhaps, above, beyond, after all criminal and existential questions, the true God is found, the One who gives to sweat so that man also becomes a god or, at least, a semi-god...

Then the realm of envy; what I have that you don't have or vice versa, what you do or know that I don't do or know. Of all the intrigues of the spirit, the greatest is to intellectually envy someone, that is, to be jealous of their social representation, which can lead to crimes and harmful and toxic relationships and, at the limit, to domestic violence and death from jealousy.

Deep down, addictions -alcohol, tobacco, drugs- keep him attached to the world, to a square, geometric, spatial locus, determined when we love too much the woman who crossed our path and, in a way, we don't need to God, we dispense with Him because we feel too alive to feel that we need supernatural help. The more you know men, the more you know God. He's everywhere. Hence the actuality of pantheism. "God is everything" - my mother told me when I was little... And America is a witness of that, for good or for bad, a Bahá'i God, who accepts all the prophets as Beings sent by the supernatural in the service of the big Dad.

Thus, the Good God also feels loneliness, because his creation, made autonomous by the carousel of reason, took a course contrary to the Good, took its own path and threatens to replace it, to occupy its own spiritual territories, today mental, even if either by shadow zones dictated by parapsychology, telekinesis, by spiritism, processes by which the spiritual facies is altered because a new geography of biographical, videographic beings and ghosts is at stake. Everything serves to deny God, when man can never shake this idea because he is in his core of humanity that is and forever there is either blessing or persecuting, as does the Devil who carries on his back.

Is it not the solution to the ills of a large part of our society, the solution to the lack of unhappiness and psychic well-being in the excess of communication?

Nowadays there is no reservation, go, but is it easy to forget? The work suggested by José Mattoso by a medieval author, "A Nuvem do Não-Saber", in his text

"Raising the Sky" seems to assign to the human domains a certain amount of secrecy it needs to be happy. There are people who keep more than others, people who are more reserved than others. Even so, we Portuguese seem to walk in an eight and eighty regime, when nobody can stand to be too long in one of the two registers. Are we still looking for the right record to undertake new discoveries, this time those of the spirit? What has become of the Portuguese Church, which continues to forget, in terms of belief and acceptance, certain items much more accepted by a more progressive Church, such as the marriage of priests and the ordination of women? I speak of the Catholic Church. And what becomes of the Church of Lisbon? still sad, in the shadows and disguised in a cultural environment that is more profane and pagan than properly Muslim in terms of heritage. Why is it that being a Christian is a sign of weakness of spirit for some? A sign of poverty of concepts, a sign of limited ignorance?

The world has become clogged, intubated, like the end of a cigarette, with references and as little valuable as what is close to us ceases to matter to us, as much as the point of a cigarette, with no references, what is far matters well more than the cigarette that is made, when it doesn't really matter at all. Therefore, it is necessary to undertake metaphysical bridges and in the diabelief of religion, which is an instrument of climbing the social ladder for the poor, see American, North and South American executives, such as the Portuguese, who do not abdicate from claiming God for their purposes, social. On the side, those lay people who, at the very least, want to be rich as much as possible in life, because death is not worth it, so it is necessary to mark this world with the seal of their individuality, the lay people, the disbelievers, most of them university professors, atheists and agnostics, who have never known a metaphysical experience in young people, or if they have known it in adults, want by force to get rid of it because such a mnemonic record is attentive to your alleged sanity of spirit and theft of the notion and space of divinity in Your lives. Because religious experience is always replaced by the experience of the world, in a pretense and pretension of becoming an instituted God himself, more or less vagabond, with or without worshipers and faithful. In this regard, see the Evangelical Churches in the USA and Latin America, which replace the presence of the great religions of the Portuguese, Spanish and other European settlers, they forcefully want to get rid of it because such a mnemonic record pays attention to your alleged sanity of spirit and theft of the notion and space of divinity in their lives. Because religious experience is always replaced by the experience of the world, in a pretense and pretension of becoming an instituted God himself, more or less vagabond, with or without worshipers and faithful. In this regard, see the Evangelical Churches in the USA and Latin America, w

Therefore, if the Devil bothers a lot of people, in the current times, God bothers a lot more. Or, at the very least, the idea of Good, of what is fair, or what is normal. In this regard, consider domestic violence, an authentic social wound, along with pedophilia and the rape of women, which makes us think seriously, I would say philosophically, which family we want to have. The rights of minorities were raised as the flag of civilization in terms of human rights, to the point where minorities govern peoples. Isn't that too fancy? or the sayings

normal? And those who are normal not being so? And those who aren't normal if they are? Where is the cracking of the criteria is thus the progress of the human spirit, which walks from one side to the other, making sense, interspersed with the thought of the crotch as if diving into a sea of understanding of what is most immense in the universe, that is, , human nature.

## **XXII**

The epidemic made society more monastic, therefore, not in its habits, but in its relationships, not frightened by a dangerous and reckless God, but with themselves and highlighted the lowest common denominator, being human. When the probe "Perseverance" lands on the surface of Mars, we do a year of confinement, with a few exceptions. It was the practice of social relations that changed with this pandemic, that is, we have to give an account even to the State of the state of our health, which has become the most important issue, as professional football, with so much abundance, spread to the female sex.

Relationships that are too socially open are prohibited, under the pretext of fines or contagion, to leave the house you need justification, you can work but telework at home. And, meanwhile, the numbers begin to drop and, after a year and several false alarms, we begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel, I hope a new wave doesn't come after it. For many, loneliness weighs heavily and mental illness soars, as psychiatry here in the borough has always defended that being at home for a long time was bad for mental health, it was necessary to go for a walk, even if it was with the dog, go to the movies, socialize, which is the best remedy for a disease like loneliness and a few more mental ones.

Yes, Covid may go away soon. But let us not be deceived. The poison is out there and it is at the heart of all of us in social relationships. This is the real poison that, when awakened in our hearts, does more harm to our society and the more it spreads, whether in economic, psychic or informational forms, it causes enormous damage. It is the virus of intolerance and pettiness, but also of the village spirit instead of the cosmopolitan spirit and the virus of cosmopolitanism instead of the house connected to the world and the surroundings of the heart.

Thus, life is recognized in a certain space, celebratory, media, typical of discotheques and *pub*, while death is relegated to a secondary plane, behind the stage of (social) life. From so much stamping on life, the man

he certainly seeks death, in the most unsuspected forms, from hiding death so much, it ends up exploding like a grenade in his hands, instead of being thrown away. But this is also newsworthy. And the question is the same as always: what television do we have? Who are the programmers? Is the man of culture forever condemned to RTP2 or ARTE, if he doesn't want to make a*melting pot*of culture with your sedentary television experience?

The act of smoking sums up the essence of western civilization, in its meager good habits: I avoid smoking as much as possible, because I know it makes me sick, like all vices. But I am planted in a civilization of pleasure (and its discontents), in a hedonistic, albeit democratic, civilization; therefore, I can choose to have pleasure and feel the need for pleasure over and over again, even though the deprivation of that pleasure brings me pain, due to the lack of this substance that the organism feels. The same is true of voyeurism in terms of porn. Will those who do so have moral principles? In other words, is cultivating the body for the purpose of a pleasure show legitimate, even in a democracy, so to speak? Addiction, pleasure, soft drugs, hard drugs, prostitution. And why does visiting the girls dampen the desire to see sex? It is not porn only, a mechanical product, as existential autonomy and some unity because profitable, a product of industrial society, first, of doing, and of Western society, with an American content, later? Sexual freedom is confused with freedom in general when it is not even a form of freedom, rather, of debauchery, of rebellion, well shaped in films opposite James Dean, Brad Pitt, Al Pacino, Marlon Brando. It is a certain spirit at work, alien to the In fact, that's where the supreme pleasure comes from: being like (all) social scientists, even if not all of us realize this through scientific articles. a product of industrial society, first, of doing, and of Western society, with an American content, later? Sexual freedom is confused with freedom in general when it is not even a form of freedom, rather, of debauchery, of rebellion, well shaped in films opposite James Dean, Brad Pitt, Al Pacino, Marlon Brando. It is a certain spirit at work, alien to the pleasures of religion and monasticism. But there is much more between porn and monasticism, there is social life and the desire that animates to fulfill a mission as the head of a family. In fact, that's where the supreme pleasure comes from: later? Sexual freedom is confused with freedom in general when it is not even a form of freedom, rather, of debauchery, of rebellion, well shaped in films opposite James Dean, Brad Pitt, Al Pacino, Marlon Brando. It is a certain spirit at work, alien to the pleasures of religion and monasticism. But there is much more between porn and monasticism, there is social life and the desire that animates to fulfill a mission as the head of a family. In fact, that's where the supreme pleasure comes from: being like (all) social scientists, even if not all of us realize this through scientific articles, after? Sexual freedom is confused with freedom in general when it is not even a form of freedom, rather, of debauchery, of rebellion, well shaped in films monasticism, there is social life and the desire that animates to fulfill a mission as the head of a family. In fact, that's where the supreme pleasure comes from: being like (all) social scientists, even if not all of us realize this through scientific articles. after? Sexual freedom is confused with freedom in general when it is not even a form of freedom, rather, of debauchery, of rebellion, well shaped in films opposite James Dean, Brad Pitt, Al Pacino, Marlon Brando. It is a certain spirit at work, alien to the pleasures of religion and monasticism. But there is much more be

## **XXIII**

Thus, the artist's role is nothing but to immortalize the moment, to make it memorable, celebratory of any rave in Israel, for example. And if literary writing is an art, the writer takes the forms of the divinity when creating and it is not for nothing that it is said that each book is a child. There are those who have many and are a big-men, there are those who have only two or three, but the thing does not go without saying because of that, the quantity. But it is rare for a thin piece of writing to be prolific, moreover ignored and forgotten and that leaves writing for writing, with good and bad moments and in different registers. This is our case, that's why we wrote this essay in these pandemic times that obligation to quasi-spiritual recollection, even without running in particular and physical exercise in general.

Thus, what matters most in this Existenz is not so much the present moment, the moment that it is, but the moment that is becoming, in a so-called Heideggerian dasei that we deposit on the moment, on doubt, and that we manage in a certain training of dispositional functions. of everyday, *a-la-mano*.

Remember: if someone like you feels lonely, there is always someone who feels more lonely: We are one and many, there are always those who have had good experiences but in the end they come to their senses and have not truly lived life. And truly living life has nothing to do with loneliness or mating, it has to do with giving up certain things in favor of others that are much more important, you are like the spiritual component that each one has in potential and that not all people develop, like a talent, for the supernatural, a will to live instead of a will to power, based on a strong vocation for meditation and contemplation, given that life can either give everything or, at another time, take everything away, but the spiritual perspective no one can steal from you, no matter how hard you try. You celebrate life for life's sake, then you become a monk,

Yes, because with this epidemic the normal man was stuck at home and the ghosts of loneliness rose again; the artist turns around and takes advantage of the downtime of lack of friends to create. However, creation is only a reflection of his social situation and he too needs to live together. What results from this last year is an unprecedented social reconfiguration, as if a bomb had been dropped on us or a new holocaust, the price of having friends is new and even creation itself was installed to give way to almost chronic depression.

Inspiration is not, as always, inside the ear, but it can be behind the ear, in a climate outside the Being, in the domain of exteriority in the face of poetic inspiration. Thus, beauty is not only in the face or body, it is in the way we model our will in the face of the demands or compromises of the physical and social environment and if sometimes we feel despair of being alone, sometimes we feel euphoria of being presentable and nobody to be able to see us, and social visibility was cut with this flu, which also changed the perception of reality, especially among the younger ones, because the more mature were already used to seeing reality in a more cautious way, after the Troika crisis...

This is how the very notion of exteriority is threatened, because through confinement we have returned to ourselves, to the convent, to the monastic life of the first castros of Iberian civilization, that is, to the domain of the house and the conquest of territory that we undertake each time that we go to the supermarket every time we travel to work. Thus, the domain of exteriority is confused with that of interiority, and we no longer know for sure what is intimate and what is public, whether what is more intimate is what is redoubled public or what is customary private.

Thus, we can see the monads as individual subjects with different implications in social life, that is, when they are together for a long time, frequenting their intimacies, they end up reproducing. But they can also meet for a certain long time and not reproduce, reproduce other forms of social procreation,

reproduction, at the level of ideas and spirit, that is, creating new forms of sociability around them that are reproduced in automatons and robots and that simulate the role of social relations, forged in harmony with the social and environmental environment. Social failure comes, most of the time, from the inability to have patience with what happens in terms of social phenomena, professional phenomena, and comes from the eagerness and haste in the face of what is done and whose representativeness may be greater or less. As for the rest in love relationships. Patience is what is required when you want to win socially, artistically, because your profile and social representation comes with time, usually associated with age cycles and what is like this today can be done tomorrow.

The human soul, from a certain moment, a certain stage, is nothing but selectivity, it only does and thinks what it pleases, what is proper to its stronghold. Many artists try to capture the human soul, something common to all or something uniquely beautiful that needs to be highlighted for posterity, postponed for posterity. While some try to do it through music, through literature, others believe that this task is done through cinema, opera, multimedia. The human soul can be captured by a sigh of life and activity, others believe it will be in the long term or by religion, with more or less work. This search is strongly associated with the veneration of Beauty, with an idea of perfectibility in the articulation of the mind with the body. Therefore, others see the crucible of the human soul in sport and not much more is said, or in the age of technique,

Thus, philosophy belongs to the night regime and the art of the day regime, while some celebrate, another work for themselves through art and this is nothing, like philosophy, nothing without social recognition, if only to continue doing the same. , art or philosophy. But philosophy, unlike literature, is a so-called evidence, a making evident, of the creative process, hence its unique vocation of untangling what is human and what is transcendent. To that extent, it fulfills a function and is also a technique, not only of living, but also of reading, reading the world and the possibilities of evidence again of what is old and withered. In this way, it is ultimately a non-exclusive form of wisdom because it is open to the most varied expectations of Being, Existing, Belonging.

The philosopher does not live in the moment, he lets the moment pass in and of others and wants to surf the transcendent, inhabit the moment that has already been, has passed, to resurrect it for the now, the now, on the one hand and in the there, in terms of of future. Hence his intimate relationship with Time, which he tries to tame, yes, the philosopher is, above all, a tamer of

time, when the anthropologist relates it to the social and cultural world and leaves bureaucracy and politics to the sociologist and others...

The local and the global come from human geography and history, from the voyages and discoveries of navigators, and philosophy makes the close distant and the distant close, even geographically, for it is an art of relativizing, like anthropology, which makes strange what is near and near what is far. The rest is politics and governance, that is, a politically correct way of architecturally ordering subjects in a given space when they are attached to a given time.

Thus, practice comes from a certain form of economy inscribed in Time, at the same time that it abdicates the transcendent, which is always a refusal of a present moment, it inscribes itself in history, person and social, anything that is within the scope of an experience that is not registered, that is, there is a gap, in certain societies, between literate and illiterate knowledge, while the literate calls everything into question, the illiterate is destined and comes from an instinct of conservation of a group, of a way of life. It is the relationship between these two ways of facing reality that interests me scientifically, philosophically.

Thus, the eroticity of relationships has to come with a greater or lesser investment in the world, in the things of the world, which can only be seen from afar, just as an investment in anthropology has to come with things and the relationships between things and people, in the most diverse contexts in order to build the theory with which others, artists or technicians, will understand a world where in most cases they are blind and not everyone knows how to correctly envision it in its most diverse forms and disputes. to unfold to the eyes, to the senses. Then, philosophy has to do with the transcendent, not eluding theology, which in a way is the closest thing to philosophy. A philosophy of knowledge, which can be transmitted and even given, offered to the human race so that man understands what most enigmas he sows,

Because time is pressing and it is necessary to do something important with life and, contrary to what it may seem, in this chapter philosophy has a central role, not to complicate, but to lay a brick in the edifice of the human sciences. Philosophy is the deepest echo of existence, an appeal of the man who suffers and who wants to see life forward, even if his perception is and is constituted in terms of peripheral knowledge, that is, the philosopher is played and judged in the its existential stronghold and its words transform and ignite an already hollow and sad world, filling, filling, the empty lives of culture, normally caught in certain social roles, constituting itself as a building that questions the Other without judging it, advancing in words, wrapped in a logic that is not even human, not human,

Thus, knowledge, philosophical or social sciences, needs, as if it were a sponge, the oldest living being, which lives at the bottom of the sea, to be squeezed according to the world, so that it spreads and bears fruit, with the due manure of the human action, for the social world from a perspective of understanding man in his activities and in his thinking and logic, so that it finally ceases to be a poor, marginalized and ostracized knowledge and becomes the center of current reflection on the condition of Being, relativizing common-sense knowledge, which is always professionalized knowledge, which legitimizes logics of the here and now, usually by more or less monad people who never make reflection the center of their lives.

Of course, philosophy does not interest the world. Neither anthropology and sociology. They constitute themselves as opponents to the rolling and blushing of the world and only intervene from time to time and in Portugal they are attached to the academies. Of course this, this question, obeys fashions, times of greater or lesser interest. In my view, philosophy should constitute itself, after the experience of the pandemic, because it is the world as a will and representation that dictates its laws, to constitute itself as a social science. Because the core of what it is to be human is not in the Self, but in the relationship, in its tension and intention towards the Other. It is this, in my view, that defines man. Even with the greatest of adventures, the stele, the galactic one, what man seeks is to answer this essential question in the face of the immensity of the universe: are we alone?...

## **XXVII**

Thus, the realm of Belonging, rather than the realm of perception, is something prior to the very destiny of Man and that defines him, like Being, he is attached to the Opinion, that is, glimpsing the space between monadic real and social representation. , there is a space of habitability where man spends more time with himself and it is even a memory of Belonging, of the relationship with the Other, which defines him as a Being.

But not everyone practices philosophy, not everyone distributes bread to the villages, hence the idea of complementarity, that a little of everything is needed, not everyone is subject to being mocked by their own relatives, not having work, as philosophers or not. Human beings are opportunistic and self-seeking by nature and avoid dependence, whether economic or strictly physical or work. But this does not imply that they stop betting on bonds, essentially those that give them advantages of various kinds. In academia, too, there are dependencies in the struggle for symbolic capital, which is what writes better, speaks and thinks better. It is the domain of competition, although many do their activities alone. Thus, the unemployed or retired philosopher is always subject to criticism from others ("do the same", "get out of your hair", even from the kids, always subject to criticism and I still haven't been able to understand why, perhaps because of a gap that he has at the moment, in the present, or because of the lack of solidarity and spirit of companionship of the philosophers here in the borough. Or, perhaps, because another philosophy is needed, more attentive to the social relations of power, in a competitive world from which not even the philosopher, like the religious, has an escape, because before Being, whether there or there, he is under the in the interest of Belonging, he is a part and therefore responds to his own, whether superior or inferior.