

PROFILING MODERN RISKS. AN APPRAISAL OF THE WORKS OF BAUMAN, BECK, CASTEL, GIDDENS AND BAUDRILLARD.

Korstanje Maximiliano E.

University of Moron Argentina.

Abstract

Undoubtedly, the fear can be seen a grounding emotion broadly studied by psychology, sociology and anthropology for many years. Every end of millennium represents for human beings a new embodiment of their beliefs, their production, forms of consumption and even their hierarchical lines of authority. As privileged witnesses of the starting of a new millennium, one might realize how the sentiment of unprotection has been disseminated as a virus world-wide. Ranging from appalling events such as 11/09 towards the Swine Flu recently appeared in Mexico, the perception of lay-people of what is or not dangerous seem to be changed for-ever. Under such a context, the present theoretical manuscript explores the connection of risk and fear at the time it delves into the main contributions and limitations of Jean Baudrillard, Anthony Giddens, Robert Castel, Ulrich Beck and Zygmunt Bauman. From different angles, every-one of cited scholars will give to reader an insight view of the role played by risk and fear in our modern society.

Key Words: Fear; Risk; Modernity, Consumption, Late-Capitalism, Secure-Base.

Introduction

To a greater or lesser extent, the advent of new millennium has brought unexpected aftermaths for lay-people, for their cosmologies, traditions, customs and event for their day-to-day relationships. To the best of knowledge, advances in fields of technology and production seem to be accompanied with a new way of perceiving the public sphere, events and otherness. In last decades, there has been a radical change in the ways of perceiving the interaction of human with its environment. Ranging from the World Trade Center attack to the appearance of SARS or Swine Flu outbreak, the perception of ontological security of citizenship has been substantially altered. This issue has been drawn the attention of many scholars. Under such a context, the present conceptual paper explores the issue of security and risk from the perspective of four well-known philosophers such as Robert Castel, Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, Zygmunt Bauman and Jean Baudrillard respecting to the role played by media and market in the mitigation or overexposure of such a fears. With different styles they have substantially contributed to a much more deep understanding why people feel more insecurity in spite of having an array of devices and methods aimed at enhancing protection. To put this matter bluntly, a growing number of psychological pathologies as phobias or panic attacks have recently surfaced product of an overload of information. Readers who wishing to have this more clear will read a manuscript which is encompassed in 8 interesting sections that

trigger a hot debate hopefully can be continued by others in next.

Inflation of threats in Robert Castel

One might suppose we are not in conditions to discuss the role of fears and risks without citing Robert Castel who devoted considerable efforts to examine the connection between perception and security. At a first glance, Castel inspects how the civil and social right according to the fundamental liberties with private property converges. The latter refers to ontological security associated to illness, poverty, disasters and old aging. The current degree of insecurity corresponds with the level of materiality and richness of society. At time societies achieve their goals, news types of risks are created. What it is important to mention here is that the advance of technology and Science in human domain engender new dangers we have not contemplated in past. This collective aversion corresponds with a lack of dependency among the different collectives that encompass the society. In part one might speculate that risk communication plays a pervasive role in the process of mitigation of natural disasters. In some cases, it allows solving conflicts to make a coherent evacuation but in other creates panic flights that substantially affect changing the life of people (Gough, 2000).

With this background in mind, Castel argues that throughout the Middle Age families played a different role than now. Security was circumscribed to a protection given by the proximity, oddly, among net-works associated with a high degree of cohesion related to lineage and heritage. In order for being protected of external aggression, societies considered fear as an instrument for political indoctrination, a way of grouping similarly-minded people. Enrooted in the belief that the vulnerability of citizens is accompanied by the declination of State, Castel realizes even though Middle age was a much more dangerous era than today but paradoxically lay-people felt safer.

Following the contributions of Thomas Hobbes who affirmed that fear of dying corresponds with the starting point that constitutes the modern-State, Castel realizes that security is vague as a concept. Whether every citizen complaints for security to State, they involuntarily are pushing in order for the State to monopolize a major propensity of violence creating the preconditions towards totalitarianism. The present frustration of unsatisfied demands in combination with a more deficient bureaucracy gives as a result the current sentiment of unprotection. One might speculate that the growth experienced industrial societies from 1953 to 1970 certainly triggered a rise on consumption and incomes which failed to be materialized in a fairer wealth distribution. This issue not only shortened previous social inequalities but also gave a principle of differed satisfaction. The pre-conditions for domination (in this point the argument of Castel equals to Giddens) emerges from the need of social security and uncertainty (Castel, 2006: 49).

As Beck puts it, no solution is completely effective whenever the society should face outsider risks. In this point Castel's development diverges from Giddens who consider fatalism is a conservative course of action to get back to the lost previous political order. It is unfortunate that inflation of risk is experiencing modern societies demonstrate serious problems to annihilate the existent angst, fear and anxiety resulted from the over-protection claims. For that reason, individualism in conjunction with a critical risk perception paved the pathway towards the entrance of market in the citizen's daily life. The proliferation of insurance policies of all types or insurances brings to consumer a temporal feeling of security. Equaled the consumers in similar conditions, the market transforms consumers in consumable goods.

This point diminishes their self-esteem and jeopardizes the process of identity.

Daily risk in Ulrich Beck

In a similar manner of Castel, Ulrich Beck argues that the process of modernity has been created a radical shift afterwards the nuclear accident occurred in Chernobyl, Ukraine. This tragedy certainly marked a beginning and end of a new manner of perceiving the events beyond possibilities of subject reactions. Postmodernity characterized by blurring the boundaries between classes and their responsibilities in the process of production. Threats are implicitly derived from a product of the economic development but sooner or later the accumulated risks give place to real dangers compromising the stability of system.

In opposition to industrialism that held the line between poverty and richness, western societies face a new configuration of social order. Needs of mass-consumption in association with a growing sentiment of fear paved the pathway to advent of a new spirit of capitalism. As a result of this, logic of appropriation -which characterized classical mercantilism in past decades-, is being replaced by its own antithesis, the logic of disavowal. Technically for Beck fears surface whenever the risk is trivialized. After further examination, Beck explains that in "traditional society of classes" the involving groups replicate certain criterion of social distinction according to the style of consumption. In the era of industrialism societies structured their solidarities based on property, blood-hood and status.

The risks not only are triggered by the advance of technology but also they are covered and studied by experts. In this vein, the market plays a pivotal role in bringing security to citizens just there where the State is hand-tied.

The upshot of Beck is that the production of risks is proportional inverse to existing wealthy distribution. The imposition of external risks in consumer minds predispose to an increase of consumption. After all, the fear is the only sentiment which can be continuously stimulated. The technological and economic production generates some risks which not only are ignored but also symbolically manipulated and perpetuated. Whilst in Middle Age witchcrafts, devil and demons shaped the consciousness of theology in Europeans, today "global risks" related to environment contamination plays a similar role in encouraging an unsustainable consumption. The paradox seems to lie in a situation of this nature predispose the society to collapse. Contributions of Beck merit be contrasting and complementing to the approaches of other well-known scholar as Z. Bauman who in his book *Liquid Fear* examines the relationship between emerging and continuous fears with mass-consumption practices.

Liquid Fear in Zygmunt Bauman

In sharp contrast to Beck who considered fears are product of history, Z. Bauman considers the sentiment of security is inextricably intertwined to the performance of economy. Basically, he is convinced that, in contrast to animals (which feel basic fears like a kind of impulse to escape in specific situations), men have the ability to elaborate a secondary emotions characterized by being enrooted in the culture. This means that fears vary on society, time and culture. Following this model fear can be classified threefold: a) fears that threaten physically to persons, b) fears which jeopardize the social order, and c) those that affects the phenomenological being in the world of people.

The risk operates as a mechanism used in order for subject to reduce the psychological impacts

of unexpected events. Unlike of emotions, risks are characterized by the calculation of contingency. Following this explanation, Bauman warns that the message of modern television (like Big Brother) programs is aimed at publishing the human weakness simply because the salvation is only reserved for only one. For our philosopher, Big Brother works as a “moral story” in which punishment and prizes become more important than solidarity. Unlike a hero who individually looks for his own fame and salvation, religion provides the opportunity of transcendence whenever people might not access to the benefits of immortality of self. Under these circumstances, the humanity is continuously being fragmented due to individualism and egoism. Underpinned in the proposition that our obsession of living forever jeopardizes the social bondage, Bauman realizes that the likelihoods to contemplate the mortality as an improbable event are of course associated to the declination of solidarity. Disasters can be explained following a mythical archetype where in similar conditions the involved community overcame a situation of complete destruction. The uncertainty triggers a much broader sentiment of anxiety because people think things are out of control.

As the previous argument given, the appalling natural disasters like Katrina showed two relevant aspects to be seriously taken in mind: for one hand, a major part of inhabitants in New Orleans were “black or Latin American” living in situation of unpreparedness and poverty. For the other, victims are often excluded from economic progress long time of the catastrophe takes room. So far, it is hypothesized that modern bureaucracy not only affects the responsibility for actions in the different ways but also subordinates emotions in a secondary role. In the threshold of twentieth century, the ethic has been cynically replaced by rationality. Once the appropriate abilities to consider how to use it rationality are deteriorated, the advances of technologies have the intention to reduce the costs of freedom. The suspension of ethic order in conjunction with a moral declination of reliability appears to be predominant characteristic in liquid times.

From this change of mind, technological fetishism performs the role of a political mechanism in substituting the modern culprit by the needs of information. Taking its cue from R. Castel, Bauman outlines that the rise of risks and insecurity are derived from a process of rationalization that recently invaded all spheres of day-to-day life. Therefore, Nation-States are unable to reduce the cognitive dissonance between reality and virtuality. These gaps are fulfilled by the market which poses at consumer’s disposal a set of elaborated products to alleviate its own angst. By the way, Bauman is strongly interested in examining how this issue is accompanied with an ever-growing process of individualization. One of characteristics of prophecies was the forecasting how unexpected events can be ushered to the present. It was not surprising that ancient prophets were concerned over predicting that the end of world was coming up. In our profane times, there are no boundaries between fantasy and reality. The worse side of globalization is not linked to mediated events in such but to deficiencies to prevent a real disaster really happen. The excess of information and technology plays a crucial role in the enhancement of warnings. At a first glance, nor Bauman neither Beck are unable to determine to what extent capitalist trademark reduces solidarity nor the ways these restrictions creates a declination in the natural defenses of society against risk. To some extent, some scholars think this thought rivals with Anthony Giddens’s. Rather in next section we will see that these two developments share a point of agreement.

Risk and Reflexivity in Anthony Giddens

As previously explained Bauman, Beck and Castel devoted considerable attention to

understand the interconnection between modernity, risk, security and threat perception. However, only in Giddens we found a convergence between sociological methodologies with psychological insights. Restructuring the contributions of French sociology with British Pragmatism, Giddens intends to resolve to what a extent a micro-social theory as Secure base and Attachment converges with macro-sociology of his previous thesis about structuration. Starting from the premise that modernity is a post-traditional order based on the rationality and doubt, Anthony Giddens examines how the concept of risk emerges replacing the pre-existing logic by a rational knowledge which operates from the subject and the structure at the same time. Reflexivity institutionalizes the principle of “Radical Doubt” while trust draws the boundaries between care-taker protection and ontological security. Notably influenced by the “Attachment Theory”, Giddens realizes that trust should function as a “protective cocoon” wherein the involving care-takes provide in early socialization process to the child a necessary inoculation to face and of course overcome the potential threats and dangers in adulthood.

In terms of our author, *“Modernity reduces the overall riskiness of certain areas modes of life, yet at the same time introduces new risk parameters include high-consequence risk: risks deriving from the globalized character of the social system of modernity. The late modern world –the world of what I term high modernity- is apocalyptic, not because it is inevitably heading towards calamity, but because it introduces risks which previous generations have not had to face”* (Giddens, 1991: 4). After reading this excerpt, one might question whether modern people seem to be more vulnerable than other generations.

After all, A. Giddens contends that the modernity can be equaled in certain degree to the notion of industrialization. Both are part of a broader process of labor organization and material production power (commoditization). Nevertheless unlike industrialism, modernity created a new political and economical form of institution: Nation-State. The Classical Order here contrasts with the logic of Nation-states because of two reasons: a) a new way to perceive the space and time in social imaginary and b) the needs of monopolizing the usage of violence within certain territory. Time-spaces distances are controlled by the beurocracy of a system which is centered in three respects. Surely, the first one is what Giddens calls *the separation between space and time*. This principle reminds us even if all cultures have their own time-reckoning as well as spaces parameters, only under the late modernity the time and space merge in a much broader configuration: the place.

As mediator between the site and time, the place very well corresponds with modern form of social organization intended to connect “the where” with “the when”. Giddens discusses how works the disembedding mechanisms of society to articulate the symbolic sings with expert systems which are self-oriented to separate the pre-existing daily interaction from particularities of locales. This happens because the institutional reflexivity works as a regularized knowledge in terms of a constitutive element of organization. The disembedding mechanisms are two: symbolic system and expert systems. For further understanding, he goes on to say *“symbolic tokens are media of exchange which have standard value, and these are interchangeable across a plurality of contexts. The prime example, and the most pervasively important, is money. Although the larger of pre-modern social system have all developed monetary exchange of one form of another, money economy becomes vastly more sophisticated and abstract with the emergence of maturation of modernity”* (ibid, 18).

Rather, the system of experts circumscribes their actions to the private life not only expanding

to lay-persons their technical perspectives but also connecting the intimacies of self with others. As a consequence of this, both types of system (illustrated here) depend upon the trust to operate in the complex and inextricable social net. With the advent of modernity, we might speculate, the privacy has come to end. In our times, consumers acquire more knowledge about their purchasing power as well as their possibilities and rights as consumers. The process of reflexivity obliges persons to find themselves beyond the influences of social institutions. Whether pre-modern societies saw in witchcraft a valid instrument to anticipate the future, today statistics not only validates the position of Nation-State regarding certain troubling issues but also represents the ways people perceive events. Modern reflexivity permits people questioning course of actions of their own institutions and leaders. In other terms, *“modernity’s reflexivity refers to the susceptibility of most aspects of social activity, and material relation with nature, to chronic revision in the light of a new information or knowledge. Such a information or knowledge is not incidental to modern institutions, but constitutive of them ... because many possibilities of reflection about reflexivity exist in modern social conditions”* (ibid: 20).

The rise of risk perception as a theory has been resulted of the need of reflexivity. It is also assumed that risk perception trends to grow up at once individuals are in conditions of collating more information. Disconnected events and different points of the world can be mixed and disseminated by mass media in few minutes to a broadest audience worldwide. This means that the experience is not being determined by the proximity where the event takes place any longer. One of characteristics of high-modernity is that unfamiliar events are internalized individually as a part of daily social life of consumers. To wit, Giddens argues that the so-called “scientificization” may create problems as well as efficient solutions to humankind concerns. Inasmuch as people make a decision in one of other way to resolve certain point further propensity of generating unprepared risks. The degree of expertise in our modern world is substantially determined by the ways it can resolve the contingency in lay persons. Furthermore, risk can be understood as parameters to measure the probabilities of an event occur beyond the boundaries of perception (calculations). In opposition to Luhmann and Castel, Giddens considers risks should not necessarily be determined by contingency.

The insecurity feelings are a result of early socialization process wherein the subject anticipates its own actions to environmental problems. This process involves the early mentioned separation between space and time. There is certain analogy between mother liaison and the perception of contingency. Whereas children expect the protection of their care-takers, once in their adult-hood they place expectations about the consequences of future facts. People who have been socialized in an atmosphere of conflict and violence show fewer probabilities to face the unprepared events than others who received considerable support during their childhood. In other words, a minimal degree of trust not only is needed to explore the uncertainty (time) in a supposed hostile environment (place) but also triggers the curiosity to explore the limits of certainty. This means the identity is a product of opposing the social change with self.

In a bodily sense, Giddens considers that the essence of life is strongly influenced by the perception of risks, which are no other things than a way of calculating (and of course intellectualizing) the contingency. With the calculative ability each human being has the possibility to overwhelm its own anxieties and goes on. For that reason, he argues psychologically that risk play a pivotal role in social behavior. Risk allows persons to feel

certain invulnerability before to disaster. To set a clear example, a driver who sees a traffic accident (happened alongside the route) may be dissuaded to drive slowly (at least) for few miles but once invulnerability sentiment returns, he or she opts for accelerating again. Whether the sentiment of vulnerability plays a conservative role simply because it preserves the integrity of self, the trivialization of risks (generated by the excess of information disseminated throughout the Mass-Media) places the self in a real danger.

Taking his cue from Winnicott's studies, Giddens dwells on the self-identity progress as a form precondition towards trust. Potential space between the children and caretakers will be surely the relationship with otherness in their adult-hood. Sociologically speaking, whereas daily routine brings to psychological ego to certain coherence and integrity, unpreparedness situations (expressed in dangers or risks) threaten such an organization with fragmentation. Following this argument, we might think that freedom can be deemed as the counter of external reality with self-identity (which combined with other variables) gives the anxiety as a result. Four are the existential questions of being which are assessed by Giddens. *Existence and Being* is a category denoting the identity of objects and events. Secondly, the *finitude of humans* refers to the complexity of sentiment involving human beings in connection with self and nature.

In accordance with other scholars such as R. Beck (2006), R. Castel (2006) and N. Luhmann (2006), Giddens sees in modernity a stronger irreversible dynamic that exerts influence in daily life bringing a new re-structuration of political and social order in which case space, time and authority seem to be gradually blurred. After a critical review, we consider *Modernity and self-identity* is an important book that bridges the contribution of psychology with sociology in the understanding of the new times we are now facing. Most likely, the criticism on this masterful text can be channeled in the following direction. Inflation of risk, as professor Giddens explains, is a part of a passage from hierarchal authority to reflexivity in terms of the Heidegger's phenomenology of being. Most likely, one of the credits of Giddens is the capacity to orchestrate macro-social theories with micro-psychology of self.

Assuming that the fate is open to particular decisions, fatalism plays a counterfactual role in closing the contingency. The fatalism is comprehended as a refusal of modernity, a kind of linkage of fatefulness that certainly fabricates an explanation about events. The needs of rationalizing the causality of events lead lay-people to future while the needs of risk avoidance re-establish the psychological order. Based on the belief that risks are created in the decision-making process, it is necessary for Giddens to distinguish operationally the conceptualization of risk from danger. To simplify, whether the former refers exclusively to a way of intellectualizing hypothetic hazards that are underpinned in the liberty of subject, the latter is not circumscribed under all circumstances of what person perceives. Centered exclusive on the inter-play between perception, time and territory, the model of Giddens will lead reader to assume that the romantic notion of community is definitely broken into pieces by giving rise to a new form of political order where resurges the monopoly of aesthetic. Cartesian space as thought for long-time is being replaced for this new form of three-dimensionality. Modernity paved the pathway towards the hope of a broader comprehensive and all-encompassed experience for the subject, more authenticable but more danger as well. Quite aside from Giddens's limitations, his ideas should be considered as a valuable project which originally introduces (by first time) the contributions of Attachment theory in the research of sociology. Most certainly, this has been the main merits of this scholar in the development of fear and

risk.

Contributions of Baudrillard

One might think Jean Baudrillard does not need previous presentation but for anybody who are not familiar with his works he is a critic philosopher who had contributed in many areas of social perspective combining a neo-Marxism posture with a philosophical aesthetic. Based on understanding how are constructed the mythical archetype of modern mass-consumption, his contributions ranges from political comprehension of war to visual issues related to mass-media performance in the culture of postmodernity. The fear in his appraisal seems to be inextricably associated to politic power and terrorism. In accordance with Castel, Bauman and Giddens, Baudrillard acknowledges that post modernity is substantially eroding the basis of classic legitimacy. In fact, the artifacts and objects of the culture are being abstracted to the extent being beyond their functionalities. The boundaries between consumed goods and consumers are certainly being blurred. A postmodernist consumer needs to feel the control of environment even though he or she failed to consume the object as it really is. This exactly means that the importance of aesthetic in our postmodern world is often associated with the symbolism of functionality. In other words, as Baudrillard put it, one of aspects that characterize the industrial logic seems to be the nuisance of subjectivity, the systematic reproduction of symbolic meaning. That way, objects personalizes the human bondages re-signifying their functionality depending on the epoch. Baudrillard primary point of entrance here is that symbolic and usage values of objects are circumscribed to the organizational values. The main thesis of our author recurs to nietzschean tension between *Pathos and Logos, order and chaos, meaningful and meaningless*. This convergence explains the roots of tragedy as psychological needs to intellectualize the nature of are wildering (Baudrillard, 1995a: 20-24).

The postmodern fear is related to the interaction between tragedy and voyeurism. The former refers to the psychological effects of terrorism in audience while the latter works reifying the suffering of others in a good product of mass-consumption. In accordance to Giddens, Baudrillard's pessimism mass-media has been created what one can call an spectacle of disaster. Politic fear works as a mechanism of self-indoctrination and paved the pathways towards a total control. Terrorism is only an excuse of a much broader deep-seated issue. Thus, Baudrillard argued in 1995 that "*the Gulf War did not take place*" (Baudrillard, 1995b). To date, it is no important who is the victim and guilty, both are representative of a new order which seems to be very well surfacing. A message of this caliber matches with the contributions of previous scholars synthesized in this paper.

Nevertheless, Baudrillard seems to go far beyond when argues that the logic of spectacle as the glass we can view in a show-case invites to an abstract communication enrooted in the strategy of advertising. The transparency of all exposed objects, for one hand, induces but at once it excludes consumers. This double-dynamic is very well present in our modern times because it is one of main tenets of market. Overall, here we raise a question hard to respond, ¿what is the relationship between terror and consumption?

The rise of Terror in the world of post-consumption

No matter of what polemic would be the work of Baudrillard in relation to the terrorism, one of their best merits is to the analysis of how mediated events not only determine the consciousness of viewers but also transforms reality in virtuality. The significance of this

thesis is that 11-September as well as posterior wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are parts of non-events a broader sense. For further understanding, let us transcribe verbatim the following excerpt: “*a whole strategy of deterrence that does service today for a global strategy. Steven Spielberg’s recent film, minority report, provides an illustration of such a system. On the basis of brains endowed with a gift of pre-cognition (the precogs), who identify imminent crimes before they occur, squads of police (the precrimes) intercept and neutralize the criminal before he has committed his crime ... ruptural events, unforeseeable events, unclassifiable in terms of history, outside of historical reasons, events which occur against their own image, against their own simulacrum. Event that breaks the tedious sequence of current events as relayed by the media, but which are not, for all that, a reappearance of history or Real irrupting in the heart of the virtual*” (Baudrillard, 2006: 2; 8).

As previously mentioned, existing information plays a pivotal role as most effective machinery for reproducing the values of events. The catastrophe, market and spectacle become in exchangeable goods that enjoy viewers 24 hours of day. If in past events were intellectualized once happened, in the postmodernity the visual hegemony of events precedes the pragmatic occurrence. Events are elaborated, transformed, disseminated so that viewers feel amusement and excitation. The mystification of non-events characterizes an inevitable ever-deferred time and space conceptualization whose goals are two-folds: (in this point Bauman and Baudrillard would agree) enhancing the needs of mass-consumption to face external threats that Mass-media invents, and secondly, legitimating policies and strategies of control over population.

Exactly, similar concerns can be seen in K. Baral who assesses the terrorism’s effects in North-East India reminding us how pervasive can be the role of Mass-media in the re-construction of former Imperial Hegemony. Examination of Devi’s case wherein police forces supposedly tortured and assassinated to a dissident, Baral argues that “*Baudrillard understands terrorism as both a product, of and a challenge to, modernism. As a challenge, terrorism problematizes the modern state’s conception of order versus chaos as it substitutes one reality for another*” (Baral, 2008: 5). From this point of view, discourses of terror emphasize on the needs to keep people under control by means of subrogating a political of virtuality. In terms of Baudrillard, terrorism generates an excess of reality that mobilizes material and symbolic resources to administrate the idea of sovereignty. Of course, even if territorial vindications are channeled by terrorists as well as industrialized countries officials whenever they appear in TV, their aims are intended to recreate a new order based on tradition and customs for formers, and in novelty for latter ones (Baral, 2008).

As prolific author throughout his trajectory, Baudrillard has pointed out that the end of history involves implicitly and explicitly the end of events. A detailed view into this question reveals the fact that global capitalism has certainly petrified the advance of history. This moot point is addressed by D. Keller in his work “Baudrillard: Globalization and terrorism”. On the introductory section, this author acknowledges that “*shortly after September 11 terrorist attacks, Baudrillard wrote a paper L’Esprit du terrorisme in Le Monde. He argued that the assaults on the World Trade center and Pentagon constituted a strong event, that the attacks were the ultimate event, the mother of all event, the pure event within itself all the events that have never taken place. The event strike, Baudrillard declared, was over and since this time he has continued to focus intensely on the dynamics and happenings of contemporary history ... For Baudrillard, the 9/11 attacks represent a new kind of terrorism, exhibiting a form of action*

which play the game, and lays hold of the rules of the game, solely with the aim of disrupting it. They have taken over all the weapons of the dominant power. That is, the terrorists in Baudrillard reading uses airplanes, computer networks, and the media associated with Western societies to produce a spectacle terror. The attacks evoked a global specter of terror that the very system of globalization and Western capitalism and culture were under assault by the spirit of terrorism and potential terrorist attacks anytime and anywhere” (Kellner, 2005: 2).

One of the respects that characterized this event is the jubilation for a super-potential power is destroyed accompanied with a rising sentiment of fear product of uncertainty. Paradoxically, in a world that prioritizes the technologies advances that permitted the rise of motilities, lay-people still remain immobilized because of frights and panic. The needs of control drive our civilization towards the chaos. Unless otherwise resolved, existing complicity between Mass-Media and Terrorism looks to be unquestionable. Other noteworthy theoretical contributions of Baudrillard in the fear's study lies in the conceptual distinction in what is global and universal. Whereas globalization very well refers to a movement which encourages the circulation of goods and humans, the conceptualization of what is universal revitalizes the tendons of humanism and of course the necessary concerns for the suffering of others.

To this debate Kellner textually adds *“most theorists, including myself, see globalization as a matrix of market economy, democracy, technology, migration and tourism, and the worldwide circulation of ideas and culture. Baudrillard, curiously, takes the position of those in antiglobalization movement who condemn globalization as the opposite of democracy and human rights. For Baudrillard, globalization is fundamentally a process of homogenization and standardization of crushes the singular and heterogeneity. This position, however, fails to note the contradictions that globalization simultaneously produces homogenization and hybridization and difference, and that Baudrillard links with a dying universalization. In fact, the struggle for rights and justice is an important part of globalization and Baudrillard's presenting of human rights, democratization, and justice as part of an obsolete universalization being erased by globalization is theoretically and politically problematic” (Keller, 2005: 4).* This means that a newer capitalism has been suspended the logic of morality, precisely in a world where torture and pleasure are not differentiated.

Conclusion

So far, we have looked into the works of R. Castel who argued that insecurity feeling corresponds with inflation in the ways of perceiving the day-to-day threats. For Castel, we should remind the reader, the present frustration of unsatisfied demands in combination with a more deficient bureaucracy gives as a result the sentiment of unprotection people manifest in our days. It is important not to lose the sight of integrity of voters is often to a necessity of being valorized. The lack of work or sickness not only represents a disaster for people but also a symbolic death respecting to their status and social position. The underlying fact here is that fear holds an aversion to be ignored by others.

In Beck, inversely, existent development of risk is associated to the nuclear accident of Chernobyl in Ukraine. In deep contrast with industrialism that held the line between poverty and richness, western societies face a new configuration of social order. Needs of mass-consumption in association with a growing sentiment of fear paved the pathway to the advent of a new spirit of capitalism. As a result of this, logic of appropriation - which characterized

classical mercantilism in past decades-, is being replaced by its own antithesis, the logic of disavowal. The privileged groups hide collateral damages as a product of non-sustainable consumption; their practices are supported by means of the intervention of Science and Journalism. The underlying problem seems to be that duties and responsibilities are globalized at the same time humankind exhausts the non-renewable resources in earth as well as polluting the ozone layer. Implicitly or not, that spurs the boundaries between victim and culprit.

Technically for Beck fears surface whenever the risks are trivialized. The order of economy is being changed. It can be said that a change of this magnitude is feasible in accordance with an increasing materiality as well as empowerment of productive forces. The lines of production in societies which are supposed to prevent the threats follow counter-effects and predispose the system towards the final collapse. This means that threats are implicitly a result of economic development but sooner or later accumulated risks, placed in the process of decision-making, can impinge the functionality of system. The economy of risk and of course the society of risk does not distinguish classes, richness or ethnicity. The possibilities of a disaster can take form every-time, everywhere is one of the characteristics of society of risk. Nobody feel safe in the society of risk. The State should set the pace to the advance of market and trade that catch and elaborate the ongoing concerns of citizenry in products related to security issues.

This argument substantially coincides with Bauman's development respecting to declination of solidarity and trust. For this scholar, in our liquid modern society of consumers, strategies are deployed in marginalizing or disregarding all that is long-lived; from this perspective, people look forward to devaluing all own experiences shaped in the immortality. Unlike a couple of centuries ago, our modern views are not aimed at accessing eternity but a transitory style of life (profane). In a process that Bauman denominates *deconstructionism* of death, the western civilization is experiencing an staggering panic. The fear of dying can be intellectualized as the fear of being rejected. Enrooted in the belief that our obsession of living forever jeopardizes the social bondage, Bauman realizes that the odds of considering the mortality as an improbable event are associated to the declination of solidarity. The risk as a form of ephemeral calculation allows people to go on with their life. The risk works as a mechanism for people to intellectualize what is beyond their control. Philosophically, the risks are characterized by being calculable while certainness focuses on the visibility of dangers. Likewise, Bauman outlines that no catastrophe is hardest than what is unthinkable.

As the previous argument debated, Giddens focuses on the role played by reflexivity as explanatory of the enhancement of protection. Whether in Beck and Bauman the key factor of risk calculation is linked to market's appearance, Giddens gives emphasis on a much broader process which overwhelm not only to material channels of production but also to psychological behavior. The existing security feelings are interconnected somehow with early socialization process where the subject learns to construct the anticipation of future (a kind of openness over contingency). This process involves the early mentioned separation between space and time. In a bodily sense, Giddens considers the essence of life is strongly influenced by the perception of risks, which is no other thing than a way of calculating the contingency. With the calculative ability each human being has the possibility to overcome their anxieties. For that reason, he argues psychologically that risk play a pivotal role in social behavior by allowing persons to feel certain invulnerability before to disaster. Taking his cue from Winnicott's studies, this British philosopher dwells on the self-identity progress as a form of basic trust pre-condition. Potential space between the children and caretakers will be surely the

relationship with otherness in their adult-hood. The early process of socialization plays a pivotal role in the self-confidence of subject to explore the environment successfully.

In sharp contrast with Giddens and Castel, Baudrillard ultimately puts emphasis on the relationship between virtuality and reality assessing some controversial points. For one hand, he realizes 11/09 marked the end and beginning from a new way of living the events. Re-signifying the previous structural theses of F. Nietzsche in regards to the encounter between pathos and logos, Baudrillard argues that modern democracy in conjunction with Apollonian logic upends the reality of environments in a simple representation. However, things come worse to worst, because Baudrillard realizes that there is no limits when the fear is installed in the core of societies. Terrorists or lay-persons are two side of the same coin. Politic fear works as an effective instrument of self-indoctrination and paved the ways towards a full control of civility. To date, it is no important who is the victim and guilty, both are representative of a new order which seems to be very well surfacing. Pictures, films, depictions are simoultanesly disseminated by Mass-media rising the fear as a form of spectacle which determines a consumption that never stops. As Bauman developed, Baudrillard knows that fear is the only sentiment with does not have limits. In accordance to this, it is important to note that Late-modernity combines the fear from an ever-changing and dangerous world with the fascination for the bottom-day.

Bibliographical References

- Bauman, Z. (2008). *Liquid Fears contemporary society and its liquid fears*. Buenos Aires, Paidós Editorial.
- Baral, K. (2008). "Engaging Baudrillard – Papers from Swansea, Terrorism, Jean Baudrillard and a death in Northeast India". *Baudrillard Studies*. Vol. 5 (1). January. Available at <http://www.ubishops.ca/BaudrillardStudies/>. Bishop's University, Canada.
- Baudrillard, J. (1989). *La Transparencias del Mal*. Barcelona, Anagrama.
- Baudrillard, J. (1995a). *The systems of the objects*. Mexico, Siglo XXI.
- Baudrillard, J. (1995b) *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*. Sydney, Power Publications
- Baudrillard, J. (2006). "Virtuality and Events: the hell of power". *Baudrillard Studies*. Vol. 3 (2). July. Available at <http://www.ubishops.ca/BaudrillardStudies/>. Bishop's University, Canada. Version translated by Chris Turner.
- Beck, U. (2006). *Risk Society, towards a new modernity*. Buenos Aires, Paidós
- Castel, R. (2006). *The Social Insecurity ¿what does it mean to be protected?.* Buenos Aires, El Manantial.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Defender la Sociedad*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and society in The late modern age*. California, Stanford University Press.
- Gough, J. (2000). "Perceptions of Risk from natural hazards in two remote New Zealand Communities". *The Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies*. Vol. 2
- Hobbes, T. (1998). *Leviatán o la materia, forma y poder de una República Eclesiástica y Civil*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kellner, D. (2005). "Baudrillard, Globalization and Terrorism: some comments in recent adventures of the Image and Spectable on the occasion of Baudrillard's 75th birthday". *Baudrillard Studies*. Vol. 2 (1). January. Available at <http://www.ubishops.ca/BaudrillardStudies/>. Bishop's University, Canada.
- Luhmann, N. (2006). *Sociology of Risk*. México, Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Poter, M. (1989). *Jean Baudrillard*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Polity.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. London, Hogarth, pp. 57, 86.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1974). "Creativity and its origins". *In the Playing and Reality*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.