

AMBITO POLITICO

Nel problema della libertà di coscienza, che per alcuni anni ha tanto circolato tra noi, ciò che ha principalmente confuso la questione, mantenuto viva la discussione e accresciuto l'animosità è stato, credo, questo: entrambi i partiti hanno con uguale zelo ed errore, troppo esteso le loro pretese. Mentre una parte predica l'obbedienza assoluta, l'altra pretende una libertà universale nelle questioni di coscienza, senza stabilire quali sono le cose che hanno diritto alla libertà o mostrare i limiti dell'imposizione e dell'obbedienza.

Per aprire la strada a questo chiarimento, porrò come fondamento quanto segue, che credo non sarà posto in dubbio o negato.

Tutto il mandato, il potere e l'autorità del magistrato gli sono dovuti perché non li usi se non per il bene, la conservazione e la pace degli uomini nella società alla quale è preposto.

John Locke, Lettera sulla tolleranza, Laterza, Bari-Roma 1999

The relationship man-to-man is the first historical testimony as regards the epoch that's being, or has been lived. The second historical testimony – that comes directly and consequentially after the first- is politics.

In the course of this essay, I'm going to analyze this dynamic, considering the following aspects:

1. the society as mirror of the single; the single as mirror of the society;
2. the society as mirror of the economy (structure and superstructure);
3. the politics as mirror of the society.

1.

If it was the Man creating the society, or the society creating the Man, it is not that immediate.

Sure, it might be natural coming to the fact that the society *must* be secondary as predisposition and a definition of the word itself -*the aggregate of people living together in a more or less ordered community*- that suggests the idea that it is nothing more than a conglomerate of individuals. Also, it could also come deductively due to the temporal gap in which there surely was Man, but not a society, at least not in the way we globally mean it nowadays.

However, was it really that way? Has the Man ever been capable of facing his loneliness? To be as clear as possible, let me rephrase it this way: Has the Man ever been capable of surviving without his pack? Has he ever choose solitude over community?

There's no need of answering, history speaks itself.

Pragmatically it comes that they both influence each other, so that whether the one changes, the other changes, whether the one perishes, the other perishes, as bounded by a sort of dualism that makes them live one in virtue of the other. Besides, naturalists had already come to that back in the '800, talking about how the race (both the place and the family you're born in), the social-economic condition and the epoch influences and shapes the individuals into being who they are, becoming unequivocally member of the unalterable part of the self.

Therefore, stating that *society=individual; individual=society*, it surely can be affirmed that the sickness of one of the two, involves that they'll either be sick, or either be sane.

2.

Before talking about the men who leads the societies, I find the exigence to talk about what leads those men who leads the societies: economy.

As Karl Marx stated almost 200 years ago, economy is the structure from which everything else takes its shape: instruction, sanity, politics, even religion, everything turns to have an economic outcome.

It has always been this way, or at least, human mindset has always been clear about one statement since the age of the barter: *to do something for something else*. Which is a totally reasonable way of thinking, because it needs to not be forgotten that overall, the main function of every single living being is to survive.

However, the introduction of the capitalistic system, that transformed the market in an all-vs-all war, combined with all the facilitations that came with the Second Industrial Revolution, changed that statement for the very first time in history, turning it in: *to do something for something more*. And to obtain more, man understood that he had between his very own hands, the most precious good that he could find: man himself, and the possibility that comes with him to obtain a “plus lavoro”.

Therefore, that *more* in the end, seem to be nothing less than man himself, despite the consequential alienation that naturally comes with it.

This was the very moment in which the society denied its own nature, creating a fragmentation between its own members, pushing them to constantly fight with each other in order to preserve themselves, forcing them to renounce to their status of Man, to become a mean of production.

This was the very moment in which the duality between that same society and the individuals had been poisoned, ignoring the fact that even in sickness, the bond between the two cannot be split.

3.

Politics is a predisposition of the human being. It is the practical manifestation of the unexplainable need to turn the chaos into cosmos, to rely on a hierarchic system that states our place between the others.

Just like a pastor, whoever has the rule to guide a society needs to act in virtues of it, to enlighten the right road and to lead his heard through it.

“Tutto il mandato, il potere e l'autorità del magistrato gli sono dovuti perché non li usi se non per il bene, la conservazione e la pace degli uomini nella società alla quale è preposto.”: what John Locke states is undeniable. But, unfortunately, is just as utopian.

The problem with the pragmatic realization of what Locke suggests is that he doesn't consider the fact that morality is subordinated to economy in every single practical aspect, transforming “the good, the conservation and the peace” in nothing but secondary problems.

The biggest evidence of what I am stating is simply the global out-come to conservative parties.

Locke complained about the main problem between the parties the fact that they either tried to eliminate the differences, or either tried to pretend they didn't exist. Just as he indicated, neither of the two could possibility be functional, but whenever the people are obligated to choose, it succeed the historical time in which they are living: if you choose to deny the existence of the differences, you're utopian, if you choose to eliminate them, you are scared.

And in an historical moment in which men are constantly turned against each other and pushed to their limits, it is not possible to be in any other than selfish.

To follow Locke's statement, is necessary to sew the society back together, to re-unite the individuals into a community. It is necessary to let people believe again into union, it is necessary to let them see what a world they can find outside their own home.