

The “Don’t React” Paradigm: When Compliance Can Kill

The “Don’t React” Paradigm: When Compliance Can Kill

Sandro Christovam Bearare¹

Summary

At some point in recent history, a **prudential guideline** became a **silent dogma**. The advice “don’t react” — originally conceived for specific risk situations — was amplified by institutions, the media, family environments and even religious discourses, until it became consolidated as an **absolute moral rule**, applied without analyzing context, profile or scenario. This article does not seek to blame. It proposes reflection. Based on **real cases, neuroscientific evidence, psychopedagogical studies**

and analyses of media culture, we examine how this systematic repetition has generated serious side effects: **automated passivity, blocking of the defense instinct, post-traumatic guilt** and the installation of a true **social doctrine of submission**. Through the notion of collective **lambing**, this study proposes a new paradigm: **Conscious Self-Defense**, based on a lucid, **proportional, ethical** and technical **reaction**, restoring to the citizen the right to decide when his life is at risk. It is not about encouraging violence, but about rescuing the ability to **choose consciously** - even under threat.

Keywords: Don't react; automated passivity; sheepishness; blocked instinct; lucid reaction; conscious self-defense; ethical survival; social doctrine of submission; induced guilt; culture of fear.

Abstract

At some point in recent history, a **well-intentioned safety guideline** silently evolved into a **social dogma**. The advice "do not react" — originally meant for specific high-risk situations — was repeated so frequently by institutions, media, family environments, and even religious voices that it became an unquestioned moral rule, applied indiscriminately across all contexts and profiles.

This paper does not seek to assign blame. It seeks understanding. Through an examination of **real-life cases, neuroscientific evidence, psychopedagogical studies**, and **cultural analysis**, we explore how this repetition has produced unintended consequences: **automated passivity, suppressed defense instincts, post-traumatic guilt**, and the rise of a **social doctrine of submission**.

¹ Electrical Engineer, MBA in Production Engineering, Postgraduate degree in Logistics, Psychopedagogy and extension in Neuroscience. Specialist in training and education of professionals in the area of weapons, shooting and security, with extensive experience in product development, logistics processes and coordination of operational and administrative teams. E-mail: scbearare@bol.com.br

Using the concept of **collective lamb conditioning**, this study introduces a new framework: **Conscious Self-Defense** — a technical, ethical, and situational response philosophy that restores the individual's right to act when life is at risk. This is not a call for aggression, but a reaffirmation of the right to **choose consciously** — even under threat.

Keywords: *Do not react; automated passivity; lamb conditioning; blocked instinct; conscious reaction; conscious self-defense; ethical survival; social doctrine of submission; induced guilt; culture of fear.*

1. Introduction – When Guidance Became Dogma

Not every tragedy is born from a bad decision. Some arise precisely from the total absence of choice.

For years, the advice “**don’t react**” was presented as a protective strategy: simple, straightforward, seemingly sensible. And perhaps, in certain contexts, it even saved lives. But over time, what was once a **situational guideline**, applicable under specific criteria, became a **social doctrine** — repeated like an **institutional mantra, culturally programmed** and internalized as the only legitimate response to threat.

This **automated passivity** was reinforced by all sides: authorities, educators, communicators, families, religious people. Each one, in their own sphere, contributed to transforming a tactical decision into an unquestionable reflex.

It is not a question of blaming these instances. In many cases, the repetition of “don’t react” was born out of fear, caution or trauma. But by becoming **universal, thoughtless and absolute**, this command silently blocked the natural instinct of human **defense** and created what we call here **collective sheepishness**.

The result of this is an alarming scenario: citizens who no longer know how to act under threat; victims who die even after obeying all instructions; survivors who lose their morals.

react and instead of support, receive judgment

We are facing a **symbolic crisis of survival**: the common citizen has been trained

to silence, surrender, submit — even when there is real room for choice, reaction or legitimate protection.

This article proposes a conscious break with this pattern. Through the analysis of **real cases**, evidence from the **neuroscience of fear**, foundations of the **psychopedagogy of inaction**, and observations on the **media culture of surrender**, we propose the construction of a new lens: that of **conscious self-defense** — a practical philosophy that combines technique, ethical discernment, and emotional lucidity.

Reacting isn’t always the best choice. But never thinking about it is almost always the worst.

2. Real Cases: The Obedience that Failed

2.1 15-year-old student killed after handing over cell phone

Lucas Teles Santana, 15, was killed after trying to hand over his cell phone during a robbery in the east of São Paulo. The device fell to the ground and, even without reacting, he was shot.



Link: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/2023/06/morte-estudante-assalto-nao-reagiu.shtml>

Analysis:

The “don’t fight back” doctrine fails to ignore the irrationality of many criminals. In this case, simple submission did not prevent the fatal outcome.

2.2 Woman attacked even after handing over her belongings

In September 2023, a woman was the victim of a robbery in the west zone of Rio de Janeiro. Despite handing over the objects, she was brutally attacked with a gun butt to the head.

Link: <https://odia.ig.com.br/rio-de-janeiro/2023/09/6715771-video-mulher-e-agredida-com-coronhada-na-cabeca-durante-assalto-na-zona-oeste.html>

Analysis:

This case highlights the moral bankruptcy of passivity. The victim followed the “script” suggested by the authorities — and even so, suffered gratuitous violence.

2.3 Delivery man beaten after obeying criminals

A delivery man was approached in Fortaleza (CE). Without reacting, he handed over his belongings. Even so, he was beaten with helmet blows and kicks.

Link: <https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/nacional/entregador-espancado-apos-assalto/>

Analysis:

The violence was not a response to a reaction, but part of the aggressor's plan. This case dismantles the myth that obedience always preserves integrity.

2.4 Teenager jumps out of car to escape rape

In Campo Grande (MS), a teenager jumped out of a moving car to escape a ride-sharing driver who was trying to rape her. Injured but alive, she managed to call for help.

Link: <https://www.campograndenews.com.br/cidades/capital/adolescente-pula-de-carro-de-aplicativo-em-movimento-apos-tentativa-de-estupro>

Analysis:

The young woman's instinctive reaction saved her life. Passivity, in this case, could have resulted in a completed crime.

2.5 Merchant reacts to robbery and survives

A merchant in Rio das Ostras (RJ) reacted to an attempted robbery, was shot, but survived and was discharged after receiving medical attention.

Link: <https://odia.ig.com.br/rio-das-ostras/2023/09/6705977-comerciante-vitima-de-attempted-robbery-in-rio-das-ostras-receives-medical-discharge.html>

Analysis:

Despite the risk, the merchant's reaction did not result in death. It shows that there are scenarios in which reacting may be the only real chance of escape.

2.6 Mother prevents her son from being kidnapped in front of school

In the United States, a mother saved her 5-year-old son by pulling him out of a kidnapper's car. The video, recorded by cameras, went viral.

Link: <https://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2021/07/17/mae-salva-filho-de-5-anos-de-kidnapping-in-usa-watch-video.ghtml>

Analysis:

The mother's quick and instinctive action broke the cycle of "do nothing". This immediate lucidity prevented the crime from being committed.

2.7 Driver avoids robbery in traffic with maneuver

In São Paulo, a driver realized he was going to be robbed and threw his car at the criminals, preventing the robbery.

Link: <https://recordtv.r7.com/balanco-geral/video/motorista-joga-carro-contra-ladrao-and-avoid-robbery-in-traffic-in-sp-17082023>

Analysis:

Quickly reading the threat and reacting assertively were decisive. Proactivity, in this case, was synonymous with survival.

These cases show that "don't react" can be as risky as confronting someone. **Passivity as an absolute rule disregards the unpredictable nature of the aggressor.** In many situations, **lucid, proportionate and technical action is the only real chance of survival.**

3. The Passivity Programming

Not all passivity is a choice. Often, it is the result of **subtle, repeated, and silent conditioning.**

The advice "**don't react**" was, in its origins, a **strategic guideline**, designed for specific situations of clear disadvantage, armed criminals, imminent risk.

However, over time, this guidance ceased to be a tool for analysis and **became an unquestionable moral doctrine.** Prudence became programming. Precaution became automatic obedience.

This process does not have a single author. It was born from the sum of multiple voices:

- **In the media**, headlines repeat "He tried to fight back and died", but they rarely show those who **survived by reacting with technique.**
- **In schools**, punishment often falls equally on the offender and the offender defended himself.
- **In families**, the emotional script repeats itself: "Give everything. Don't react. Stay still."
- **In churches**, faith is confused with unconditional submission, taking spiritual principles out of context.
- **In public policy**, the passive doctrine is normalized as prudence universal.

“What was situational prudence became a ritual of collective surrender.”

(BEARARE, Sandro C. **Philosophy of Arms – Defense as a Human Virtue**, 2025)

3.1 The brain trained to keep quiet: neuroscience of learned submission

Under extreme stress, the human brain engages three main pathways: **fight, flight, or freeze**. When one of these pathways is continually disengaged —

especially the **active reaction** — it loses neurological access. The brain then **turns off the defense option**.

Passivity becomes the default, not the choice.

This kind of conditioning is not biological — it is cultural.

3.2 The pedagogy of inaction: the prize lamb

Since childhood, we are shaped by phrases like:

- “Don’t fight back.”
- “He who keeps silent is wise.”
- “Don’t get into fights.”
- “Stay where you are, it’s safer.”

These messages, repeated with love and fear, teach not only to avoid conflict, but to **suppress the instinct to defend ourselves**. We create children who confuse courage with aggression and silence with intelligence. And so **we produce emotionally domesticated adults** who blame themselves even for surviving.

3.3 The aesthetics of surrender: the role of the media and public morality

Newspapers, soap operas and films create the **ideal victim**: submissive, obedient, quiet — and, if possible, a martyr. The survivor who reacted with courage, preparation or instinct rarely has a voice. When she does appear, she is portrayed as “exceptional”, “lucky” or “controversial”.

This reinforces in the collective imagination the idea that **the only morally accepted way to survive is to obey** — even if it costs one's life.

The programming of passivity is the result of an **interconnected symbolic system**: media, education, faith, public safety, and family culture. None of these elements act with malice—but all of them, together, reinforce the idea that reacting is wrong.

Breaking this cycle requires more than courage: it requires **emotional re-education, moral technique**.

and

As stated in *FilosofiArmas*:

“True prudence is not submission, but discernment. And discernment includes the chance to react.”

of to say: now, I I go

(BEARARE, 2025)

3. The Passivity Programming

Blind obedience is rarely born of evil. It is usually sown by good intentions, wrapped in fear and repeated. Thus the doctrine of “**don’t react**” was established — not as until if become standard.

advice, but as a **moral condition**.

What began as a legitimate guideline in the face of urban violence was, over the years, **transformed into social dogma**, repeated by authorities, teachers, leaders

zealous religious people.

Without realizing it, **we stopped teaching discernment** — and started indoctrinating surrender.

“When prudence ceases to be a choice and becomes a reflex, thought fades from view.”

before same threat

(BEARARE, Sandro. *Philosophy of Arms – Defense as a Human Virtue*, 2025)

3.1 The brain conditioned to immobility

Neuroscience shows us that when faced with situations of extreme risk, the brain chooses between fighting, fleeing or freezing. When one of these pathways is **socially inhibited by life**, instinct.

all one if delete as

The body does not react because **it has been trained not to recognize the choice**.

3.2 Education that silences instinct

From childhood, we are trained to avoid conflict, not to raise our voices, to confuse firmness with rudeness. The intention has always been peace. The effect, however, has been to **inhibit discernment under pressure**.

Schools punish students who defend themselves. Families extol silence as wisdom. Religions, misinterpreted, make renunciation an absolute virtue.

But no virtue paralyzes before **The morality that does not protect is a fragile ornament**. of bad.

3.3 The imagery of the ideal lamb

The media reinforces the aesthetics of submission: the victim who obeys is praised; the one who reacts is questioned. Cases of active survival rarely gain space — because they threaten the collective myth that **living well means dying in silence**.

This symbolic programming has created a society of citizens who do not prepare, do not analyze and do not decide — they just wait for the outcome to be imposed on them.

“The lamb is not a symbol of humility when it walks alone to the slaughter. It is the one who has unlearned how portrait of one culture what to resist.” the

(BEARARE, 2025)

Passivity programming is not an individual mistake — it is a collective system that mistakes paralysis.

peace with

Breaking with it requires **re-educating instinct, rescuing the right to decide** and restoring courage as a lucid virtue, and not a moral deviation.

4. Scientific and Philosophical Foundations of the Lucid Reaction

Reacting is not the opposite of prudence. It is the balance between irrational denial and collapse. The culture of risk and the “don’t ahead from him.” react,” by eliminating the possibility of conscious response, compromises **not only physical safety**, but also the **cognitive and moral freedom** of the individual.

This chapter presents the pillars that support the **legitimate possibility of lucid reaction**, based on three complementary dimensions: **neuroscience, psychopedagogy** and **moral philosophy**.

4.1 The neuroscience of choice under threat

When faced with a threat, the human brain activates specific areas responsible for reading risk, such as the **cerebral amygdala**, the **prefrontal cortex** and the **hypothalamus**. In extreme situations, as discussed previously, three basic responses emerge: **fight, flight or freeze**.

Freezing is more common in individuals who **have not been exposed mentally or physically to controlled risk contexts**. The lack of technical repertoire — combined with cultural conditioning not to react — blocks rational decision-making.

Training, simulation and advance reflection **do not transform the individual into a combatant**, but they allow him **not to be reduced to a biological reflex of submission**.

4.2 The psychopedagogy of induced omission

Behavior in the face of threats is shaped from childhood. Children who are taught to never assert themselves, to never say “no,” or to apologize for existing in aggressive environments, become adults with **low emotional and moral assertiveness**.

This silent learning reinforces fear as a primary pattern and gradually installs error.

the belief of what defend yourself and

More than a lack of preparation, a cognitive structure is formed **that denies one's own legitimacy to act**.

Re-educating this pattern is not simple, but it is possible. It starts with recognizing that there are contexts where **protecting oneself is not a transgression, but a responsibility**.

4.3 The Philosophy of Just Reaction

Reacting to a real threat is not a moral dilemma — it is a survival imperative.

There is a recurring conceptual error in some of the literature, legal discourse and even philosophical doctrines that treat self-defense as if it were a game with rules, limits and balance. This view ignores what actually happens in reality: **an aggressor does not think about justice, proportionality or human rights while attacking**.

In situations of extreme risk, when life is threatened, **we do not ponder — we act**.

The truly just reaction is not to measure the force, but to **use all the force necessary**.

to get out alive, even if it means exceeding any theoretical expectations of containment.

No there is ethics in the hesitation ahead from the death.

The instinct to preserve oneself is prior to philosophy and superior to the judgment of those who have never been in a corridor of real risk.

Reacting forcefully is, in this context, the highest expression of responsibility towards oneself and towards those one wants to protect. The so-called “proportionality”, often defended as a principle, **disregards the emotional factor, the technical disadvantage, the response time and the level of aggressiveness of the criminal**.

Demanding millimeter rationality from the victim is an injustice disguised as moral sophistication.

The philosophy of just response, therefore, does not seek the “balance of confrontation.” It seeks the **immediate interruption of the threat — in the most effective, intense and definitive way that the context allows.**

Not out of anger. Not out of revenge. But because **those who hesitate because of rules and dogmas often don't return home.**

5. Collective Lambing

A society does not surrender all at once. It gets used to it.

First, instinct is silenced. Then, reaction is discredited. Finally, passivity is transformed into a moral ideal.

This process — silent, continuous and structural — is what we can call collective **sheepification** : the symbolic production of obedient citizens, programmed to accept, not to question, not to act — even in the face of injustice, threat or the imminence of evil.

“Don't react” has become **the mantra of social neutralization.**

5.1 The institutional mantra of unconditional obedience

The phrase “don't react” is in school textbooks, in safety programs, in official interviews, and in outdoor sermons.

US

and

US

It is repeated so often that it has ceased to be a suggestion and has begun to operate as a **collective psychological command.**

Worse: this command is no longer presented with variables, but as an unquestionable truth, applicable to everyone, in any situation, without distinction of profile, capacity or context.

Thus, what should have been a choice became a **conditioned reflex of surrender.**

5.2 The moralization of passivity

Today's culture doesn't just tolerate passivity—it glorifies it.

The obedient citizen, even when murdered, is praised for “not having reacted”. The survivor, however, reacted, even successfully, when asked:

“But why didn't he keep quiet?”

This moral inversion is one of the main symptoms of sheep-ification. Society stops valuing life protected by firmness — and starts to **venerate a dignified death through obedience.**

There is no honor in dying in silence when there was a possibility of living with discernment.

5.3 The ideal figure of the obedient victim

The ideal victim, in contemporary social aesthetics, is one who:

- did not face,
- did not question,
- did not defend himself.

She is transformed into a symbol of prudence, even when her death was a direct result of her inability to act.

This archetype feeds the fear of thinking differently. The individual who dares to train, prepare or study protection strategies is viewed with suspicion, as if he were wrong for **actively wanting to survive**.

Lambing *out*, then, not only silences action — it **delegitimizes the desire to protect oneself**.

5.4 The collective impact: from prudence to social anesthesia

The final effect of *lambing* is not just individual. It is structural.

It generates populations that:

- **accept risk as fate;**
- **expect protection to come from outside;**
- **blame themselves for thinking about reacting.**

This weakens not only individuals, but also homes, communities and bonds of mutual responsibility.

Anesthetized society **outsources courage** and is content with the passive expectation of security — even if the facts insist on showing the opposite.

Lambhood is not born of weakness. *It* is built on repeated fear and taught absence of alternatives

What we need is not a culture of impulse reaction, but an **ethical reconstruction of conscious readiness**.

Breaking with *sheep-ification* means giving citizens back sovereignty over their own destiny.

It's not about teaching how to attack. It's about remembering that **acting with lucidity is a right — and, often, a duty to one's own life**.

6. The Doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense as a Strategic Response

Faced with a social system that promotes passivity as a virtue, the mere idea of thinking about reacting may seem subversive. But there is no freedom where there is no choice.

The Doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense was therefore born as **an ethical proposal to break** with the mentality of automatic submission. It does not oppose prudence — it rescues it in its most lucid form: the ability to assess risks with moral freedom and technical preparation.

This doctrine does not invite impulsive reaction. It invites **possible reaction** —one that arises from discernment, context, and awareness of purpose.

6.1 Central concept: reacting is not attacking, it is preserving

Conscious self-defense is based on a fundamental principle: **protecting is not attacking**.

Defending yourself is not violating others, but **preventing the destruction of yourself** or those under your responsibility.

6.2 The three pillars of the doctrine

1. Technique

Conscious reaction requires practical preparation. This is not limited to — nor is it limited to — to master martial arts or to carry a firearm. This is something more comprehensive and applicable:

- know escape routes and safe points;
- identify risk patterns in the environment and in the behavior of third parties;
- develop the ability to verbalize firmly and assertively;
- train decision-making under real or simulated stress.

The technique, in this context, does not transform the citizen into a combatant, but into a **lucid presence under threat**. It converts the uncontrolled impulse into a coordinated response, and activates the paralyzing fear.

in perception

To achieve this, specific research, studies and readings on civil protection strategies and defensive mentality are necessary. In this sense, the work “**Self-Defense and Anti-Kidnapping – Volume 1**” (*Bearare, Sandro Christovam. Ludus Vision, 2025*) is recommended, which delves into the technical and emotional foundations of situational self-defense, based on real experiences and urban survival protocols.

2. Ethics

The second pillar is awareness of what is at stake: life. In a real situation of self-defense, there is no room for philosophical calculations or moral idealizations about proportionality. The aggressor does not follow rules, does not consider limits and does not recognize honor. In view of this, conscious self-defense does not require apparent balance — it requires **blunt effectiveness**.

immediate and

The priority is clear: **to survive**. And to do so, we must react with all available means, with the maximum force possible.

what the context

This is not about revenge. It is about **stopping the threat once and for all**, before it destroys the victim's integrity. This is not a symbolic duel — it is a fight between life and death, where hesitation can be fatal.

3. Purpose

Every reaction must have a legitimate reason. The doctrine teaches us to **act for what we protect**, not against the what if fear.

Protecting life, innocence, family integrity or personal dignity are noble and morally justifiable purposes.

6.3 Practical application: from theory to civil action

Conscious self-defense does not just belong in public safety environments or professional training.

It can — and should — be applied to:

- **families:** teaching children to identify risks and not remain silent in the face of danger;
- **schools:** promoting situational thinking, not blind obedience;
- **communities:** preparing collectives for protective cooperation;
- **religious spaces:** balancing faith with lucid vigilance;
- **personal relationships:** establishing clear boundaries, including emotional and symbolic.

Doctrine **does not arm the hands — it structures the conscience**.

6.4 What it breaks — and what it proposes

Conscious self-defense breaks with:

- universalized passivity;
- the guilt of reacting;
- the aesthetics of the obedient lamb.

And proposes:

- a new pedagogy of ethical survival;
- a rescue of instinct combined with technique;
- a society that is less vulnerable and more responsible for its existence.

The Doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense is not radical. It is rational.

She does not suggest that everyone react, but that everyone knows that **reacting is possible** — and, in many cases, **fair, necessary and morally superior to inaction**.

The next step is to understand how this doctrine can be implemented in collective spaces and gradually form **a culture of lucid and dignified reaction**.

7. Guidelines for Social Implementation of the Doctrine

Every doctrine is born in thought, but only becomes culture when it reaches everyday life.

Conscious Self-Defense, as a philosophy of preserving life with lucidity, should not remain restricted to circles of experts, tactical training or academic debates.

It needs to reach **families, schools, religious communities, media, public policies and, above all, the social imagination**.

7.1 Education: reprogramming from the ground up

The school environment is the most symbolic space in the formation of the perception of risk, justice and response.

Suggested actions:

- Introduction of content on **environmental reading, risk analysis and defense proportional**;
- Simulations and workshops focusing on **non-violent resolution with option to react lucid**;
- Training of teachers to differentiate legitimate reactions from acts of gratuitous aggression;
- Creation of school projects with **an emphasis on responsibility, readiness and self-control under pressure**.

7.2 Families: emotional formation for ethical reaction

In the home we shape what will be instinctive in adult life.

Parents who teach their children to **recognize threats and act wisely** create adults who are less vulnerable to emotional collapse in the face of chaos.

Suggested actions:

- Encouraging dialogue about protection, limits and choices in the face of danger;
- Creation of simple family protocols (code words, safe routes, reading of situations);
- Teaching that **saying “no” can be an act of self-respect integrity.**

7.3 Religious spaces: faith and vigil as an inseparable duo

Authentic spirituality does not demand irrational sacrifices. It values life as a sacred gift.

Reacting when necessary **does not violate principles of faith — it honors them.**

Suggested actions:

- Balanced reflections on classic texts (such as “turn the other cheek”), contextualizing their meanings;
- Pastoral training to deal with believers facing violence, not guilt, but with support;
- Valuing active spiritual vigilance: **praying and watching, but also preparing if to act.**

7.4 Social communication: breaking the narrative monopoly of surrender

The media plays a fundamental role in shaping what is seen as heroic, prudent or foolish.

Currently, there is a **systematic imbalance**: stories of submission receive praise; survivors who fought back are silenced or treated as exceptions.

Suggested actions:

- Production of content that values lucid, technical and fair reaction as an act legitimate;
- Reports that show **not only obedient victims, but citizens who survived because they thought and acted;**
- Inclusion of experts in conscious self-defense in public debates.

7.5 Public policies: encouraging non-violent civil preparedness

Public safety does not need to be just repressive. It can — and should — be formative.

Suggested actions:

- Partnerships between schools, gyms, shooting clubs, psychologists and churches to promote **defensive education actions;**
- Inclusion of **urban survival and reactive discernment** modules in citizenship and youth programs;
- Incentives for popular training projects focusing on **ethical and safe responses to real risk situations.**

Implementing Conscious Self-Defense **does not mean militarizing society.** It means giving the population back **the right to choose between remaining silent and preserving themselves.**

By educating for lucidity, by restoring instinct with ethics and by emotionally preparing the common citizen, we form a new paradigm of coexistence: where life continues to be the most precious asset — but where no one needs **to lose it through programmed inertia.**

8. Proposals for Future Research and Interdisciplinary Expansion

The Doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense is not just a philosophical or practical answer — she also **science.** one **called** the

It is necessary to understand passivity as a neurological, cultural and educational phenomenon; and lucid reaction as a trainable, ethical skill that can be integrated into welfare and citizenship policies.

To this end, **interdisciplinary investigations** are needed , capable of exploring the phenomenon of automatic surrender under the following axes:

8.1 Neuroscience: freezing, reprogramming and emotional plasticity

Studies should delve deeper into how the brain **internalizes repeated social commands**, especially in contexts of acute stress, and how this process can **block access to the self-preservation instinct.**

Possible lines of research:

- Mapping brain activity in threat simulations with victims conditioned to passivity;
- Evaluation of neural reconditioning protocols through simulation, visualization and deliberate practice;
- Analysis of the relationship between *freezing*, trauma and absence of defensive repertoire in infancy.

8.2 Psychology and pedagogy: victim identity and education for choice

To investigate how the social archetype of the **obedient victim** is formed , and how this affects self-esteem, perception of agency and decision-making capacity in adults.

Possible lines of research:

- Effects of authoritarian or religious education on the formation of emotional inhibition in the face of threat;
- Impact of family and school repetition of “don’t react” on the construction of passivity as a value;
- Development of pedagogical strategies to teach ethical reaction and situational since childhood.

8.3 Communication and culture: narratives of submission and symbolic restructuring

The media and fiction construct the social imaginary. It is necessary to study how stories of surrender are exalted as morally correct, while defensive actions are caricatured as reckless.

Possible lines of research:



- Semiotic analysis of public safety campaigns, soap operas, films and reports on urban crime;
- Study of how the “obedient victim aesthetic” reinforces moral conformism;
- Creation of alternative symbolic narratives that present the lucid reaction as a virtue.

8.4 Law and ethics: the limits of self-defense and the blame for the reaction

It is necessary to investigate how the justice system deals with cases in which victims react, and how legal discourse reinforces or inhibits the legitimacy of proportional defense.

Possible lines of research:

- Comparative study of jurisprudence on self-defense between different countries and cultures;
- Investigation of the indirect blaming of the victim who reacts — by the media, by public opinion or by the legal system itself;
- Proposals for updating penal codes in relation to rational and technical legitimate defense.

8.5 Applied interdisciplinarity: laboratories, protocols and public policies

The doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense can be the basis for a new scientific and educational field: **strategic civilian survival.**

Viable proposals:

- Creation of research centers at universities focusing on neuroeducation defensive;
- Development of booklets, applications and educational games aimed at teaching lucid reaction;
- Interdisciplinary protocols for families, schools and at-risk communities;
- Training of teachers, psychologists, social and religious agents on the subject.

Science, when well guided, has the power to **reprogram society** not only through information — but through the **restoration of freedom of choice under threat.**

The Doctrine of Conscious Self-Defense, more than a moral concept, is a **fertile field for scientific, educational and cultural innovation.**

It now remains to be seen who will have the courage to study it seriously — and apply it with ethical commitment.

References

BEARARE, Sandro Christovam. *Self-Defense and Anti-Kidnapping – Volume 1*. Adamantina: Ludus Vision, 2025.

BEARARE, Sandro Christovam. *Philosophy of Arms – Defense as a Human Virtue*. Adamantina: Ludus Vision, 2025.

BEARARE, Sandro Christovam. *Manifesto of Legitimate Courage*. Adamantina: Ludus Vision, 2025.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. *Liquid Fear*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.



DAMÁSIO, Antonio R. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

ERICSSON, K. Anders; KRAMPE, Ralf T.; TESCH-RÖMER, Clemens. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, vol. 100, no. 3, p. 363–406, 1993.

FITS, Paul M.; POSNER, Michael I. *Human Performance*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1967.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Autonomy: Knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

LEDoux, Joseph. *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998.

PRADO, Maria Thereza Rocha de Assis Moura. *Self-Defense and Use of Force*. New York: Court Review, 2002.

TAVARES, Ana Luísa. *Media and Violence: The Construction of the Ideal Victim*. Porto Alegre: EdiPUC, 2021.

TORRES, Marcelo. *Personal Security and Urban Survival*. São Paulo: Atlas, 2019.

WHO – World Health Organization. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: WHO, 2002.

Journalistic Sources Consulted

FOLHA DE S. PAULO. 15-year-old student is killed in SP after handing over cell phone.

Available at: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/2023/06/morte-estudante-assalto-nao-reagiu.shtml>.

Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

O DIA. Woman assaulted even after handing over her belongings. Available at: <https://odia.ig.com.br/rio-de-janeiro/2023/09/6715771-video-mulher-e-agredida-com-coronhada-na-cabeca-durante-assalto-na-zona-oeste.html>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

CNN BRAZIL. Delivery man beaten after robbery without fighting back. Available at: <https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/nacional/entregador-espantado-apos-assalto/>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

CAMPO GRANDE NEWS. Teenager jumps out of car to escape rape. Available at: <https://www.campograndenews.com.br/cidades/capital/adolescente-pula-de-carro-de-aplicativo-em-movimento-apos-tentativa-de-estupro>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

O DIA. Merchant reacts and survives attempted robbery. Available at: <https://odia.ig.com.br/rio-das-ostras/2023/09/6705977-comerciante-vitima-de-tentativa-de-assalto-em-rio-das-ostras-recebe-alta-medica.html>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

G1 GLOBO. Mother prevents son from being kidnapped in front of school. Available at: <https://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2021/07/17/mae-salva-filho-de-5-anos-de-sequestro-nos-eua-veja-video.ghtml>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.

RECORD TV. Driver throws car at thief and avoids robbery in traffic. Available at: <https://recordtv.r7.com/balanco-geral/video/motorista-joga-carro-contraladrao-e-evita-assalto-no-transito-de-sp-17082023>. Accessed on: May 5, 2025.