

Борис Братина

доктор философии
Университет в Приштине
(Косовска Митровица), доцент,
Философский факультет,
кафедра философии

ТЕОРИЯ ОДНОГО ДНЯ: ТОТАЛЬНЫЙ КОНТРОЛЬ?

Copyright © 2013, Борис Братина

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются некоторые из онтологических перформансов современной реальности в спектре западной иудео-христианской традиции. Доминирующий вопрос статьи — вопрос прочности и устойчивости системы в противовес энтропии сложного многоуровневого социального взаимодействия. Современный мир — это либеральный капитализм, мировая экономика, глобализация, милитаризация, создает иллюзию свободы и демократии. В глобальном масштабе даже небольшие изменения в любой точке системы могут привести к разрушительным последствиям. Это событие, необратимую сингулярность, можно рассматривать как амплитуду отклонения, новое движение ко-эволюции. Все предыдущие попытки освобождения от ре-систематизации оказались безуспешны. Одно событие может оказаться началом апокалипсиса даже для тех, кто его предсказывал. Событие одного дня, которое разрушит систему.

If the notion of being, the central notion of all philosophy, has yet preserved some sense in contemporary reality (other than of an auxiliary verb), then it seems inevitable to conclude that a certain dynamic and procedural meaning remains in it. This is particularly true if one has in mind the Modern project, beginning from structuring the Cartesian *cogito* and the whole philosophy of consciousness, up to the present day. In that epic of spirit and insofar as philosophy wished to remain both epistemology and ontology, subjectivity, once set up as a founding principle, experienced its twilight. After Nietzsche, no phenomenology, structuralism or analytic philosophy could save its unity. Far from being the one who just affirmed the will to power, Nietzsche exposed the philosophy of consciousness as ontology of power; the death of God implicated the death of morality and this, in its own turn, the death of man (as in Foucault, for example), as well as the rise of idea of a subjectless system. Philosophy gradually lost all its sense of transcendence, which completely disappeared in the smooth area of our present. In postmodernity, therefore, one gains a torn and fragmented subjectivity; a subjectivity that not only cannot guarantee for anything beyond itself, but moreover, is not the master in its own house, so to say. Consequently, neither can the «picture of the world», which necessarily follows this subjectivity, be significantly different from it. Such a constellation

is, of course, an expression of unfree relations to the world. Therefore, no wonder that the world appears as a broken mirror to postmodern subject — he or she is just a collection of unrelated reflections, reflections that no longer relate to anything. Power and solipsism are *recto* and *verso* of this state. Desire for freedom has become irrelevant in postmodern order of values, except as negative freedom for unreflected goals, and certainly not as a humanistic freedom of, say, one Sartre. Nevertheless, the world as a game of relationships turns out to each subjectivity — it is structured, so to say, as such a game. In other words, the notion of being dissolved in the system of relations. Each of the preceding historical constellation kept something stable within itself, even while reversing the previous states. However, all is fluid and everything is included now; neither is anything stable, nor is the system of relations, understood as a system of interest relations, transparent — the subjectivity has lost every haven. The system itself remains transcendent to the subjectivity, even though the latter is totally involved in it — it seems that the subjectivity has lost the power to transcend the system.

Contrary to narcissistic but devastated and impotent subjectivity, the system on the other hand seems disproportionately powerful. It deprived the individual of many of the functions that traditionally belonged to him or her, leaving them exclusively in a working and consuming dimension, and thus available in each and every moment¹. On the other hand, the system is itself bound to respond to the degree of relation complexity, which it bases in order to justify its existence, that is, in order to be reproduced. In whole, the stability of its reproduction represents the measure of system's success. Gone are the days when the main measures of effectiveness were the maximization of profits and the performance optimization. One does not say here that they seized to exist as requirements, but only that they are no longer the most important ones.

Nevertheless, a second danger emerges and threatens with self-destruction. Firstly, the system is far from being proved as reversible and its maintenance requires larger and larger inputs of what is alien to it. In its globality as the maximum of its dispersion, it then realizes its own finiteness. All the dreams of colonizing Mars and Moon are nothing but science fiction propaganda in aim of giving hope for that whereof there is no hope. Even in that finiteness, the system is not total: it has not established itself, as some claim², as an universal measure of the

order of being on global level, although it constantly aims to it. The system cannot give up these aims even if it wanted, for due to its irreversibility, any stagnation means its death.

Thus, to destroy the dominant order of being means, in first place, to stop the system in its progress. But, is this possible if the system repeatedly succeeds in improving its progress, and if doing so is desirable at all? In other words, is the transgression within the domain of validity, wherein all acts of subjectivity are transparent, possible? Obviously, something of the sort, if possible, can only come from an area of being, which substantially escapes the system, even though it is affected by it (as today's Kosovo and Metohija). It must stand towards the system in a relation different from the relation of a subset towards an again and again inclusive field. This repeated inclusion, internalization and placing under system's order represent a requirement forcing the system to operate under the current circumstances in the critical regime. In order to fulfill it, the system must develop very sophisticated forms of its own reproduction. The distribution of power requires a delicate mechanism of providing the power. However, the requirement issued here also demands extreme complexity of the governance mechanism. So we learn from automatic control systems: the requirement for sophisticated mechanism results always in lack of functioning stability. One finds here its most sensitive point, whereof awareness exists even within the system.

Hence the interest of all logics and natural sciences in chaos theory or in description of random processes, as well as of all the types of models, wherein small changes in input always lead to, if not incommensurable, at least unpredictably large responses. This means that, despite all the surveillance, a seemingly random event with catastrophic consequences for the system is likely to occur. This would have no great importance by itself if we lost out of sight the fact that the traditional emancipatory strategies by now proved futile and read out.

But what would such an event have to be like? Not requiring any special preparation or organization, it could seem as pointless to the system. Such an event, or rather a series of events, could be initiated itself by an event; an event that is no more than a mere call, a senseless act, which starts the sequence. It has only one role in its absurdity — to schedule the day of the collapse of the Great Objective Order of Things. In addition, this event, which truly is not an event (this call), is a one time event, but its uniqueness does not come from whoever referred it or out of mere uniqueness of singularity. Its authenticity comes from the fact that it starts a series and from the fact that almost nothing is prior to it — every other call would be a false one, simply because it would be second. Furthermore, the author of the call is of no theoretical importance: it could even be an employee at the Pentagon or a member of an extremely revolutionary cell in Nepal. The only difference is, by the way, that in the first case no one would believe in the call due to its location, i.e. to the fact that it originated from the West. Even at the cost of oversimplifying, but right in the heart of reality, it

should be openly said that the U. S. and Western Europe *are* the system, its metropolis and its Babylon, which largely inhibit the possibilities for development of a non-violent world and intersubjectivity — *they* are not invited, the call refers *to* them. It calls for destruction of power idols, knowing where its heart is and not calling those who stand within the metropolis, but those who are the system's Other, i.e. those who are under its domination or at the edges of its influence.

What does this call actually recon with? First of all, it recons with the fact that it will reach those intended, by some media (mail, internet, word of mouth, etc.), as well as with the fact that the aim is easily targeted. After all, the answer is simple: the system has learned to absorb single attacks, whatever their power, and to take advantage of them even when they are simultaneous, but it did not and cannot learn to defend itself if simultaneously attacked in all its points. One should not forget the fact that all the important points for survival of the metropolis are located outside of it. Hence, that absurd call not only schedules the day, say 4th September 2015, as well as the time uniformly set at the same moment in all the time zones, but also dictates a general attack against all that is possible attacking, under the condition that it belongs to the metropolis. This implies literally everything that may be affected: military bases and facilities, NATO offices, diplomatic agencies and residences of Western countries, as well as trade representative offices of multinational companies, originally Western firms and banks and all their properties, up to endangering the lives of their citizens who happen to be on site³.

The system cannot respond to such an attack. First action to follow is a reverse exodus of system's citizens and exponents, namely, their return to the metropolis. The second thing to happen is implosion of the system. Now the perspective changes: while it previously surrounded the areas, which it wanted to put under control, the system becomes now the one to be cut off and surrounded. All the dissipative and disintegrative processes that were previously acting towards the outside, now remain closed within it. The centrifugal forces act in the ethnic, territorial and cultural directions: hence, they are valid for groups such as Asians, African or Hispanic Americans in the U. S., the Arabs in France etc., or for the regions such as Quebec, Texas, Northern Ireland or The Basque Country. On the other hand, this reversed perspective offers an image of connectivity and prosperity on potentially quite different grounds. If once again one turns to the global order of being, the opening of possibilities for structuring on completely different grounds could be clearly seen, even in theoretical realm. «The Eclipse of the West» could mean the dawn of the mankind — an active irruption of general human subjectivity would be a sign that one historical role is completed. By all means, postmodernity is dead.

Epilogue

This theory has one defect. Namely, what if the worst fears of Edward Snowden turn out to be true —

what if everyone can bear witness to the existence of Big Brother, and yet nothing changes? Bradley Manning revealed to the world via Wikileaks the U. S. military crimes in Iraq and the American public considers him to be a «traitor»; they mostly remain insensitive to a 35 year prison sentence for a man who has shown truth to the world. British government and police have set up all over London «smart» public trash cans with an ability to photograph anyone who disposes of something and to record the content of mobile phones of the people who pass by them. Yet, faced with this facts, the population of London averagely answered that they had nothing to fear of, because they had nothing to hide. Freedom and privacy no longer are in postmodern value system. Although it is no secret that online social networks actually serve for data collection and control of their users, people continue using them. What kind of order of being could one then expect from «subjects» who do not want freedom? If the humanistic project of selfconsciousness has collapsed, does this mean that the motive of freedom will never again have the ultimate meaning for the entity called «man»?

Can then, or more importantly, should then a minority, which cares for freedom and privacy seize them? Does this mean that an elite or *avant-garde* is again needed, one that will initiate and expand the struggle for freedom? At the moment, this elite is made of persons such as Edward Snowden, Jullian Assange, Richard Stallman, the Cypherpunks movement and all the «hackers» (in the original meaning of the term) involved in encryption, free software and open source code. Therefore, it is a very narrowly conceived

notion of elite, defined by the struggle for freedom and computer knowledge. Does this in turn mean that those who want freedom must learn encryption and those who do not know it have not matured yet for freedom? Not necessarily. As it is not necessary to understand the programming details of an operating system in order to use one, it is also not necessary to understand the encryption algorithm in order to encrypt the message successfully. However, some knowledge or some basic culture in this sense is indeed necessary. Struggling for freedom presumes knowledge and since this is of significantly informational, symbolic and communicational nature in postmodern age, a post-modern struggling elite or *avant-garde* must have at least basic knowledge of the type. All of the above members of the contemporary *avant-garde* insist on it. Of course, this does not mean that the need for experience of reflection is lost. The knowledge that will form a new ontological order must include both elements.

Примечания

- ¹ This dictate is exemplary suggested in a comertial, wherein Maria Sharapova advertises a deodorant with words «24 x 7» — a formula intended for every woman who «stands on her dignity».
- ² Liotar, for example, or Negri, Baudrillard, etc.
- ³ I stress that the current processes, which clearly point to the collapse of the ruling system of domination, such as the economic collapse of the West, are not taken into account here. The modus is far more general, for it also anticipates the potentially infinite overcoming of such processes.