

The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the “Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity

Antoniu Alexandru FLANDORFER, Ph.D. Student
Department of Human, Social and Political Sciences
“Ștefan cel Mare” University of Suceava, Romania
tony_flandorfer@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract

The tolerance is the form of the ethics, but the uninherent manifestation of the religious moralities, it develops socially profoundly, representing a pale projection of the christian ideal (challenge) of the principle of “love all people as you love yourself” through an avatarized perspective of an immanenting transcendence which is produced by the desacralization on the onthical level cliving to “uncharmed world”, where the “man” participates actively to the edification of the City of God. The social economy in its primordial form was revealed in the Utopia of Morus, then it will circumscribe in the utopical socialism of saint-Simon and in the architecture of the idealistic community represented by the Phalenstère of Fourier, but now it constitutes an ultimate hypostasis into the Europe 2020 Strategy.

The recrudescence of the utopias with homocentric values can be eluded only by democratical systems, through the replacement of the “new man” by the citizen, whom he substitutes in a civic role, where he is perceived like a persona by the other actor, living a profoundly process of atomization, happened from the standardization which we discover into the actual phase of the marketplace economy, that is tributary to the hystorical capitalism yet, but through its social form can be perceived like a ethic panacea of the necessary protection of the imminent victims of any kind of revolution. The present society which is in the moment of a deep revolution that is marked by the evolutionary progress of modernity, passes away by its humanized period through the intrusion into the collective imaginary of an archetype which was increased by the postmodern era, that could suffer a transmutation from the intrusive Lupasco’s trialectic, as an appeal of transdisciplinarity where the ethics, the politics and the social can represent the onthological coordinates, whereupon the aporetical antinomies inhesion to mundaneity are retrospected it, but the tolerance has a soteorological function ant act as “T-state”, being the unifier principle of them.

Keywords: *Utopia, Ethics, Dystopy, Transmodernity, Cyclicity, Social Economy, Tolerance, Included Third.*

If the origins of social economy are said to be found in the need to dream of the oppressed masses during the Industrial Revolution, and if tolerance emerged as a counteracting principle of fanaticism in the humanistic era only to then develop into an ethically social behavior once the masses became emancipated in the face of progress, we can then say that trans-modernism is a status quo generated by the changes at the level of ethos within the axiological pantheon of the human history.

Saint-Simon was one of the pioneers of social economy. However, his vision, removed from being a system per se, represents in fact a manifestation of a conceptual state within the program-revolution, which belongs to the organic times preceding the revolutions of the critical times, thus defined by his disciples, who advocated “(...) for progress in history through, on the one hand the extension of brotherly love and religion, and on the other hand the extension of science and industry (...) Society must be governed by great minds, by science and its application, which is industry. That will be the day when prosperity and happiness shall reign. The lazy ones must be replaced by specialists. Political governance will then become futile in itself when society will have the appearance of a self-governed association.”¹

The rudimentary concept of tolerance in a socialist sense, which is based on the transformation of society into a family, and therefore doesn't seek violent social reform via annihilation of the masses, can be seen in the view of Saint-Simon disciples in the general rule of the idea of progress, where association is subordinated to antagonism, with the latter being defined as a form of exploitation of the kin. The ideal portrayal of society that the Saint-Simon disciples predicted was based on social cohesion of the exploited. “In their progressive doctrine, the moral factor emerges, and it takes precedence over the economic factor. Without being egalitarian or democratic in their political views, they never lose sight of social fairness, which was a foreign concept for their mentor. They protest against the status quo, not only as a means of profiteering and gaining advantages, but also as a way of seeking equality and justice.”²

We can only speak of a social economy in the real sense of the word when we refer to Fourier's phalanstery, where the citizens become co-proprietors of the citadel, actively engaged in collectivist production, and their redistribution disappears, being replaced by their participation in the fruit of the labor. We shall

¹ Mihail Ralea, *Ideea de revoluție în doctrinele socialiste (Studiu asupra evoluției tacticii revoluționare)* (*The Idea of Revolution in the Socialist Doctrines (Study on the Evolution of Revolutionary Tactics)*) (Bucharest: Albatros, 1997), 66-67.

² *Ibidem*, 77.

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

not explore in depth the differences between Charles Fourier’s vision and that of Saint-Simon and his disciples as this is not within the scope of our current research. However, we will take a look at the architecture of the phalanstery, a collectivist complex made of 1500 to 1600 people, with a view to reveal man’s captivity in relation to its own creation within the contemporary urban ritual, regarded as a mimetic sum of the collective imagination of a presupposed Civitas Dei, albeit reversed from the perspective of a theologian axiology.

It’s apodictic that the social economy stems from the pre-Marxist socialist utopias, meant to reinstate a certain behavior within collectivism that would run parallel to the industrial progress, and that which meant a societal proto-form of the principle of tolerance as the antidote to the evil generated by the disappearance of social classes that were about to be abolished. However, even today we cannot speak of the ultimate concept of tolerance, but only of a tolerance of the marginal that comes from standardizing the theoretical notions of power within the nation state, if we are to take into consideration only the democratic territory of society. “In the common acceptance, tolerance is said to be a relation of inequality in which the tolerated individuals or groups are seen as inferior. Tolerating someone is an act of power; being tolerated means accepting one’s weakness. We should aim for something superior to this dichotomy, something above tolerance, something that closely resembles mutual respect.”³

Although these utopian forms of ideal cohabitation of all members of the collectivist society are seen as a common body, they could be traced back to a biblical paradise of the commoners, approached from a mimetic angle but wrongly applied in comparison with the division of labor and the interrelationships within the monarchical settlements, we can still maintain that they have set the groundwork for the beginnings of the modern bio-political thought. The utopian rupture of fields such as economy, social psychology and politics constituted the source of inspiration for the instatement of the subsequent totalitarian political religions. These, in turn, have influenced not only socialism and communism, but also the national-socialism, according to Michel Foucault. “It is the industrialization of state control over the economy, the industrialization of even the analysis of economic phenomena that neo-liberals call «the eternal Saint-Simonism» which gives naissance to this sort of whirlpool that affects the liberal art of governance and which forces it to look for a principle of curbing, of restriction, in an attempt to apply to society the scheme of rationality intrinsic to nature. This principle will

³ Michael Walzer, *Despre tolerare (On Tolerance)*, (Iași: Institutul European, 2002), 47.

eventually have led to the Nazi mindset. It seems then that from Saint-Simon to Nazism there is a cycle of rationalities which attracts interventions, and these interventions lead to a disproportionate growth of the state, which in turn leads to a form of governance that rules according to these types of technical rationalities, and which constitutes the genesis of Nazism throughout the history of capitalism dating back two centuries ago, or at least one and a half centuries ago.”⁴

Tolerance, as an exalted form of the layman’s Christian acceptance, which has its ethical matrix in *imitatio Christi*, is manifested collectively in a practical way through extroversion; as for tolerating, that “(...) will most likely work best when the civil religion will look less like a ... religion.”⁵ Therefore, just as the *homo religious* in his initiating ritual inherent to the ontic and ephemeral adventure uses the mundane model of Christ to guide himself, in the same way the citizen surrenders to a so-called *civil religion*, as an ethic manifestation of the collectivist norms instituted within the *Civitas terrena sive diaboli*, without genuinely being capable of reaching tolerance in his relations with others, but doing so only to the extent to which it means facing oneself in the mirror when relating to The Other. From this perspective, the individual is only capable of conforming to tolerating. If for the Christian, the transcendent truth means epiphany, by extrapolating this to the individual, the citizen, it follows that the latter would relate to others through tolerance only when at the level of community there is a societal *satori*??? which would concur with the end of history, the time of perpetual peace when the human being lives in the lost paradise projected like hopelessness by the ultimate progress of technology.

One of the key proponents of the principle of tolerance, J. Locke criticizes the dogmatic restrictiveness of the Church which had repercussions on the psyche of the masses, being the generator of the collective imagination with its mitologemas and old habits of hatred, of the diachronic world as a whole which revealed itself as a geo-strategy of the secularized religion to give authority to the institutionalized Church over the State, thus producing a multitude of victims. “In this context, the issue of tolerance is a political issue which takes on the following meaning: what opinions can be banned by the political powers? The problem isn’t about the Church, it’s about the political powers. We must find a principle that works to determine, among the variety of opinions, the ones that can have legal status; consulting the religious authorities in matters they might consider as

⁴ Michel Foucault, *Nașterea biopoliticii. Cursuri ținute la Collège de France (1978-1979) (The Birth of Bio-Politics. Lectures at the Collège de France (1978-1979))* (Cluj: Idea Design & Print, 2007), 117.

⁵ Walzer, *Despre tolerare*, 68.

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

deviating from the dogmas should no longer be necessary. Their position is, in fact, quite predictable. The issue of tolerance needs to be regarded not as a religious problem, but as a theological one, as a political one, as a civic problem.”⁶

In a secondary context, replacing the Christian moral, which overlaps to some extent with the civil religion advocated by J. J. Rousseau, has the purpose of manipulating the masses and subjugating them by the powers at work in various situations. Indeed the *mélange* of these two types of manifestation is referential to the axiology inherent in the collectivist spectrum of community, leading to a dangerous cleavage in what could be the incubation of political religions of totalitarian nature. Within the *ecclesia* of the polis as a form of estheticism of subordination, the civic spirit which incubates the principle of tolerance has the effect of a narcotic promised freedom for the man seduced by his own values artificially created. In this *disenchanted world*, the constant fabrication of these ethical inventions of bio-politics results in our resignation to the social status, with its hierarchical stratification, by the invisible power of administration. The ethics, the politics and the philosophies of the community, when they existed (and they always have existed, even when they were reduced to talk about fraternity or productions on the theme of «inter-subjectivity») followed their paths or their humanistic impasses without the knowledge that these singular voices were advocating for community, and they were potentially only talking about community without realizing that a «literary» or «esthetic» experience was rooted in the experience of the community and it was about the community.”⁷

The *de facto* estheticism of politics as Walter Benjamin was to perceive it in Mussolini’s fascism*, and as it would later be reflected in other forms of totalitarianism, transgressed the level of community by renouncing to the overt conflict between the power opponents, even as back as the time of the Cold War where the masses were offered another participatory ideal, an equally atrocious one albeit a more bearable one due to manipulation with an element of play. Thus, Alain Badiou, starting with an analysis of Brecht’s destiny and the influence of eras on human creations, maintained that “(...) nowadays people think that the theater must change – it has to become the celebration of a democratic and moral consensus, a sort of a brooding choir that laments the misfortunes of the world and

⁶ Dominique Colas, *Genealogia fanatismului și a societății civile (Civil Society and Fanaticism)* (Bucharest: Nemira, 1998), 254.

⁷ Jean-Luc Nancy, *Comunitatea absentă (The Absent Community)* (Cluj: Idea Design & Print, 2005), 31.

* Walter Benjamin, *Iluminări (Illuminations)* (Bucharest: Univers, 2000), 142-144.

praises their humanitarian counterpart. We can't talk of heroes, of typical conflict or of thought; we can only talk of unanimous bodily emotion.”⁸ We can see that the creational forms of humanity are influenced in order to implement new ethical and moral values in the collective mind according to the political strategies pertinent to each era. If modernism offered us the *hero* with a soteriological function as a justification of the cathartic atrocities, falsely justified as expiating of certain sins and invented by the totalitarian regimes of the first half of the 20th century, and postmodernism had the role of offering us an exacerbated freedom transformed in an anomic libertarianism, then trans-modernism will achieve the task of instituting order, albeit not in a manner similar to modern totalitarianism but in a way that gives birth to a different type of *new man* by attributing the role of hero to the marginal created as a result of the seism produced by the preceding *aiones*. That would represent a compromise between modernism and postmodernism, reflected in the trans-modernist values, as an escape from the recrudescence of totalitarianism as well as the institution of the much needed order that was lost with the arrival of postmodernism. We can maintain that whereas the bio-politics of modernity with its totalitarian regimes led to countless human victims, the postmodernism invented new systems of enslaving the masses, much more subtle and sophisticated.

Democracies are characterized by diluted ideologies which inoculate to the man the idea that he is the master of his own destiny, whereas totalitarian regimes have concentrated ideologies where the man is subject to a process of atomization, he possesses an avatar pertinent to the system and is alienated either from the state or from the image of the leader. The diluted ideologies are impregnated by the imaginaries which reveal themselves through the effortless and grobian needs of the ethos, whereas the totalitarian ideologies develop out of the vital necessities, the frustrations and the unfulfilled ideals in a state of ebullition and marked by a *punctum saliens* identified in a revolution which manifests entropically in its climax until the deletion of all the energy emanated by the masses, and through the upheaval of the preceding values within the context of various historical intrigues, recreating a new social order meant to instate a status immutable to the previous one (as an example we should mention the perpetual revolution which has a purely theoretical impact with an anarchic projection). This immutable status of the order is versatile as it can be found in both democracies and totalitarian ideologies since the history of humanity consists of binary pairs alternating infinitely, in Gnostic key according to the vision of I. P. Culianu, under various divided hypostases in

⁸ Alain Badiou, *Secolul (The Century)* (Cluj, Idea Design & Print, 2010), 47.

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

which it is customary to associate the first with the Evil and the latter with the Good. This approach asserted to the variable empirical norms is promoted by none other than the secret forms of manifestation inherent to the sphere of political power.

From a kaleidoscopic perspective, history reveals that the valences of power, either totalitarian or democratic, remain unchanged, and the same system of imposing the mechanism of power over the masses is manifested in an itinerant and recrudescing manner. In fact, these two forms of political powers with a major social impact are hypostases created artificially in the immanence of the collective imagination with a view to distract the public opinion from the true intentions of the political power. The coercing mechanism of democracy impacts the masses in insidious ways, eroding the will of the people over a longer period of time than the violent terror instated by totalitarian rule while still having as a final goal the same potentiating impulse. Whereas the political modernism of the 20th century sought to implement fear through warfare, postmodernism, with its explosive technology, imposed the slavery of work as man's only form of salvation. In this context, tolerance emerges as an indubitably necessary outcry, “(...) as the sole resolution to avoid conflict among people, cultures and civilizations that could endanger the very future of mankind, a future that is being built or denied at present – thus it becomes a necessary cultural act of informing a new moral paradigm that today's reality invites.”⁹

For Karl R. Popper, if the fight against poverty and the idea of equality of chances didn't come true, that would reflect a fiasco of the general welfare state, inherent to Western culture which still offers a model worthy of copying on the way to the ideal, albeit still perfectible, society. Karl R. Popper thus proposes the involvement of each individual in his or her own social growth with a view to eliminating the involvement of the state in the life of the citadel; this can be achieved through mechanisms of social assistance which would lead to an etatic bureaucracy similar to that of totalitarian rule. “In this light, the success of our Western economic system seems to me of primordial importance. If we can't make poverty into a rare occurrence, then we stand to lose our freedom to the bureaucracy of the welfare state.”¹⁰

⁹ Sorin-Tudor Maxim, *Toleranța. Dreptul la diferență (Tolerance. The Right to Difference)*. (Bucharest: Didactică și Pedagogică, Publishing House, 2004), 67.

¹⁰ Karl R. Popper, *În căutarea unei lumi mai bune (In Search of a Better World)* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1998), 236.

Ultimately everything comes down to the welfare of each individual vis-à-vis the state, and the political hypostases are molded onto the ideals of the masses in order to further facilitate the manipulation of the masses by the powers at play. Of course, we can see that the Western design of this ideal type of welfare state hasn't materialized, or at least not under the sanctions it initially envisioned. The impulse, otherwise known as the fundamental social catalyst to creating a welfare state is maximized when everyone contributes to their own growth and when the necessary supports are created to protect the marginalized classes within the society. We can identify the same impulse from a historical perspective in the utopian models, which constructed their hierarchical systems in their own pragmatic immanence depending on the role of each member of the social contract that bound all members together.

In an attempt to describe the failure of the general welfare state through the establishment of a dominant role of the state over the individual as well as the triumph of bureaucracy, we shall now look at the panoptic model of Bentham, which at the present time (and we say this without assuming a conspiratorial view on history) has reached its peak through the virtual techniques of postmodernism which changed science into ethics, the really dangerous process that continues into trans-modernism only this time under the guise of the rupture between progress and tradition. Under the pretext of protecting the individual from the disturbing elements within society, Bentham created in 1885 the model of the Panopticon, or the House of Inspection. This anti-utopian political model has its ethical grounds on the socially moralizing role of work, having as coercing resort the punitive observation. The subjects of this experiment are the marginalized social classes gathered from prisons, factories, warehouses, social nursing homes, mental institutions, etc.* The Panopticon is a trans-disciplinary model with an architecture that takes on ethical valences. From an architectural standpoint, Bentham's model has the circular design resembling the Citadel of the Sun depicted by Campanella, only that instead of the temple of sun at its center, it has the prisoners' surveillance tower. Michel Foucault describes it as follows: "(...) a circular construction on the outside; in the middle, a tower with large windows overlooking the inside of the outer ring; the outer building is divided into cells which stretch over the entire width of the construction; these cells each of two windows, one facing in towards the tower windows and one facing out enabling the light to shine all through the cells. In this scenario, it's sufficient to place a surveying person in the main tower

* The Works of Jeremy Bentham, vol. 4, William Tait (Edinburgh, 1843) *apud* Zygmunt Bauman, *Libertatea (Freedom)* (Bucharest: DU Style, 1998), 38.

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

and in each cell locking a mad man, a sick man, a convict, a working man or a school kid. Due to the *contre-jour* effect of the tower, the little silhouettes in the cells of the construction are clearly visible in the light. There are as many theaters as cages, where each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and visible at all times. The Panopticon design arranges the space into units that enable continuous visibility and instant detection.”¹¹

Extrapolating this model to the macro-social level, the surveillance or tight control of the masses by an externalized political body, which has the function to eradicate in a subtle manner the instances of social accession, are exercised through invisible political mechanisms employed by the coercing political systems and administrations with the ultimate goal of keeping the social asymmetry among members in the same pre-determined harmony of the societal chain. In this way, the subjects, particularly the social representatives who are the messengers of the community in the relationship with the authorities, capable at any time of social upheaval, are monitored by this externalized political body which is situated in a subsidiary decisional layer that gives it an air of secrecy which enables it to easily manipulate the masses. “Any relationship between people or groups is characterized by the presence or the absence of the secret and its nature; for, even when the other fails to notice the secret, the behavior of the secret keeper and therefore the relationship between the two is determined by the existence of the secret. The historical evolution of society is characterized in many ways by matters of public interest having fallen under secrecy, and vice-versa, namely secret matters having lost their protection and which became exposed – this development can be paralleled to the evolution of the spirit where what used to be done consciously changed into an involuntary mechanical instinct, whereas what used to be unconscious and instinctual became conscious. It wasn’t until much later that it was acknowledged that this development differs from private life to public life, and that evolution leads to more adaptable conditions in such a way that the secret, initially clumsy and indiscriminating, becomes too extended too often, making everyone aware of the benefits of keeping the secret; it wasn’t until later that the relationship between the importance or the insignificance of the secret, its dimension and its consequences was to be acknowledged – all these factors bring

¹¹ Michel Foucault, *A supraveghea și a pedepsii: nașterea închisorii (Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison)*, Pitești: Paralela 45, 2005), 255.

under scrutiny the significance of the secret within the structure of human reciprocity.”¹²

The current thesis doesn't propose to analyze in depth the influence of architecture on the ethos in general, starting from proto-realists such as Loos, Perret and Garnier. It will however look at the vision full of intensity of Le Corbusier, who, in his typically austere style, proposed new urbane and utopian values. For instance, in the Voisin design for Paris, Le Corbusier ordered the social hierarchy according to the urban center. The high central buildings are reserved for the economic elite (the entrepreneurs), whereas the smaller apartments with gardens in the suburbs were designed for the subordinate / lower classes. Thus, a person's status could be measured by his or her proximity to the center. However, just like in a well-managed factory, all the inhabitants of the city would have the “collective pride” of a working team that manufactures the finished product. (...) Le Corbusier considered urban planning to be a giant effective engine with countless finely tuned pieces. As a result, he assumed that the citizens of such a city would proudly accept a modest role within this urban machinery built on scientific principles.”¹³ By resorting to discipline and using the architectural system as a form of coercion on the social hierarchy, evaluated according to an ultra-modernist authoritarianism design that imposes the respect inherent to tolerance in the form of resignation in a well-defined state, the urbanite ergonomics represented the pretext to divide daily life according to production, disregarding the complex individual necessities. The austere architectural style that Le Corbusier proposed to the inhabitants of the citadel, with its large areas that make them easy to survey, represented the conceptual trans-disciplinary origins of the current panoptic dystopia and the development of privacy-invading systems such as Big Brother with the goal of depersonalizing the individual and transforming him into a machin.* This reifying of the individual reached its climax

¹² Georg Simmel, *Despre secret și societatea secretă (On Secrecy and Secret Societies)* (Bucharest: Art, 2008), 38-39.

¹³ James C. Scott, *În numele statului: modele eșuate de îmbunătățire a condiției umane (Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed)* (Iași Polirom, 2007), 150-151.

* “«Any machin» is endoubted with operational virtues. If the machine proclaims its function through the name itself, the «machin» remains an undetermined term in the functional paradigm, with the pejorative connotation of a «thing without a name», or something that cannot be named (the imorality of an object the use of which is unfamiliar to us). And despite all this, the object functions. An uncertain paranthesis, an object separated from its funtion, the «machin» – or the «trick» as some call it – hints at a vague, endless functionality which is more likely a mental image of an imaginary functionality.” Jean Baudrillard, *Sistemul obiectelor (The System of Objects)* (Cluj: Echinox, 1996), 76. In my view, this is the final phase in the denial of the human being where the

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

in the postmodernist era only to be continued at present. However, unlike the precedent model where science was given precedence over tradition, nowadays, due to the proposed reconciliation through tolerance as an ethic foundation among individuals of the gregarious system, we can identify in our proposed theory, the T state inherent to the trialectic of Lupasco, of the “included third” principle. In fact, this acts as a link between the two ontical and social dimensions, that of science and that of tradition (religion) that we would place at points A and non-A, regarded independently as antinomic, just as it happened in postmodernism.

Social economy is participatory in that all the members of the community are all involved with solidarity in this social utopia where the state, as the foundation of social protection, becomes the individual’s guardian and in doing that it accedes to a position of invincibility which, in a democracy manifests itself preventively, or else in a manipulative manner, whereas in totalitarianism it manifests itself through repression.

Utopias are cosmopolitan – keeping in mind the etymology of the term which comes from *kosmos* – univers, *polites* – citizen, and as such they can foster the universal. It’s ironic nonetheless that, in this universal milieu, the marginalized and not the majority are given precedence.

In the trans-modernist dystopia, there is a dissolution between the individual and the citizen as the two situations in which the man without a destiny engaged in the construction of his own instrument of torture, namely in edifying the sacerdotal encampment of the mystical state, made up of the rupture between science and tradition / religion. At present, science is in a hipertelic state, that refracts on the entire socio-political scene, and the institutionalized church is a reflection of the hiatus between the mundane and the transcendental. The civic aspect of a democratic culture replaced the traditional and it has become or is about to become a political religion. The trans-political as Jean Baudrillard sees it has a devastating connotation not only for the political structures but also for the man himself, representing the end of the ontic. “The trans-political is the transparence and the obscenity of all structures in a structure-less universe, the transparence and obscenity of change in a history-less universe, the transparence and obscenity of

being is completely reified in the trans-modern dystopia, prophesied by Fukuyama, concomitant with the *death of history* which will trigger not the death of the species at a physical level but at an existential one. If Baudrillard employs this concept of the *machin* beyond the dimensions an object can take on through its well-defined functionality, it is my opinion that a transformative dehumanization would be accomplished through the apotheosis of science in conjunction with attributing work an axiological value with an ultimate soteriological function, where the human being must expiate the sin of complete knowledge.

information in an event-less universe, the transparency and obscenity of space in the promiscuity of networks, the transparency and obscenity of the social in the lives of masses, of the political into terror, of bodies into obesity and genetic cloning... The end of the historical scene, of the political scene, of the fantastic scene, of the bodily scene – an overflow of the obscene. The end of secrecy and the deluge of transparency.”¹⁴

In the same order of things, if we look for instance at social factories, which represent the projection of this type of economy at the practical level, we will notice that often disabled citizens have been used for labour with a view to integrate them socially through work under the pretext that it is a form of therapy; all this is reminiscent of the concept of super-human, and society as a whole is a true Lebensborn where these marginalized individuals become prototypes of overcoming the human limitations and even of the capability of human nature in general. From a Christian moral stance, these people should be the protégés of social reforms since they are stigmatized, and Christianity, as a model of Western culture empathizes with those in need. Jove’s submission is soteriological through the concatenation of the human immanence with transcendence; at the same time, the state, in its desire to be ubiquitous present in all forms of social structures, overcomes its limitations and transgresses into the divine.

Work isn’t the highest purpose of mankind; it’s not through work that humans find their redemption. Social economy in its contemporary acceptance isn’t the source of social protection but only another form of surrender to the totalitarian conditions of the bio-power.

Bibliography:

1. Badiou, Alain. *Secolul (The Century)*. Cluj: Idea Design & Print, 2010.
2. Baudrillard, Jean. *Sistemul obiectelor (The System of Objects)*. Cluj: Echinox, 1996.
3. Baudrillard, Jean. *Strategiile fatale (Fatal strategies)*. Iași: Polirom, 1996.
4. Bauman, Zygmunt. *Libertatea (Freedom)*. Bucharest: DU Style, 1998.
5. Benjamin, Walter. *Iluminări (Illuminations)*. Bucharest: Univers, 2000.
6. Colas, Dominique. *Genealogia fanatismului și a societății civile (Civil Society and Fanaticism)*. Bucharest: Nemira.
7. Foucault, Michel. *A supraveghea și a pedepsi: nașterea închisorii (Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison)*. Pitești: Paralela 45, 2005.

¹⁴ Jean Baudrillard, *Strategiile fatale (Fatal strategies)* (Iași: Polirom, 1996), 31.

*The Tolerance as the Ethic Foundation of Social Economy into the Perspective of the
“Included Third” in the Contextuality of Transmodernity*

8. Foucault, Michel. *Nașterea biopoliticii. Cursuri ținute la Collège de France (1978-1979) (The Birth of Bio-Politics. Lectures at the Collège de France (1978-1979))*. Cluj: Idea Design & Print, 2007.
9. Maxim, Sorin-Tudor. *Toleranța. Dreptul la diferență (Tolerance. The Right to Difference)*. Bucharest: Didactică și Pedagogică Publishing House, 2004.
10. Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Comunitatea absentă (The Absent Community)*. Cluj: Idea Design & Print, 2005.
11. Popper, Karl R. *În căutarea unei lumi mai bune (In Search of a Better World)*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 1998.
12. Ralea, Mihail. *Ideea de revoluție în doctrinele socialiste (Studiu asupra evoluției tacticii revoluționare) (The Idea of Revolution in the Socialist Doctrines (Study on the Evolution of Revolutionary Tactics))*. Bucharest: Albatros, 1997.
13. Scott, James C. *În numele statului: modele eșuate de îmbunătățire a condiției umane (Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed)*. Iași: Polirom, 2007.
14. Simmel, Georg. *Despre secret și societatea secretă (On Secrecy and Secret Societies)*. Bucharest: Art, 2008.
15. Walzer, Michael. *Despre tolerare (On tolerance)*. Iași: Institutul European, 2002.