The Question Story

Summary

The main theme of the essay is the phenomenological analysis of the world essay contest question "liberating the future from the past? liberating the past from the future?" posed in Weimar in 1998.

The essay begins with a two-page literary mystification, understanding of which is left to the reader's shrewdness. The reader starts to suspect that the processes of our environment can be described as happenings taking place in the plot-time.

Then the author builds up a fantastic construction, from which the reader learns, that the process (i.e. liberating the future from the past and liberating the past from the future) proceeding from the contest question was realized in the seventeenth century, and the corresponding theoretical study of the purpose proceeding from the question (i.e. liberating the future from the past and liberating the past from the future) was carried out in the first half of the twentieth century.

It is known that the question itself was put in the spring of 1998 and turned into the world question by means of informational and university networks.

The author analyses this unusual state of affairs and comes to the conclusion that all the possible answers to this question have actually already been given. All the hypothetical or already existing answers rotate in the socio-politico-philosophical-economic plane, where either the models of future are elaborated or liberating the past from the future is denied.

The self-evidence of the answer to the contest question (its socio-politico-philosophical-economic nature) makes the author think that the answer i.e. the way out from the closed circle of our environment should be the elaboration of the ethics, which does not proceed from any existing socio-politico-economic-philosophical model-theories; moreover – it will be directed towards the abolition of these model-theories (existing by our side or hypothetical), but not by means of their annihilation.

At the end of the essay the reader can see a naïve attempt of elaborating such ethics.

Question Story[1]

In the detective novel "Grave New Word" of Milosh Armic, a Serb writer now living in Zagreb, action is set in the part of Cosovo which is controlled by Serb Forces. The plot of the novel develops like the TV series "Colombo": in the beginning a murder is described and then we find out how it was planned. At the end we learn the motive of the murder. The background of these three blocks of events is the investigation carried out by military police. Reading this at first sight ordinary and modern novel, readers will discover that the order of conveyed events is not a literary contrivance, but a description of actual situation; the novel tells us the story, where the murder happens first, then the planning of this murder and the examination by the murderers of the possibilities of their own exposure take place; then the desire and motive of committing the murder arise. This actual sequence of events is strengthened and made veracious by the fact also, that the investigation proceeds in a "right" way – i.e., after the discovery of the body the case is started, an investigator is appointed etc. The military orthodox priest, who resembles Chesterton's Father Brown, guesses what kind of case he is facing. After this he is just waiting until the preparations for murder begin and then the motive of murder is formed.

The end of Milosh Armic's novel should be noted: the murderers and their influential friends declare that the priest has gone mad and attempt to put him in the psychiatric asylum. Serbian orthodox circles accuse the military priest of heresy.

The well-known Argentinean critic Orando Garcia Luciende in his article "Signs of Future", dedicated to the influence of South American writers upon the literature of post-communist countries, sees in this story by Milosh Armic the trace of Borges, Casaveeda and Casares, though he notes that none of them has made such a brave step; and he offers us no less brave interpretation of reality implemented in "Grave New Word": The world, writes Luciende, is constantly changing, and it is changing under the impact of consciousness. Reality described in Armic's novel is our world, which became like that after the text, textuality and text-becoming have been given principal and crucial importance. This was begun by Plato writing his dialogues, but became evident and clear

---

[1] Only for readers, interesting in the philosophy

in our time, when everything was declared a text and when the world was regarded as a text. And the world did not hesitate to turn into a text. The signs of world's textuality will become more and more evident. The world's becoming a text, says Luciende, means the transition of reality from the form of chronological development to that of plot development. Gradually in our environment the events start to exist in the plot- time.[2]

At the end of the article Luciende tries to take away the serious character of his theory. He declares Milosh Armic's "Grave New Word" a parody of Umberto Eco's "The Name of Rose" and says that according to this viewpoint this novel by Armic can be the forerunner of Eco, Chesterton, Borges, Casares and Tarantino's "Pulp Fiction"—the bearer of their fantastic plots' core idea. Even more so, that a civil war, known to Borges through memories and legends, for Armic takes place in the environment where he writes "Grave New Word."

---

[2] Here I have to note the kinship of Luciende's ideas to "Time of Existence and Plot Space", the book published in Russian in Tbilisi in 1970s, whose author is a Georgian German-speaking writer Givi Margvelishvili. The idea developed in this book and based on Martin Heidegger's philosophy, is that the time of existence can be only if it is a plot time.

*   *   *

In the spring of 1998 two questions were heard from Weimar, the city which was declared the cultural capital of Europe of 1999. The questions were as follows: "Liberating the future from the past? Liberating the past from the future?" These two questions, that are the theme of international contest of essays, strengthened by a serious price fund, and then, by more then 2500 unswers, turned into the world question by means of university, scientific and all other kinds of networks.

These two questions raise the feeling of déjà vu, but not because such a question, formulated in such a way, has already been posed sometime and we can remember it vaguely. The meaning of these two sentences (without the question mark) tells us that it is necessary to overcome the discourses existing in and around us, that we should surmount our understanding of being, we should draw up a line of demarcation between our past and future, and lastly, that there are the conditions, possibilities and necessity of implementing all these in us and in our environment. This was first developed and conceived in the works (and heads) of French enlighteners, as a program and wish of activity directed towards the leaving the age of immaturity.

We can not find these contest questions in any of the works of French enlighteners, but the themes that started entering our world via French enlightenment clearly point to the total intention of liberation existing in their circle; the intention of liberating the future from the past and the past from the future.

The enlighteners have not put such questions, but they have elaborated in affirmative form what for all them, who decided to write an essay on this theme, become a question. They said that we must liberate our future from our past and vice versa, that there are conditions and necessity for doing that.

We can develop two main themes that the French enlighteners have introduced to our environment: science-history and knowledge-labyrinth;

At the dawn of modern times science was defined as the knowledge of the history [genesis and development] of the object ("knowing an object means knowing its history" - Locke). Accordingly, for being a science two components were essential - the object of

science, which should be defined as an object of study, and the method which would study the history of this object.

The first who announced the poverty (the un-scientific character) of existing history, i.e. the annals, was Voltaire[3]. The goal that history should have, as Voltaire said, is world history. With this presumption the history was given an object, that was quite general (the world) and quite unchangeable. Correspondingly, history made a step towards becoming a science, but for achieving this goal the method was required. And the method was elaborated: world history is achieved and consists of the histories of the world's peoples (nations). The world's peoples (nations) were defined as the societies marked by the borders of the States of that time. The written histories of the world's peoples should ultimately construct the world history. By this Voltaire defined the object for each specific written history — people, nation - and started the implementation of the way to the world history; he wrote "The Philosophy of History"—a theory of history as a science.

Another important paradigm, developed during the enlightenment, is the universal knowledge conveyed in textual form, i.e. encyclopaedia. First of all, encyclopaedia is a system of knowledge — a unity of component parts, in which every theme is linked with every other theme in a special and its own way; this is a bundle of links, which is at first sight in disorder, but an observing glance can detect in it order as well as strictness of trends. In this system it is possible to get confused, but "actually" there always exists a way out. Enciclopaediasts introduced the idea of knowledge as a system, in contrast to the previous, medieval knowledge paradigm, which was an accidental, hierarchical unity of various knowledges[4] (i.e. knowledge in medicine, theology, philosophy, military service etc.). Besides, in this "invention" there were realized the program words of the

---

[3] Annals were defined by the enlighteners as a history of this or that king or master; thereon was based the assertion of un-scientific nature of the annals: The object of annals (the subject of history – a king, a master) was changing after some time and depended on chance.

[4] Though the idea of united knowledge existed in Middle Ages as well. But the knowledge united in Middle Ages was personified and made the fate of extraordinary people (Albert the Great, Erasmus). The wish and program of enlighteners was abstract, scientific conveying of knowledge as a system, unifying this knowledge and making it available for everyone, i.e. elaboration of knowledge-system method.

enlighteners - "knowledge is power" (Francis Bacon)—by giving knowledge the form of a labyrinth.

Hypothetical consideration linking power with knowledge could be imagined in such a way: if knowledge is spread in the whole world and without knowledge rational actions are impossible in the world, and at the same time knowledge is a labyrinth, then the most powerful is the one who knows the ways of this labyrinth well. In addition, the labyrinth offers us its own game. While mazing in the labyrinth one could encounter the link (linking of two or more themes, i.e. the way out from one theme [path] to some other unexpected theme) that had not even been considered by the creators of the labyrinth.

By introduction of labyrinth by the enlighteners, a new rule started functioning in the consciousness, which so far could be called "indeterminacy principle", until we find a better name. This is the case when because of the unexpected intersection of seemingly unconnected themes a strange result is obtained. After we know the result, it looks necessary and self-proceeding i.e. the labyrinth starts its own life and becomes an organism.

* * *

One of such self-proceeding results is the nationalism.

History–science that got caught-up in the labyrinth, started bringing "strange" results: what should have been the basis for rationality and wisdom in the future, turned into the most irrational and gloomy fervency, which then spread to all the spheres of being, from personal relations to politics. Putting the history-science into the labyrinth caused the occurrence of nationalism and all the results proceeding from it.

Although all this became known at the end of the 19th century and in the twentieth one. But the indeterminacy principle, born in the labyrinth, had been working earlier in the environment created by the enlighteners and the name of one of its outcomes was Marquise de Sade. The study of feelings and passion, that should ultimately take us to the understanding of freedom — this is the way that Marquise de Sade took while wandering in the knowledge-labyrinth and which in the end made him commit a unique crime and receive a unique punishment. Although it should be noted, that later this crime and

punishment were separated from uniqueness, extraordinariness. But about this — later. This time let us go back to the basic instrument of liberating the future from the past and the past from the future in the seventeenth century — nationalism.

By putting science-history in the knowledge-labyrinth and by means of the indeterminacy principle nationalism arose.

First of all, the basis of this was the concept of nation as the subject of history, introduced by the science-history. Through this innovation, instead of a specific person, a general unit was established as the subject of history. This may have been a convenient way for writing the world history but because of the indeterminacy principle a very logical desire to study the genesis of this new subject, its merits, its biography, was born. As the newly emerged concept of nation was empirically connected with the state, this subject gradually moved to politics and became one of the main themes of conversation language. The necessity of studying the biography and the past of the nation brought this theme to literature and theory (in various -sophies and -logies).

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

The thematisation of nation was gradually implemented on all levels and became the ground for discourse. Of course sensations were also thematised. General idea of nation ultimately acquired the ideal of ruling the mass. This process probably illuminates Althusser's proposition, that "philosophy *(read: thinking)* brings science into politics and politics into science." In the end nationalism was established as the contribution of science (science-history) to the political discourse and that of politics to the science. This happened after it became necessary and inevitable for the state politics to assert the primacy of one subject over the others and by means of this to justify the political and military claims for its people.

The indeterminacy principle, which gives such results in the knowledge-labyrinth, may in another way be called "the necessity of unknown result," i.e. when all the parameters are known but it is impossible to predict the result until it actually comes. In

this specific case we can regard as the results segregation, black and white racism, eugenics, fascism, ethnic conflicts[5] etc..

After the establishment of nationalism it can be said that there doesn't exist a state in the world, the politicians and citizens of which do not identify themselves by recognizing their belonging to the nation.

Hence, the program set by French enlighteners was successfully implemented – they succeeded in liberating their future from their past and their past from their future; the line of demarcation was drawn in consciousness. French enlighteners created the present that became the borderline of consciousness: the past could no longer influence the future for the future was constructed according to other principles and rules. In a similar way the link between the future and the past was broken (or it seemed to be broken); the past could no longer be used as an example or a model for the future. Europe and soon the world started existing according to other rules and other consciousness than it was before; the new world was determined by two main themes, which are – 1) new understanding of the new history, i.e. the new subject of history and 2) new knowledge, i.e. knowledge as a system of sciences. The new thematism, proceeding from these two themes — new politics — new rule of self-identification of the State and the citizen played a crucial role in the empirical expression of liberation[6].

The rule, by means of which knowledge-labyrinth exists as an organism and which so far was given two names — indeterminacy principle and the necessity of unknown result, is politics, which, as a thematism, is a parameter of the Modern Age. Before that, the politics of antique period and that of the Middle Ages was the intrigue.

---

[5] Regarding the latter: ethnic conflict is nothing else but a wish of an ethnic group — a part of a State — to become the subject of history (i.e. to gain State). This wish is as a rule strengthened by means of arguments drawn from historical and material culture.

[6] Of course there were many other new components that emerged in Modern Age, or at the end of the Middle Ages. But they only strengthened the changed environment. For example, at the end of Middle Ages the phenomenon of the map was discovered again; the theme of the map got into the knowledge—labyrinth. Accordingly it penetrated the field of politics. Politics changed the role of the map and turned it from the guide to the goal: The map created the reality, in which the state borders are established not on land but on paper by a dotted line. This dotted line is in its part made legitimate by "International community" (by marking the paper with signs). Ethnic group or nation that starts conflict, contradicts the map's dotted line with land, stones, churches and with these arguments tries to create a new dotted line on the world map.

The "politics" of those periods can be described as the relations of Royal Courts, which were headed by kings and all the other "politicians" acted towards changing the ideas and activities of these kings and masters.

What emerges in knowledge-labyrinth, as the principle of existence of this knowledge-labyrinth and the main guarantor of this labyrinth to be turned into an organism, is politics. History-science and knowledge-labyrinth for the first time made evident the development of politics — as the all-penetrating thematism. Politics that made the existence of discourses and their relations possible.

The axis of politics is power. Power, as the analysis of knowledge-labyrinth has shown, is the function of labyrinth. Knowledge-labyrinth for the first time made it possible to gain power by means of knowledge. — It was the first to connect knowledge with the power — the power was deprived of its charismatic nature and became obtainable.

Politics is what emerges by means of intersection of themes in the knowledge-labyrinth. It does not matter that all of the intersections exist potentially. The importance is attached to the fact which system of intersections becomes actual in a certain period of time, which theme becomes actual for the knowledge and existence of the knowledge-labyrinth[7].

The main step that in the seventeenth century liberates the future from the past and the past from the future, is a necessary link between the knowledge and the power. The power becomes the product of [knowledge] system. Only the one who knows the ways in the labyrinth and can convince other that he himself is standing in the center of the labyrinth, can gain power. Here the knowledge-labyrinth shows one more unexpected aspect in this at first sight rational (common sense) world: belief and persuasiveness

---

[7] That is why Marquise de Sade, who happened to be in the theme different from the ruling politics (a slightly different theme of intersections), was a political prisoner and was in jail during all the governments. Because his theme involved power, pointed to the ways of achieving the main theme of that time – liberty –and also was hazardous for its neighboring theme that was being carried out by revolutionaries. Not to mention the Royal authorities.

necessary for the power. Nationalism was the clearest and most evident idea pointing to the knowledge of the center of the labyrinth, the intersection of all the themes and directions of the labyrinth.

One more merit of the knowledge-labyrinth is the establishing of necessity of the sensible. Faith that was before the guarantor of heaven and the peacefulness of State system, turned into an actual instrument and an necessary part of the way of existing of the labyrinth[8].

One more important contribution of the enlighteners to the introduction of new parameters and discoursive fields is the introduction of the goal of education (knowledge) —bureaucracy. i.e. positing of the stratum that will distribute the power hierarchically. The nature of this new power — the labyrinth — is best realized in bureaucracy. Bureaucracy as a new body was created for carrying out the function of Ariadne's thread — the guide — for those who want to proceed to the center of the labyrinth, or just make out any direction. The emergence of bureaucracy as a new body, was conditioned by the complicated nature of the labyrinth and the necessity of distributing knowledge, which later became the basis for labor distribution.

Of course later when this new body — bureaucracy was developed, its analogues appeared in Egypt of Pharaohs and even earlier. But the difference is in the present–count–out point – the seventeenth century — from where the history spread out to the past and the future. The present of the seventeenth century defines the earlier time just as it does our environment. Just as the labyrinth begins not with the gate of the labyrinth, but with the first thematic intersection that the one going in the labyrinth will face; with the place, from where the wanderer in the labyrinth starts making out his way in the

---

[8] The myth about the new labyrinth should probably look like this: Minotaur does not live in the labyrinth. Theseus becomes Theseus only after he comes as a winner out of the labyrinth. Accordingly, Minotaur becomes Minotaur only after Theseus comes out of the labyrinth, i.e. the dead changes his form. But problem is the following: how is one to single Theseus out of the people coming out of the labyrinth? Here the winner is the one who assures Ariadne that he is Theseus.

labyrinth[9].

The enlighters changed the nature of knowledge and power. They gave different meaning to faith and sensation. Thus the first great act of liberation was realized. In fact, with this liberation the history has began - the history an which nations and states participate and which relates the biography of power.

The reality of the 17th century was the point from which the history is counted. But not only the history in which we have been living until now but also the past of this history. In fact, the new contents-calendar began which determined the periods of the past. This determination was fitted in the current center of the knowledge-labyrinth so precisely that the division of the history of the mankind into three periods (antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Modern Age) became universally acceptable and self-evident. Only with the beginning of history became it possible to see the past as a system to place it into the knowledge-labyrinth.

*   *   *

History begins not at the point where the eye or the brush of paleontologist and archaeologist can reach, but in the seventeenth century and spreads both ways — to the future and the past. Thus the liberation of the past and the future from each other took place. The result of this is that our legitimate [and not real] present is the environment of the seventeenth century. Each our step is directed towards the future of this present and while reflecting we find ourselves in the future of that present.

---

[9] The Egyptians, the Shumerians, the Greeks and the Romans could not have had bureaucracy – they had the distributors of knowledge, assigners of knowledge into hierarchies, establishers of hierarchy – priests. Accordingly, if it were possible to reconstruct the paradigm previous to the modern times, it should be called library, where the complicated system of book ordering is known only to the librarian. Knowledge of this order is not power, but the means and proof of sharing, proximity and co-existence with the power, with the charisma and with the God. Knowledge until the 17th century was the way, the means of approaching the power, just to be near the holder of the power – the King, the God. So it can be said that the knowledge of the Middle Ages and of antique period was less practical than ours. This is told to us by our general consciousness, which admits that our education and knowledge are more practical. i.e. in our environment praxis is linked with the power.

Our social existence today is determined by the main themes introduced in the seventeenth century. In this case by "social" I mean the legitimate existence that enables every individual to be the citizen of the State and to have rights and privileges as well as responsibilities and limitations that are confirmed by "the international community." The themes of knowledge–labyrinth, knowledge–power and labyrinth bureaucracy still operate and deal successfully with the structurization of the society. The theme of the state-nation is also still actual.

This means that our rationality and what we take for granted today, our prejudices are determined by the seventeenth century. Likewise, the sciences and directions, which study the times existing before the seventeenth century and the objects and things of those times, are conditioned by the parameters of the Modern Age (including deconstructionism which does nothing else but opposes these parameters).

The only legitimate reality that exists today and that has existed during the last three centuries, is the environment of the seventeenth century. The environment in which **new politics** was and has been created — a completely new and different **thematism** of the power, which in its part caused the emergence of new themes (e.g. **nationalism**) and the birth of new bodies (e.g. **bureaucracy**).

Our environment, the one in which we live today, is the future of the present existing three centuries ago[10].

* * *

In the twentieth century, after the **political defeat** of one of the main and central themes, after it became clear that politics and nationalism (i.e.. the existing thematism and the specific theme) are incompatible, there emerged gradually an illegitimate space in the holes that appeared after nationalism was pulled out of the legitimate space.

Illegitimate space exposes strange circumstances: as an example we could use the transformation of the new body — bureaucracy: bureaucracy emerged as the guide to knowledge–labyrinth, but gradually, with the complication of the knowledge–labyrinth, the nature of bureaucracy changed. It turned into the carrier of labyrinth thematism, i.e.

the carrier of power. The power that the bureaucracy carries exists only inside the labyrinth. Bureaucracy can not get out of the labyrinth and remain the carrier of the power. That is why it is in the interests of bureaucracy to include all the environment in the labyrinth, i.e.. in knowledge[11].

But the essence of power was in the ability to draw the power out of the labyrinth, i.e. in the ability of the one coming out of the labyrinth to assure Ariadne in the fact that he is Theseus. When the whole environment becomes the knowledge-labyrinth, the power, i.e. the thematism coincides with the themes and is disseminated. There arises the situation, when everyone feels and shares the power, but none has the power.

After the World War II the hazardous nature of one of the main themes to the people's lives became evident: with or without intention the mentioned dissemination of power began. Dissemination and vagueness of the power means annulment of politics: its turning into something general and omnipresent not as thematism[12], but as a theme[13]. The "epoch" when politics determined the matters and situations was substituted by the time when all the matters and situations became politics. This dissemination and metamorphoses of the politics, as the general thematism, into general theme, became the basis for the illegitimate environment in which all of us live today.

<p style="text-align:center">*　*　*</p>

The dissemination of politics and power again brought about a strange result: universal institutionalization. By institutionalization I mean the general determinations of the behaviors existing in our environment on the one hand, and maximum variety of discourses and unlimited possibilities of moving between the discourses on the other.

---

[10] But this is concerning the legitimate environment. Naturally, there exists the illegitimate environment, about which we will have to talk.

[11] This could explain the promotion of at first sight unpractical sciences [e.g. theoretical physics] by the governments of the developed countries — as an intention to turn everything into knowledge and include it in knowledge-labyrinth.

[12] Just as it was before – after the seventeenth century politics, as a principle, as thematism, participated in determining almost everything and shifted everything to the political plain.

Both these phenomena cause and determine each other; today it is impossible for any behavior, action or ritual to be **new** or **pointing to** something new in our environment. All the behaviors are so well studied, elaborated and put within the knowledge-labyrinth, that it is impossible to do anything that the knowledge-labyrinth can not find an analogue or explanation (psychological, sociological, psycho-analytical, political, economic, tough, guyish, structuralistic, modern, postmodern etc.) for. It can be said, that this is the **politics** of modern time, of our environment: not to leave anything outside the knowledge-labyrinth, i.e. disseminated power. To put everything and everyone inside the knowledge-labyrinth, even that which is quite far from what in everyday life is called politics.

That is why in our environment Marquise de Sade's behavior found place in police chronicles and psychoanalysts' diaries and was explained and qualified there. His unique punishment became banal and statistic just as Marquise de Sade's behavior.

This means that in our environment of today it is impossible to escape Heidegger's **man** (mass and determinations of everyday life) by means of behavior, i.e. **epatage** is impossible. Being a hermit and orgies are as commonplace as the agenda of a conference with its coffee-breaks and reception at the end. Moreover, on the background of this general indifference and existence in one theme only all the behaviors that have ever existed are possible today and somewhere by our side maybe they are already implemented.

The specific character of our environment lies in the knowledge-labyrinth: analogues and duplicates can be found for every behavior in the history. Diversity and difference of discourses, that gives endless possibilities of explanation, enable this. Today rebellion is not the liberation from routine and generality. The only thing that a rebel can do is to move to another discursive group, which corresponds better to his rebellious behavior; then, if he wants to rebel again, change the group again etc. Today a new behavior, to which our environment can not find a corresponding framework and a group of like-minded people, is principally impossible. Moreover — opposition to the State

---

[13] i.e. when all the issues became political — should it be national literature, relationship with the people of different nationalities and race, economic links, sexual minorities, participation in organizations of civic society etc.

government, which during centuries was regarded as the fate of very few and an intellectual rebellion, became institutionalized and turned into a "civic society" (to say nothing about political opposition, which was institutionalized one of the firsts). Talking about non-governmental activeness and organizations would take us a long time, but the general structurization of the society, the part of which is the creation of civic society within the State, clearly participates in the process of power dissemination and is the outcome of bureaucracy-labyrinth.

<p style="text-align:center">*　*　*</p>

Today we live in an "apocalyptic situation": all the ideas, theories or trends that have existed during the history of mankind, have been restored and placed into our environment. There can be two causes for this: 1) Extraction of the nationalism – as a theme – from the legitimate environment, which caused discreditation of the central **theme** as such on the one hand, and conscious or unconscious (unthought) seeking for the substituting theme (themes) on the other. 2) Neutralization of ruling proceeding from pulling the nationalism out of the legitimate space and discreditation of the central theme. The process of draining ideology from bureaucracy began and several necessary demands to new ideologies were elaborated: it should not violate the basic human rights, should not threaten the State security etc. The Anglo-Saxon jurisdiction more, the German less, but still can prove that nothing is threatening State security but evident aggression and evident action against State order. Accordingly, there does not exist a text that can directly point to the danger. Hence all the texts can be restored and all the discourses can be created[14].

---

[14] This is not just a literary fantasy. Today there may exist a country where a produced object can actually have a cost price (Marx), that can not be changed. Any ruling that will be based on the fact that the [cost] price of this object should be determined by the market, i.e. economic and just plain relations of people, will not work, will destroy the social-economic system of this country and bring it to an insurmountable crisis.

It should be taken into consideration that if before World War II in some countries the existence of hidden (or evident) slave-owning was regarded as shameful and outdated, today this problem does not bother the legitimacy. Solving this problem became the business of non-State bureaucracy— non-governmental organizations. Not only because the State has more important

So arose the possibility that every kind of discourse be restored and as a result we can get a diverse discoursive reality.

But the interesting result is that the desire to leave the principles of ruling intact caused the comparative variety of discourses; The trend to drain and secure governing from ideology and retain the ideology only in party fields caused in some countries (especially in the former Soviet Union countries, where non-ideological governing was not traditional) the restoration of pre-historic tradition, i.e. the one existing before the seventeenth century: there appeared charismatic leaders and intrigue occupied the place of politics. Although no country today is safe from the restoration of such a tradition; The power is disseminated and is in the hands of a bureaucratic body, which is so merged with the legitimate society that gradually the situation will be totally realized when the government (the president, the parliament, the municipality) is elected by the bureaucracy (bureaucracy in its widest sense — including the representatives of civic society organizations). Elected by those who are interested in the results of elections and the governing system of the State in which one can see oneself and regard it as one's own environment. In this circle, i.e. among those who share with the disseminated power, the singling out of the one to be elected can happen by means of ascribing the charismatic nature.

* * *

A little earlier, until the incompatibility of thematism and the theme[15] became evident, contents of the question put to us could be heard once more, but this time with a question mark at the end. This question that repeated the meaning of the program set forth

---

problems to solve, but because "that system has also got the right to exist, the carriers of that discourse should also be able to exist." Even more so that slave-owning is not a threat to the security of these States. After all, post-modern reply to this problem points to the fact that a slave can escape.

[15] i.e. politics and nationalism.

by the enlighteners, but accompanied by the cartesian doubt, looked like this: "Does time reveal itself as the horizon of being?"

This last question of Martin Heidegger's "Being and Time" is the main line of his philosophy, though sometimes it changes so that it is almost impossible to recognize. Sometimes it appears as a question "Is it possible to overcome the metaphysics?", sometimes as a conversation about the nature of languages with a Japanese, sometimes as a phenomenological analysis of the path (Feldwege).

The question "Does time reveal itself as the horizon of being?" should be unfolded in the following way: Is the understanding of being, the paradigm or archetype of the world outlook characteristic to us (which Plato began and in which we live) the only and inevitable one for us? Or is there a possibility of the other understanding of the other being, that will enable us to live in another time (in "aiwn")? i.e. can we liberate our future from our past and our past from our future? Can we construct our lives and our world outlook on the other principles and build our environment in the other way?

At the time when Heidegger was posing this question this theme was not politically or intellectually topical and its occurrence was caused by bringing phenomenology to the end. But soon when everyone saw what nationalism was, when Heidegger was no longer the rector of Freiburg University and when it became clear to him what is the result of our time, i.e. our understanding of being, this question underwent transformation for him and turned into the questions posed about the necessity of overcoming metaphysics and seeking the ways of this overcoming. "Metaphysics" by that time already meant for Heidegger what he had earlier called "time" — the understanding of being. The essential that was the ground for our being and Da-sein.

Heidegger was the first to put forward the issue of **possibility** of liberating the past from the future. Although ultimately he responded negatively to this question, i.e. the possibility of overcoming metaphysics ("Afterword to "What is Metaphysics?"" "Introduction to "What is Metaphysics?"") — he said that time, our understanding of being is the horizon of being, i.e. that sole construction, paradigm, idea, grasping which and living in which we are able. After that, the disappointed Heidegger (with the fact the Fuhrer's voice actually turned out to be the voice of being) started seeking the ways of

overcoming in the East. But this is already the subject of Heideggerlehre (Heideggerleere).

What interests us is this entering of the consent question for the second time - in the form of question already - into the biography of consciousness. Heidegger's intention to find a way out of the existing understanding of being, the existing central discourse, to escape the established order of epistemes, considerably influenced in the future post-structuralism (Foucault), as well as deconstructivism (Derrida) and new empiricism (Rorty).

Heidegger's posing a question caused the extraction of the main theme from the intellectual space comparable to that which happened in the sphere of politics. Which ultimately determined the discoursive reflection of connecting and overlapping of illegitimate and legitimate environments;

Heidegger created a precedent of how it is possible to give a green light to illegitimate themes, i.e. disseminate the power and its source and by this to widen the area of spreading of the knowledge-labyrinth - by means of rejecting the central themes of legitimate discourse (in this case of German classical philosophy and phenomenology) and still remaining within this discourse. What earlier was regarded as side and marginal (e.g. the languages of George Bataille) could [sometime] be given the possibility of sneaking and fermenting into the legitimate space from the holes made in the place of pulled-out theme (themes).

In this way intellectual and social spaces were gradually harmonized, i.e. the barrier that should exist between the "thought" and the "matter" was lifted. As a result we have got the world that can be characterized as schizophrenic (i.e. the situation, when there is no contradiction between the thought and the real, when they are in harmony and reflect each other), which was realized in the two-volume work of Deleuse and Guattari.

Martin Heidegger's philosophy can be described as the study of possibilities for liberating the future from the past and liberating the past from the future. That Heidegger himself answered this question negatively is of no importance to our investigation. The main thing is the fact of the study of possibilities of liberating the future from the past and

the past from the future, which began three centuries after the realization of this liberation.

* * *

Illegitimate space is glancing through the holes of the legitimate environment. This space is full of chips and other products of information technology. Of course we can not say that the legitimate surface does not or can not use the new technology; on the contrary — the legitimate space is full of new technologies. New technologies and networks can be that sole chain that holds these two realities together and does not cause their drifting apart in the airless (powerless) space — the vacuum.

The network created by the new information technologies is the new net of reality which actually and not metaphorically is surrounding the world step by step. This net the knots of which are computers, modems, local and global networks gradually looks more and more like the only reality. One of the causes of this could be that our legitimate reality that is the basis of the general institutionalization, itself looks like a net because of the extraction of the basic and central themes.

This net creates a new stratum, behind which the legitimate reality is gradually hiding and with which it is being masked. The fact that the information net becomes palpable (palpable in so far as it covers the legitimate reality) is a useful action for only this legitimate reality. In this case legitimate reality becomes and behaves as the **ground**. Every one of us is a member of this net. This net also contributes to the interconnection between the civic society organizations and their activities in the world. Any crucial or not so crucial information can be received or transmitted by means of information net[16].

The legitimate environment and its attributes, such as the State, bureaucracy, police, army etc. gradually disappear beyond the more and more fine net. They may gradually even become imperceptible. But this will strengthen their positions. In any case one thing is evident: legitimate and illegitimate environments, strata exchange places. One has the impression that in the holes of the pulled-out themes the illegitimate

---

[16] And not only this: with the aid of the net one can live a full life not lacking anything.

environment arose as a fermented dough and overlapped the legitimate stratum. Gradually the signs of this overlapping become clear: Those involved in politics and the others (illegitimate actors — hackers, new "hippies", travelers etc.) are more and more coincide and the politicians are disseminated in the legitimate stratum. And the others become more and more drawn into the knowledge-labyrinth [of bureaucracy][17].

* * *

Now let's go back to the 1998 year Weimar question: "Liberating the future from the past? Liberating the past from the future?"

As the survey of the question showed, first the meaning of this question was realized and then the possibilities of realization of this meaning were studied. And today, by our side and for us the question is fully posed: in it there is implied not only the eventual program that was implemented in the seventeenth century, but also the question about the possibilities of realization of this content, which was written in the first half of our century.

Such a picture points to us that there are two possible ways of considering the described process: the first version is traditional, i.e. chronological; the chronological description of this process will tell us that first the past was liberated from the future and vice versa, i.e. one understanding of being was shifted to another by the enlighteners[18]. Later when the drawbacks and hazards of the new world, new understanding of the being, of the new paradigm were revealed, Martin Heidegger set himself the similar program and made a negative diagnosis for the possibilities of overcoming the being. Today when the necessity of thematism and the central theme becomes evident, there once more arises the question of liberating the future from the past and the past from the future.

According to the consideration based on chronological approach the posed question: "Liberating the future from the past? Liberating the past from the future?"

---

[17] Like the majority of the hippies of the 70s who ended up in the civil service, it can be said that the end of hackers is NACA or CIA.
[18] Or by Plato with his "myth of cave" or by someone else.

offers us the study of possibilities of overcoming the understanding of being. The answer correspondingly is unfolded between the two poles: one answer is that the overcoming is possible and in this case we should be waiting for a socio-politico-philosophical model, that will direct us towards the ways to the new understanding of being. Another pole will hold the answers saying that in our environment it is impossible to liberate the past from the future and the future from the past and that situation in which we live is the end of history (according to the viewpoint of Kojeve and Fukuyama), that we will always have to live in the multi-theme environment that has lost its thematism. This environment will sometimes have the form of the new Middle Ages (Eco), sometimes it will show us the necessity of seeking and understanding **the Other** (Levinas) depending on the standpoint and the situation.

The answer towards which the chronological consideration drives us will inevitably fall into the plain of socio-politico-economic prognosing. Chronological consideration which is the main consideration of our environment, abounds in such answers. Precisely because of the chronological consideration there was born the most acceptable and common prejudice of our time that is called "the end of history" and relying on which we can call the intellectual history of the twentieth century "the Chronicles of the Revelation."

Another consideration is plot consideration, that tells us that the story which started to be conveyed in the seventeenth century was finished today by our side; i.e. the plot of overcoming was finished. Such consideration tells us that there is no way beyond the contest question posed in our environment, that "actually" we are directed not towards the chronological future, but towards our chronological past, i.e.. the time when the enlighteners realized the **act of great liberation**. The plot consideration — that tells us that first the past was liberated from the future and the future from the past, then there started the process of studying the possibilities of this liberation and eventually the question was posed about this liberation — drives us towards a socio-politico-economic-philosophical answer. But this answer, because of modern networks, the vanishing thematism, loss of the central theme and of the connection of legitimate-illegitimate

environment, pendulates between the return of thematism and the non-thematic, multi-theme existence.

The return of thematism means the re-establishment of politics, as thematism: i.e. the attempt to find the central theme again, that will consolidate our inflational[19] environment and will return the disseminated and dispersed power. It is not hard to guess that such model does not principally differ from the environment after the enlightenment of the seventeenth century, and that such an intention of a possible answer takes us back to chronological past.

Non-thematic existence means admitting that it is impossible to retrieve thematicism and the central theme and that we are forced to remain in the environment with the charisma of bureaucracy-labyrinth with many centers and trends. Such an existence, as Umberto Eco justly admits, resembles the situation of the Middle Ages and means the choosing of the place which both chronologically and according to plot stands before the seventeenth century.

These are those two poles between which the answer revolves if we consider the contest question and the process of its emerging from the point of view of plot.

As we see, chronological and plot considerations haven't given us much difference. But this is in the case when we are attached to the prejudice according to which the answer to such a question is the elaboration of economic-politico-socio-philosophical model or the ways to this model.

But plot consideration offers us one more interesting possibility: if we accept the fantastic idea that the process of liberating the future from the past and the past from the future was developed in the plot-time, we will see that there is no way beyond the contest question.

The plot-consideration points only to our past and nothing else. This intention in its part tells us that the answer to the question that lies in the socio-politico-economico-philosophical plain can bring us nothing new and if we submit to this intention we will always be moving between the models of Middle Ages and the ones elaborated in the seventeenth century.

* * *

The only thing we can do because of the poverty of the social-political-economic-philosophical answer, is elaboration of such a "model" that will enable us (and others) to see what lies beyond us - the characters of the plot and beyond the last theme of the plot - the contest question - from **the other** place. But what sort of "model" should it be?

To what extent is it possible today to elaborate political or social prescription? Making a medicine (pharmacon) that will inevitably turn into a poison? When treatment by medicine turns into poisoning? To what extent will the unfolding of thought and thinking in this way be productive and constructive, when there is always danger of falling into the already said and restored?

The question "Liberating the future from the past? Liberating the past from the future?" in our environment naturally and clearly shows us that the answer should be a socio-political analysis and prognosis, that the answer should be within social thinking, social and political philosophy. On the background of the hazards that we are facing, this clearness is perplexing. To what extent is it possible to give this question an answer that will not leave us pendulating between the already realized Middle Ages and the already happened breakthrough (the already changed paradigm)?

The answer that will be in the social-political discourse and at the same time will take us beyond the three-century history that begins with the contest question of 1998 and ends with the enlightenment breakthrough realized in the seventeenth century, is impossible. The discourse that talks about paradigms and epistems, elaborates the idea of the end of history and conducts archaeology of the "phenomena" existing by our side, creates the economic and political prognoses of the future, writes about the overcoming of the understanding of being, is wholly in the history and is the product of the plot that was surrounded and consolidated by the posing of contest question.

The answer that at the same time will be the escaping from the posed question and the completed plot, should be sought in the hidden and repressed sphere that has always

---

[19] Inflation not in the economic sense but in the sense of modern physics, where the inflation of cosmos means the irrevocable separation of the component parts of cosmos.

been declared the addition to ontology and first philosophy and that has never had the origin and the value of its own.

The field where the "answer" can reside is ethics. But not the ethics that corresponds to the concrete paradigm and discourse. In this case it will only be a discoursive product and nothing else. It will fit into the existing history just as a hypothetical socio-politico-economic-philosophical answer. I mean not the ethics that calls every specific person for the carrying out of a general imperative just because in **this discourse** and **this understanding** of being the behavior **should be** such. Here, as well as in the most loyal and consistent existentialism (let alone other philosophies and teachings), the concrete **I** will be lost, with its concrete first name and surname, the same way the concrete **you** with the concrete first name and surname, and the concrete **he/she** with **his/her** concrete first name and surname[20].

Refusal of the direction towards representativeness of philosophy and thought in general, seeing what lies beyond the beginning of our history (i.e. after the end of our plot) is possible only by means of such ethics which for the first time during its existence will become self-sufficient and will not be derived from any paradigm-discourse-episteme. If this is realized, such ethics will automatically "become" directed towards the concrete **I, you, he/she** with the concrete first names and surnames, as there is no other way left.

As we have seen, we can start constructing such ethics by denying the representativeness and paradigm-discourse-episteme.

The representative character of thought and our paradigm-discourse-episteme point to the multi-center and multi-layer world. Today, as we have mentioned, one can observe all (or nearly all) ideas, theories or groups in our environment that have ever

---

[20] Existentialism and existenzphilosophie, that starts talking about Da-sein, can not overcome the general nature of the law and description: the talking about Da-sein as a concreteness, shows it as not something or someone concrete but more as a representative of this concreteness. This situation, i.e. fatal inattention towards a concrete person, who has a concrete first name and surname, can not even be helped by the introduction of **the Other** by Levinas: his ontological ethics is still the product of the multi-polarity and centrelessness, the extraction of the main theme and the information network.

existed during the mankind's "biography"[21]. Everyone has the possibility to find one's own group where he or she can feel himself/herself calm and comfortable. This situation fully "fits into" the paradigm and discoursivity of our time. All these groups have their own ethics and aesthetics[22].

The ethics that will be oriented towards denying this situation, should imply the annulment of this situation, i.e. of this apocalyptic nature of the restored and existing groups and ideas, but annulment not in the sense of destruction.

This ethics that tries to see the way beyond the contest question (i.e. after the end of the plot) points to the abolition of multi-centreness and multi-ideism by depriving them of meaning, i.e. the center position. This depriving should be expressed for the concrete **I, you, he/she** by maximum change of various groups (i.e. ideas), when one is not fixed in one center and moves to another, then the third one etc.

Through this moving the "center" is abolished, for being in the center loses its sense. Through this moving "idea" and "theory" are abolished, as they lose their solidness and concrete followers because of their constant change.

Although after extraction of the main theme the world became multi-central and multi-discoursive, nothing changed for concrete people: they still make a choice and fall under dictatorship of the center. The difference is that earlier there was just one such center and now there are many of them.

New ethics that calls for maximum changes, can be simulated by the rapid change of places within one group and one center. Here comes in the theme of morality - the choice between ethical or unethical behavior.

This new ethics, that unlike the old ethics does not oblige any concrete person and does not force people to have one common goal (as, for example, in the case of Kant's categorical imperative), enables a concrete person, X or Y to choose his/her own way, to decide where to leave his/her own trace and no one will be assessing this except that concrete person.

---

[21] I use here deliberately the word "biography" which points to the forward movement in the linear clock-face time. "History" is different from biography. It is a story that is not necessarily conveyed chronologically.

The stimulus that makes her/him act according to new ethics, will not be a reflection of the stimulus of any old ethics. Not only the God's respect but even the respect of other people can not be gained because of the rapid change of groups on the one hand and the difference between the people he/she will be meeting while travelling, on the other.

The stimulus in this case can only be one: decision to live with the only possible other life, that in the process of this life will lead him/her beyond paradigmaticity-discoursivity and will enable him/her not to fall under the dictatorship of any center, in the slavery of any discourse.

New ethics is the only way according to which it is possible to behave, i.e. to escape from *man* and schizophrenia.

The main merit of this new ethics is that it can not be checked, i.e. nothing public can be reached by executing it. There does not and will not exist a point from which it will be possible to check a behavior according to new ethics and to pass a verdict. Checking the behavior and passing a verdict on an ethical behavior will be dependent only upon the one, who will decide to act in accordance with the new ethics[23].

The main thing is that today it is possible to act in accordance with this ethics; today there are conditions for a person, who has made a decision, to start travelling in the groups or ideas (this is made possible by pendulating between the Middle Ages and the time of enlighteners, that we have described before).

Only in this case will his behavior become a story and not a ritual any more. Only in this case can a person and Da-sein change, just as consciousness changes – without

---

[22] Aesthetics not in Baumgarten's sense but in the sense of the Greek word [aisthesis — trace, footprint], i.e. the way that an individual has to pass in order to get to discoursivity.

[23] The fact pointing to the possibility of realization of the new ethics is that similar and identical action can be observed in our past and our environment: Such activity is a teenager travelling for the discovery of one's ownself and also the hippie movement. But in these cases this activity as a rule ceases upon finding a desirable group and an acceptable social place. The basic principle of new ethical "imperative" is the principally uninterrupted nature of this movement, which still lies in the sphere of decisions of the "new ethical subject".

conflict[24]. As the existing theories and groups will cease to be of any importance to the person who has taken a decision, there will not occur a conflict connected with the change of intellectual and physical position in this person.

Concerning the decision: this decision, that according to the new ethics a specific X Y should take, is the only remaining type of decision. This decision can take him beyond the beginning of the history that begins with the contest question and leads us to the seventeenth century; it can lead him beyond the plot that ends with posing the contest question.

The new ethics does not promise paradise or worldly fame to the decision-maker. It promises one thing: the genuine behavior, that means going beyond the history and the plot, participants of which we all are. This going beyond will be **the Other** for every specific decision.

On the other hand, in case of popularity of this idea, it can be formalized and squeezed even in CV. But the group where this ethics can be formalized is "central", legitimate bureaucracy. Abandoning the latter by the decision-maker will deprive of meaning this bureaucracy, just as any other group.

---

[24] Here it should be noted that the conflict of consciousness, i.e. the thought up complicated constructions [thesis, antithesis, synthesis, I and non-I, etc] is nothing else but the simple and prejudicial transference of incompatibility of material, body, solid conglomerates to the level of consciousness. In consciousness and the history of ideas there is nothing that would point us to the conflict of ideas existing in consciousness. In consciousness itself the change occurs "without blood" and controversy. There are no *"written"* ideas there, defended by the army. Conflict of consciousness and conflict in consciousness is a literary device that describes the process of becoming-the-other in consciousness.