

THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMPACT OF EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS: HEALING FEAR

NICOLETA MILICI

“Francisc I. Rainer” Institute of Anthropology of the Romanian Academy,
Department of Biomedical Anthropology, Laboratory of Social Medicine
Academy House, 13 September Avenue, No.13, 5th District, Bucharest, Romania, Zip Code 050711, tel. / fax +4021.3175072

Corresponding author: Nicoleta Milici, e-mail: nicoletamilici@yahoo.fr

*Fear is not just an emotion, but an instrument of social order.
Pandemics don't just sicken our bodies, they redefine our freedoms.*

Received July 15, 2026

The theme of “healing fear” during epidemics is deeply human and very current. Pandemics are moments when humanity goes through an existential shock. Throughout history, epidemics have not only produced physical disease, but also massive waves of fear, panic, rumors, guilt and social isolation. In many cases, fear has done more harm to communities than the disease itself. Pandemics and epidemics affect not only the body, but especially the collective psyche, and fear often becomes the “disease” that remains long after the etiologic agent is gone. Often, fear spreads faster than the disease. People begin to see danger everywhere, lose trust in other people, lose the feeling of safety in the world, go into hyper-vigilance – this is the “epidemic of fear”. In epidemics, fear is not irrational. It starts from uncertainty (“we don't know what's next”), lack of control, conflicting information, constant exposure to alarming news, death or suffering of those around us. The problem arises when fear paralyzes rational thinking, destroys relationships between people, leads to stigmatization and isolation, and produces mental exhaustion worse than the actual risk. Fear becomes a second epidemic, a psychological one. Healing fear does not mean ignoring danger. It means remaining lucid in the midst of danger, maintaining emotional balance, maintaining connection with others; it means turning fear into responsible care, not panic.

Keywords: pandemic, epidemic, collective fear, social healing, healing fear.

INTRODUCTION

The pandemics and epidemics are not only medical phenomena, but also major social events, moments in which fear, vulnerability, and solidarity reconfigure collective structures and representations of the body, illness, and morality. Beyond the biological dimension of contagion, the epidemics activate complex processes of stigmatization, moralization of illness, and negotiation of trust between individuals, institutions, and science [1,2].

Paradoxically, they function as social mirrors that reflect the tensions between scientific knowledge and popular beliefs, between autonomy and control, between the individual body and the politic body.

According to Émile Durkheim [3], society is a living organism, and disease can be metaphorically

viewed as a dysfunction of it. The epidemics act as social tests, revealing existing tensions and inequalities.

While medicine focuses on the biological causes of disease, sociology analyzes how collective reactions are formed (fear, panic, distrust), how norms and values are affected, how social and economic relations are restructured, how new forms of social control emerge (quarantine, surveillance, restrictions). In consequence epidemics become mirrors of society, in which the degree of solidarity, cohesion and institutional trust is reflected.

Fear – a central collective emotion during epidemics – has a dual function: it disintegrates social cohesion, but at the same time creates new forms of solidarity. Therefore the “healing of fear” becomes a social dimension of the recovery process, involving the reconstitution of trust in

public institutions, reconnection to the community, and the restoration of a collective sense of safety [4]. In this sense, healing goes beyond the medical sphere, becoming a form of symbolic repair of social ruptures, a “therapy of meaning” at the community level.

Recent analyses [5,6] of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic show that psychosocial adaptation, solidarity, and civic participation were essential factors in reducing collective anxiety and restoring social cohesion. Thus, contemporary anthropology and sociology propose a perspective on healing as a cultural and moral process, not just biological: healing fear means relearning trust, re-signifying suffering, and rediscovering a sense of belonging.

Health crises do not affect all individuals equally. Socioeconomic status, ethnicity, gender, educational level or living environment determine the degree of vulnerability of populations. People from lower social classes or from rural areas have less access to health services, information and protection. Migrants or those in the informal economy are more exposed to the risk of infection. Economic inequalities translate into health inequalities – a phenomenon highlighted in pandemics such as the Spanish flu (1918), HIV/AIDS or COVID-19. Therefore, epidemics amplify already existing social divisions, and society's reaction to the disease reflects its power structure and social justice.

Michel Foucault [7] has introduced the concept of biopolitics*, describing how the state manages the biological life of the population through health policies, surveillance and discipline. In times of health crisis, the state expands its powers of control and regulation, acting on the social body in the name of collective protection. Measures such as quarantine, movement restrictions, mandatory vaccination or digital monitoring are concrete expressions of this governance of life. They aim to preserve order and reduce biological risk, but at the same time test the limits of individual freedom.

Although these measures may be justified on health grounds, they raise ethical and sociological

questions about the limits of individual freedom and the power of institutions. Society, confronted with the threat of disease, reconfigures the relationship between safety and freedom, between public interest and individual rights. The fundamental dilemma consequently becomes an ethical and political one: how far can the state go to protect life, without nullifying the autonomy of the person? The COVID-19 pandemic has transformed this question into an everyday reality, in which consent, fear and responsibility have intertwined in a new form of social contract – fragile but inevitable.

Throughout history, epidemics have been more than just medical phenomena: they have represented moments of profound social transformation. The first known health crises – such as the *Plague of Justinian* (6th century) or the *smallpox epidemic of Antiquity* – laid the foundations for how societies reacted to the threat of disease. In the absence of a developed medical science, communities interpreted disease through religious and moral lenses: the epidemic was seen as divine punishment or as the result of collective sin [8].

Medieval epidemics led to the emergence of rudimentary mechanisms of social control, designed to limit the spread of disease and restore order. In the 14th century, cities such as Venice, Florence and Marseille introduced quarantine – a term derived from “quaranta giorni” (forty days) – as a standard measure to isolate ships and people suspected of infection. Authorities established cordons sanitaires, temporary closures of cities and the sick register, marking the beginning of a systematic surveillance of the population. These practices had not only medical purposes, but also political and moral ones: the control of movement became a form of fear management. Thus emerged a model of incipient biopolitics, in which the power of the state manifested itself through the regulation of life and death, transforming fear into an instrument of social order.

As people traveled around the world, they contributed to the massive spread of infectious diseases. Humanity has faced numerous epidemics that have changed the course of civilization, profoundly influencing the evolution of society, medicine and collective mentalities. Among them, the Black Death, the Spanish Flu, HIV/AIDS and COVID-19 stand out for the magnitude of their effects and the major transformations they have produced at a global level. I have chosen to analyze these four major health crises because they

*Biopolitics – political and sociological concept introduced by Michel Foucault, which describes how the modern state exercises its power through the management, control and regulation of the biological life of the population (health, birth rate, mortality, hygiene). It aims to “administer life” to ensure and multiply the population, transforming the human body into an object of governance. Pandemics highlight biopolitics through the regulation of the body, the control of circulation and the management of fear.

belong to different eras and reflect both humanity's vulnerability to diseases and the scientific progress made in the fight against them, thus offering a comparative perspective on how society has evolved in the face of invisible dangers.

THE BLACK DEATH

Many historians believe that the epidemic emerged in regions of Central Asia and traveled west along the Silk Road trade routes, from where it reached the Black Sea region.

Between 1348 and 1361, the Black Death devastated Europe, killing over a third of the continent's population. Some estimates suggest that it wiped out over half of Europe's population (death toll: 200 million people, representing 55% of the global population). It was caused by a strain of the bacterium *Yersinia Pestis*, probably extinct today, which was spread by fleas by migrating from infected rodents to humans or from one already infected human to another.

The plague changed the course of European history. The Black Death was one of the most devastating pandemics in human history, causing not only huge demographic losses but also a crisis of collective meaning. Its impact was not only demographic, but also profound social and religious [9].

For the medieval population, the disease was interpreted as divine punishment. In Europe, the epidemic was accompanied everywhere by a resurgence of mysticism. Fear, fueled by ignorance of the causes of the disease, led to extreme social manifestations: isolation, persecution and the spread of religious panic. In many European regions, the emergence of flagellants and the intensification of the cult of death transformed fear into a collective phenomenon of symbolic reconstruction of the moral order [10].

Religious institutions interpreted the epidemic as a sign of divine wrath, and clerical authority faced a crisis of legitimacy due to inability to stop the disease.

In parallel, the first forms of quarantine and institutionalized isolation were outlined. To limit the spread of the disease, some port cities began to isolate ships, goods, and people coming from affected areas. Authorities in Venice required that suspect ships wait a period of time before disembarking. Initially, the period was 30 days (called "trentino"), later extended to 40 days, from which comes the term "quarantino" (Italian for

"forty"). Similar practices emerged in Ragusa (Dubrovnik), one of the first places where quarantine was officially regulated.

At the same time, the pandemic stimulated a revival of community solidarity and redefined the relationship between the individual and religious institutions. The church, although affected, became the main mediator of hope. Thereby, fear was not just a reaction, but a social mechanism of cohesion in a world on the verge of collapse.

SPANISH FLU: 1918–1920

Despite its name, this flu did not initially originate in the Iberian Peninsula; the so-called Spanish flu actually broke out in a barracks in Kansas, in the United States.

The name that became established is due to the geopolitical circumstances of the time: in the spring of 1918, the First World War was far from over, and the press of the belligerent countries was subject to war censorship: it was forbidden to report news that could demoralize soldiers and the civilian population. In these conditions, only the uncensored press of a neutral country, such as Spain, reported the spread of a new deadly disease in the Iberian space. Therefore, the European and world public considered (initially) that the new flu was an exclusively Spanish phenomenon, and named it accordingly.

In just two years, between 2.5% and 5% of the world's population pass away in this pandemic. In all of human history, only the Great Plague of the 14th century comes close to the scale of the disaster of 1918. The World Health Organization reserves for the Spanish flu the dramatic distinction of being "the most devastating outbreak of an infectious disease ever recorded".

The pandemic was caused by an H1N1 virus with genes of animal origin (porcine or avian). It is estimated that the death toll was between 50 and 80 million, representing 2.5–5% of the global population. The spread and lethality of the flu were increased by the poor conditions of soldiers who were kept in cramped conditions and had a poor diet during World War I [11]. Many of the victims were young and healthy (mainly in the age group 20–39 years), making the Spanish flu completely different from other pandemics that affected children, the elderly and people with already weakened health.

To put these numbers in perspective, 17 million people died in World War I; the World War II

would kill an estimated 60 million people. In other words, the Spanish flu killed (far) more people than the First World War, probably more than the Second, and may have been even deadlier than both world wars combined.

Without a vaccine to protect against influenza infection and without antibiotics[†] to treat secondary bacterial infections that can be associated with influenza infections, global control efforts have been limited to non-pharmaceutical interventions: isolation, quarantine, good personal hygiene, use of disinfectants, and limiting public gatherings.

The Spanish Flu broke out in a context of emerging modernity, at the end of World War I, marking a rupture between confidence in scientific progress and the reality of human frailty. With over 50 million victims globally, it was the first epidemic to be widely publicized on an international scale. The Spanish Flu pandemic represented a major rupture between old religious interpretations of the disease and new scientific and institutional paradigms.

Socially, fear manifested itself in isolation, distrust and public silence – many governments censored information to maintain public morale. Despite medical advances, populations faced uncertainty, panic and distrust of authorities. The lack of transparency from governments, due to censorship imposed by the war, fueled a collective sense of abandonment. This collective silence generated a latent cultural trauma, rarely evoked in postwar discourse. Fear was accompanied by cultural coping mechanisms: the development of solidarity in local communities, alternative mourning rituals, and a new type of survival morality.

In this context, the pandemic functioned as a moment of reflection on the human condition, highlighting the tension between reason and vulnerability. Fear was no longer just an obstacle, but a common experience that reshaped the social identity of the 20th century. At the same time, the pandemic spurred the development of modern public health, epidemiology, and the concept of

social responsibility towards disease, transforming fear into a catalyst for contemporary health organization.

THE AIDS PANDEMIC AND EPIDEMIC

The emergence of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the early 1980s brought a new dimension of fear: moral fear. Unlike previous pandemics, AIDS was initially associated with certain social groups – notably the LGBTQ+ community, drug users and sex workers – leading to deep stigmatization and a reactivation of moral discourses about “purity” and “guilt”.

The media amplified the sense of panic, presenting the disease as a punishment for deviance. In this context, fear was used as a tool of exclusion, and the disease became a marker of difference and marginality.

AIDS has caused approximately 35 million deaths since it was first identified (0.5% of the global population). HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, likely developed from a chimpanzee virus that transferred to humans in Central Africa (probably Cameroon or the Kinshasa area of the Congo) in the early decades of the 20th century, estimates suggesting that the event occurred around 1920–1930. The virus made its way around the world, and AIDS was a pandemic by the end of the 20th century.

For decades, the disease had no known cure, but drugs developed in the 90s now allow people with the disease to experience a normal lifespan with regular treatment.

Sex between men was the most common mode of exposure among people reported with AIDS (46%), followed by injection drug use (25%) and heterosexual contact (11%). Another factor of transmission was also through blood transfusion and the use of infected needles.

Although scientific advances and civic activism transformed AIDS into a manageable disease, the social trauma persisted. The epidemic generated a redefinition of human rights and brought to the forefront the concept of biopolitics of inclusion, in which surveillance and protection extend to all forms of life, not just the “normative”.

Facing the fear and stigma, the HIV/AIDS epidemic became the catalyst for a global wave of civic and political activism. Patient groups, artists, and nongovernmental organizations challenged the silence of the authorities and demanded the right to visibility, treatment, and dignity. This activism

[†] The discovery of the first natural antibiotic, penicillin, was not made until 1928. This moment marked the beginning of the antibiotic era and revolutionized modern medicine, allowing the treatment of bacterial infections that were previously fatal.

The first influenza vaccine was approved for military use in the United States in 1945 and widely used from 1946. It was the first inactivated (killed virus) vaccine used to protect against the influenza virus.

reconfigured the relationship between science, power, and society. Through protests, public campaigns, and legal actions, a new model of involved citizen was born – the biopolitical citizen, aware of his / her right to participate in the decisions that affect his / her life.

The shift in public perception was slow but profound: from moral fear to compassion and collective responsibility. HIV/AIDS transformed the disease into a space for negotiating freedom, solidarity and social justice, marking a decisive stage in the democratization of public health.

In the last decades of the 20th century, the media became a central actor in managing and amplifying collective fear. In the context of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, the press shaped public perception through alarmist language, transforming medical information into a moralizing narrative. News about “risk groups” and “invisible transmission” created a moral panic, in which the disease was associated with shame and guilt. This media representation reinforced stereotypes and contributed to the social isolation of those infected. At the same time, the media environment began to play an ambivalent role: it was both a source of fear and a tool for awareness and mobilization. The educational campaigns and visible activism of the '90s used the same channel – the media – to transform public discourse from fear to solidarity and from condemnation to collective responsibility.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic, which began in the '80s, brought to the fore a new dimension of social fear – moralized fear, born of ignorance, prejudice and discrimination. Unlike previous epidemics, HIV/AIDS was associated not only with the disease, but also with social identity: sexual orientation, social status and behaviors considered deviant. This association generated systemic stigmatization, marginalization of affected people and a culture of silence. In many societies, patients became symbols of moral guilt, not of medical suffering. Fear of contamination intertwined with fear of shame, transforming the pandemic into a phenomenon of social exclusion. However, over time, HIV/AIDS triggered an educational and civic revolution. Information campaigns, activism of LGBTQ+ communities and the involvement of international organizations (WHO, UNAIDS) transformed the disease into a space for social learning about empathy, human rights and prevention. Thus, HIV/AIDS has become a historical lesson on how education can cure fear, replacing stigma with solidarity and silence with dialogue.

THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

COVID-19 is a respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, a coronavirus discovered in 2019 in China and which has spread rapidly around the world. The virus spreads mainly from person to person through respiratory droplets (Flügge droplets) produced when an infected person coughs, sneezes or speaks. The virus is still present today, but has undergone some mutations compared to the original version, which was much more severe and caused a large number of deaths in a relatively short time (no. of deaths: 6,367,793 people, representing 0.08% of the global population). The emergence of the vaccine, the limitation of public gatherings, compliance with hygiene rules and the use of disinfectants (hand sanitizers, surface disinfectants) have definitely contributed to reducing the number of cases.

The COVID-19 pandemic has generated not only a medical crisis, but also an unprecedented information crisis, described by the World Health Organization as an “infodemic” – an avalanche of information, true or false, that spreads faster than the virus itself.

In the digital space, fear has been amplified by images, contradictory news and conspiracy theories, which have transformed the online environment into a terrain of global anxiety. Social networks have simultaneously functioned as a source of solidarity and panic, generating a fragmentation of reality and a deep polarization of public opinions. In this way digital fear has become a new form of social control: informational self-isolation, obsessive data verification and the permanent need for certainty have created a dependence on media flows. The pandemic has shown that, in the digital era, managing fear is no longer done only through health policies, but through the cleaning and regulation of information.

The COVID-19 pandemic (2020–2022) represented one of the most profound crises of the contemporary era, testing the fundamental structures of modernity: science, rationality, the global economy, and trust in institutions. Although technology and medicine have reached unprecedented levels, fear has returned as the central emotion of collective existence. The uncertainty surrounding the virus, the isolation measures, and the contradictory flow of information have generated a crisis of trust – between citizens and the state, between science and public perception. COVID-19 has shown that

modernity has not “cured” fear, but only transformed it into technologically managed anxiety. The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated a structural shift of fear from the physical to the digital space. In a permanently connected world, fear is no longer transmitted only through direct experience, but through images, statistics, and information flows that circulate continuously. This digitalization of fear has led to the emergence of a new type of control: self-regulation. The individual internalizes fear through algorithms, recommendations, and social norms reproduced online. Fear becomes so a form of participation in the digital order, in which surveillance is no longer imposed, but voluntarily assumed.

The pandemic has accelerated the process of digitalization of power, transforming technology into an essential tool of social control, marking a new stage in the social history of fear, one defined by hyperconnectivity and informational fragmentation. Contact tracing apps, digital certificates, and mobility monitoring have redefined the relationship between the individual, the state, and personal data.

Unlike previous pandemics, the crisis did not manifest itself only at the biological level, but also in the digital space, where social networks amplified collective emotions, anxiety, and polarization. Fear went viral – transmitted through constant flows of contradictory information, alarming images, and politicized discourses. In a context of uncertainty, distrust in authorities and science, the media favored disinformation and the formation of “reality bubbles”, where personal beliefs prevailed over facts.

This cognitive polarization has divided societies into opposing camps: those who respected health measures and those who challenged them, seeing them as an attack on freedom. The pandemic has also become a crisis of social cohesion, where fear has been shaped not only by the virus but also by communication technologies.

However, COVID-19 has also reactivated forms of digital solidarity: online civic initiatives, volunteering, medical education and remote emotional support. Fear, in the digital era, has become a battleground between information chaos and the need for collective meaning.

Each pandemic has revealed that fear has a profound economic dimension. The closure of borders, the suspension of activities, and the collapse of global markets during COVID-19 have transformed health insecurity into full-blown economic insecurity.

Pandemics have always acted as moments of economic fracture, exposing the vulnerabilities of global production, distribution and labor systems. The COVID-19 crisis has generated an economic contraction comparable only to the Great Depression of the 1930s, demonstrating the profound interdependence of world economies. Supply chains have been disrupted, entire industries – from tourism to transportation – have collapsed, and millions of people have been thrown into financial precariousness. Health fear has quickly turned into economic fear, affecting perceptions of the future and the individual’s relationship with work.

In the contemporary world, the fear of disease has been superimposed on the fear of losing job, stability, and future. This superimposition has generated a culture of precariousness, in which the individual becomes responsible for his own survival in an uncertain system.

From a sociological perspective, economic fear functions as a disciplinary mechanism: it encourages conformity, acceptance of restrictive measures, and the internalization of the idea that “protection” comes in exchange for obedience. The pandemic has thus highlighted not only people’s biological vulnerability, but also their structural dependence on global economic systems.

After each pandemic, societies enter in a stage of reconstruction – not only economic, but also symbolic. Health crises reveal the fragility of social structures, but also stimulate innovation and adaptation. In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the world has had to rethink labor relations, education, social interaction, and even the way we relate to time and space. A new culture of resilience has emerged, in which adaptation becomes a social virtue.

The pandemic has accelerated the automation and digitalization of the economy, favoring technology companies and reinforcing inequalities between states and social classes. Teleworking, the digitalization of services, and the revalorization of local communities have redefined the balance between autonomy and dependence. However, this reconstruction is not uniform: economic and technological inequalities persist, and access to resources becomes a criterion for survival.

Beyond the material losses, the real impact of the global economic crisis is psychological and cultural: a new era of uncertainty, in which stability becomes a privilege and not a certainty.

Post-pandemic reconstruction does not mean returning to “normality”, but creating a new

normality – one aware of vulnerability, interdependence and the importance of solidarity as an essential social resource.

Over the course of history, the media has played a central role in how societies perceive and manage collective dangers. In the context of pandemics, the press and digital platforms become channels for transmitting not only information, but also the collective emotion of fear. The accelerated pace of news, alarmist language and dramatic images transform the health event into a spectacle of vulnerability. Fear becomes a media commodity, capable of capturing attention and influencing public behavior. At the same time, the pressure to be constantly “informed” generates an informational anxiety, in which the boundary between reality and interpretation becomes increasingly diffuse. The media not only reflects the pandemic reality, but also symbolically constructs it, providing meaning and direction to collective emotions. In the absence of ethical and balanced communication, public space risks becoming a terrain of panic, in which fear feeds itself and weakens social cohesion.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the persistence of diseases and pandemics throughout history, there is one consistent trend over time – a gradual reduction in the death rate. Improved healthcare and understanding of the factors that incubate pandemics have been powerful tools for mitigating their impact.

Each pandemic has functioned as a mirror of society, revealing both the structural vulnerabilities and the adaptive capacity of human collectivities. From an anthropological / sociological perspective, these crises show that disease is not just a biological phenomenon, but also a total social fact, reconfiguring power relations, solidarity, and perceptions of normality.

The intense mobility of people, goods and information has made diseases no longer local phenomena, but global risks, managed through a complex network of international institutions, regulations and surveillance technologies.

Globalization has transformed the way fear circulates and is managed. In this new world order, fear becomes a political and media capital. Governments and global organizations use the discourse of health risk to justify exceptional measures: border controls, movement restrictions,

digital monitoring. Thus, the pandemic becomes a laboratory of global biopolitics. Power is no longer exercised only over individual bodies, but over populations connected by economic and informational flows. Fear is less and less a spontaneous reaction and more and more a device of governance in an interdependent world.

Pandemics teach us that fear can be managed, but not eliminated. It becomes an element of cohesion or division, depending on the level of trust in institutions and the strength of the community. At the same time, modern societies tend to transform fear into a mechanism of governance, integrating it into political and economic discourses.

The history of pandemics shows that humanity learns not only from suffering, but also from the ability to reinvent itself. Each health crisis has generated profound social transformations: public health reforms, new forms of solidarity, and a more complex understanding of the relationship between science, politics, and morality. The Black Death shaped modern institutions of quarantine and control, the Spanish flu imposed a global public health consciousness, HIV/AIDS transformed perceptions of the body and intimacy, and COVID-19 has redefined digitalization, work, and social interaction.

Pandemics are not just medical events, but moments of social revelation, shedding light on the deep mechanisms of fear, power, and solidarity. They test the limits of institutions, values, and human relationships, forcing society to reinvent itself.

Healing the “collective body” involves healing relationships between people – a reconstruction of a sense of belonging and shared responsibility.

Sociological analysis shows that fear does not disappear, but is transformed: from panic to caution, from isolation to reflection. This collective metamorphosis is essential for survival, but also for the evolution of social consciousness. In each era, from the Black Death to COVID-19, the community response has been essentially the same: the search for a balance between protection and freedom. In this sense, “curing fear” does not mean its absence, but the ability to understand it, share it and overcome it together.

Pandemics have demonstrated that social empathy – caring for others, respecting common rules, community support – is a form of moral resilience. Solidarity is not just an ethical ideal, but a practical survival mechanism, which restores the balance between the individual and the community.

Healing fear does not mean eliminating it, but transforming it into a form of understanding and solidarity. In times of crisis, fear can be a destructive force, but also one that unites, generating compassion and collective responsibility.

Pandemics show us something essential: what people fear most is not the disease itself, but the loss of control. And accepting that we cannot control everything is the beginning of healing fear. Fear does not disappear when the danger disappears. Fear disappears when the brain relearns that life can be lived without constant alertness.

In a world marked by uncertainty and interdependence, healing fear means rebuilding trust in science, in institutions, but especially in humanity. Fear thus becomes a space of self-knowledge and social reconnection, in which human fragility is transformed into a common strength.

For the future, the most important lesson is that prevention and empathy are inseparable. Pandemics cannot be completely avoided, but their impact can be reduced through trust, education, and cooperation. Ultimately, the true resilience of a

society is not measured by control, but by the ability to remain human in the face of fear.

REFERENCES

1. Rosenberg C. E., "What is an Epidemic? AIDS in Historical Perspective". *Daedalus* **1989**, 118(2).
2. Strong Ph., "Epidemic Psychology: A Model". *Sociology of Health & Illness* 1990, 12(3).
3. Durkheim É., "Regulile metodei sociologice". Ed. Polirom, București, 2002, pp. 85–102.
4. Bauman Z., "Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty". Ed. Polity Press, Barnes & Noble, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 9–26, 55–70.
5. Boin A., Lodge M., Luesink M. "Learning from the COVID-19 crisis: an initial analysis of national responses". *Policy Design and Practice*, 2020, vol. 3, pp. 189–204.
6. Han Byung-Chul., "The Palliative Society: Pain Today". Polity Press, 2021, pp. 18–59.
7. Foucault M., "Naissance de la biopolitique", Gallimard, Paris, 1979.
8. Brătescu G., Lucian M., "Epidemiile de-a lungul timpurilor". Ed. Științifică, București, 1968, pp. 7–13.
9. Cartwright F., Biddis M., "Bolile și istoria". Ed. BIC ALL, București, **2005**, pp. 37–55, 57–59
10. Ibidem, pp. 55–56.
11. Ibidem, pp. 188–190.