

## A POSSIBLE POSITIONING OF THE ROAD PHILOSOPHY WILL TRAVEL

*UDC 101*

**Srboljub S. Dimitrijević**

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia

E-mail: [srboljub.dimitrijevic@filfak.ni.ac.rs](mailto:srboljub.dimitrijevic@filfak.ni.ac.rs)

**Abstract.** *Even if the entire “central weight of meaning” were to be eliminated, even its dispersive localization, questioning, however, cannot be eliminated. It is, as philosophical questioning, only localized. This sort of position has always been unchanged, only for it to be idealized to some hypostatic heights. The road philosophy will travel is the road back to its original location or a specific form of existence. It is organized through gnoseology and thus shrouded in a specific atmosphere. Philosophy questions this atmosphere or the knowledge it produces. It is a question of local moduses of knowledge, and thus of how they originated, what their form is, their physical manifestation, all the way to the most important question regarding the way in which people and their locations are shaped.*

**Key words:** *local knowledge, the relativity of knowledge, atmosphere, regional philosophy, models of knowledge.*

Except for philosophy, today almost no disciplines and professions question the sense of their own existence. Quite the contrary, they all (from myth-religions, art, tele-technology) “inflate” their own importance to the level of absolutes. With philosophy this has been the case since Hegel, Nietzsche and from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and it is still going strong, thanks to the global “crashes”, to this very day. “The crisis of philosophy”, “the end of philosophy”, “the end of some philosophical discipline”, “the end of metaphysics”, “What is left for philosophy?” and so on are some of the diagnoses which, not exaggeratedly, occupy the attention of the philosophical and intellectual public of various profiles. “Not too much” means that the confrontation with various other misfortunes is omnipresent; that there are many upcoming “catastrophes”; that the situation has been “watered down” and that the problems of philosophy have been taken over by others (politicians, journalists, as the “new sophists”, people from show business and fundamentalists) and so on. Various solutions, approaches and possible exits are being offered.

In our attempt to solve the problem of the sense and task of philosophy, we will start from the conclusion reached by Carl Popper. *In my opinion*, says he, *professional philosophy has a lot on its conscience. It is in urgent need of »apologia pro vita sua«, a justification of its own existence* (Popper, 1989: 80)<sup>1</sup>. Without getting into “what philosophy has on its conscience”, or better yet trusting that it certainly has one and that it is necessary to “learn from one’s mistakes”, we directly head to the question of – in what sense can it justify its existence? It is too soon? It would seem so. But we do not have more time and there is no reason for us to deal with our mistakes any longer, since this would again lead us to being focused on ourselves. We immediately find the answer in the following: 1. Philosophy, as, primarily a gnoseological discipline with the “imposed” pedigree of a meta-narrative, cannot solely deal with pure concepts and categories per se and their constructions, knowledge in general and its sense, since it cannot be found in such a form. Knowledge is always the knowledge of something, someone, somewhere – it has no sense outside of its own existence and role. Thus, knowledge must be studied alongside its content, objects and objectivizations, people and the locations where it is revealed.<sup>2</sup> In the terms of Husserl this refers to “the world of the living present”<sup>3</sup> or in Hume’s sense it re-

<sup>1</sup> All of the English translations of the quotes included in the text are the work of the author.

<sup>2</sup> Explaining the influence that Jean Hyppolite had on him, Michel Foucault indicates the position and role of philosophy from Hyppolite’s own perspective and his relationship towards Hegel, but also reflects and justifies our particular position on the issue of the task of philosophy today...*as the elusive thought of the totality, philosophy for J. Hyppolite is what is repetitive in the extensive irregularity of experience...so Hegel’s question of the completion of one’s self-awareness is transformed into a topic of repeated questioning. But, considering repetition, philosophy does not follow the concept; it is not up to it to follow architectural abstractions; it must always remain in the background, it must break all ties with its achieved generalities and make contact with non-philosophy...It must over and over again deal with contemplation but not the reduction of the specificities of history, the sub-fields of the rational nature of knowledge, the depth of memory in one’s consciousness. That is how the thematics of a present, moving philosophy, which moves along the line of its contact with non-philosophy, according to non-philosophy even exists, revealing its sense.* Foucault, 1994: 141. We will not give, for known reasons, an overview of the collection of texts bearing the same title as the contribution of Theodor Adorno *What is the purpose of philosophy?* with contributions from Martin Heidegger, Ernst Bloch, Jurgen Habermas, Henri Lefebvre, Paul Ricoeur, Franz Brentano, Louis Althusser, Hans Georg Gadamer, Karl Jaspers, Bertrand Russell, Rudolf Carnap...and so on. It shows that there is no philosopher in the 20<sup>th</sup> century who does not deal with the future of philosophy. However, we would like to add one of the latest opinions of the philosopher Jurgen Habermas. Namely, Hotimir Burger sums up...*that for Habermas philosophy simply becomes a reflection and discourse, it no longer has a transcendental, or deductive or speculative form, nor is it guided by "maturation" or categorial maturation, is least of all an intellectual maturation, but is merely the description of the world and the self-description of the eminence of consciousness, while the structure of these descriptions is determined by the grammars of verbal puns of certain fields of reality, that is, their linguistic articulations. It attempts to explain how it is possible to consequently develop intuitions which guide certain philosophers and everyone who is contemplating the world and his life, and according to Habermas, it is all that is left in the methodological sense of the great metaphysical tradition of European philosophy.* Burger, *Appendix*, 2006: 150.

<sup>3</sup> We will also not explain the great effort that Husserl himself invested in solving the problem of the “crisis” of philosophy and science starting from his seminal work *Logical investigations* from 1900/1901 to his work that was published in Belgrade for the first time in 1936, entitled *The crisis of European science*. We would only like to emphasize that for him, the straying of the optics of philosophy from the transcendent framework, institutional philosophy, original sources, the limitations of science and so on, towards “things themselves” and the “present living world”, that is, daily life and a concrete experience, is philosophy’s way out of the crisis it has found itself in...*because he was convinced that the movement of phenomenological self-conceptualization can successfully be developed only in the field of pluralism and multidimensionality of the sense of the sedimentary in the current life of the world.* Prole, 2005: 248.

fers to philosophy needing to be limited...*to everyday life and to things that one comes across in daily practice and experience...* (Hume, 1956: 190). In the extent to which it determines us, it should interest us in a philosophical sense. 2. The one who acquires knowledge, and what is being discovered (whatever it may be), are located in this concrete physical world, and not in some ideational, spiritual, transcendent, divine one. We as living physical beings exist there.<sup>4</sup> 3. We do so not as living bodies in general, in space in general and some abstract and superimposing time, but as living physical individuals and groups found in a certain space on earth or as ethnic-localities. As one realist put it: *...the process of knowledge takes place in certain individuals* (Selers, 2004: 149).

We usually refer to it as the process of gaining knowledge, but do not imply that it needs to be logical-linguistic “perfect knowledge”, and thus true.<sup>5</sup> If it is concrete, the local knowledge of an individual and the ethnic-locality is not true, relative, changing, and thus if we also want what is scientific and mythic-logical, the philosophical which deals with this knowledge and is found in the same situation has the same features. According to Michel Foucault: *It is important, I believe, that truth is not outside of power, nor that it is bereft of power (it is not, which is important, despite the myth from which the story and functions should be borrowed, the compensation of free spirits, the fruit of long bouts of loneliness, the privilege of those who know how to resist it). The truth is in this world, it was created thanks to multiple pressures and contains the compulsory effects of power* (Foucault, 1994: 160). Thus philosophy can only with justification be focused on the relative knowledge in whose milieu people live, and thus it will itself be a kind of relative acquisition of knowledge which leads to temporary knowledge.

People are, actually, as living physical beings (including philosophers) in a certain location in space and are constantly being shrouded in a kind of atmosphere. This local atmosphere, determined primarily through knowledge,<sup>6</sup> is then the real object of philosophical interest and not just of any atmosphere at that, but of the one in which the philosopher finds himself. The current philosophical practice indicates that all of the key philosophers thought of things and acted upon them from their own and clearly determined physical-local position and atmosphere: Heraclitus in Ephesus who spent a large part of his life next to and in the atmosphere of the temple of Ephesus; Socrates in Athens; Epicurus in the atmosphere of the Athenian garden... longing to interpret this, primarily through knowl-

<sup>4</sup> On the trail of what Heidegger refers to as “the vicious misconception of traditional philosophy” and which originates from the fact that the question of knowledge is solved without any previous positioning of man as “existing-in-the world”...*in the naïve opinion, that man is primarily a spiritual being, which then becomes transferred “into” some space. Existing-in-the world, with its facticity, always disintegrates or crumbles into certain ways of being...Knowledge is a modus of loss founded on existing-in-the world.* Heidegger, 1985: 63 and 70.

<sup>5</sup> We do not claim that philosophy of language and analytic philosophy are unnecessary, but only that they cannot be the only “foundation” and sense of philosophy. After all, what would the philosophy of language be if there are approximately six thousand languages and dialects in the world? *Today in the world there are between six and seven thousand human communities which are identified on the basis of the first language that the members of these communities speak* Ostler, 2008: 29.

<sup>6</sup> This is very close to a current trend in modern epistemology, the so-called “evolutionist epistemology” of Donald Campbell, a version of “naturalist epistemology”, which *sees evolution as a gnoseological process...this epistemology stems from the conviction that life, every life process, is at the same time a gnoseological process. Life would, on all levels, be impossible without some sort of knowledge...Knowledge is thus, in essence, representational, an important indirect reference to the body and the environment.* Arne Markusović, *Naturalizam i apriorna spoznaja*, Filozofska istraživanja, Zagreb, 1988, pg. 28-30.

edge produced, atmosphere up to its final or ultimate “limits”.<sup>7</sup> Philosophy originates from local-earthly opinions (of various atmospheres) as its theoretical knowledge. That is the mind’s “optics” or the theoretical insight, which accompanies, as “optics” through certain local concepts or marks wanting to determine their differences or concrete specificities. Philosophy is a sort of bio-gnoseology of the regional type.

Its current applicability can be found in the absence of some universal cosmological sense (except in the residual ideologies and religions), and thus philosophy is actually aimed at the partial and... “*regional*” philosophies, a term borrowed from Bašlar (Deloš, 2006: 114.) without the absence of “radical” philosophical questioning regarding...*specific fields of the relationship between man and reality* (Ibid: 114.) This certainly does not make it a search for a disseminated concept with the aim of unification, and instead is an attempt to understand a region.<sup>8</sup> This means the weakening if not the elimination of the ontological-metaphysical postulates and simple deduction as a part of the understanding of a local event from the perspective of the general sense. It is clear, based solely on the experience just behind us, that an ontological postulate can create greater problems than those it is trying to solve.<sup>9</sup> Philosophy as metaphysics and ontology are not suited to the individual in particular and communities as unique and exemplary. They always “yolk” them into serving something outside them. Just like the preceding mythology, religion is dangerous for man. Thus: In the knowledge of what is regional, “non-philosophical”, its atmosphere lies the possibility of “...the justification of one’s own existence”. Thus, the sense of the mind’s contemplation as philosophy.

\*

What is it that we are facing and what is to be done? Generally speaking, everything that is human is defined by knowledge, the human living physical nature and the location a person finds himself in. It is a case of facticity. It is a fact that we are physical, alive, that we are located in a certain place on the earth and that we are determined by knowledge. We would like to say that we live “bathed” in knowledge or “enshrouded by knowledge”, but always in a living body in a certain place on the earth. Knowledge is extended by determining... “the relations between man and reality”. The determination is for the

---

<sup>7</sup> We can notice that philosophy (and not just philosophy) primarily, almost solely, is present in institutions today. Within them it is studied as a discipline. Those who study it very rarely have as their subject of interest local problems, and instead focus on the universal-philosophical, purely speculative, at the level of the conceptual, meta-empirical and with the key world philosophers as the guides. It is a science of the “entirety” of relationships, but of the “entirety” forever. Once it is localized, included in the solution to the problem of the community, then it is with the aim of some ideology and within the plan of some introduced philosophy, that is, some “power”. This was evident in our example in the case of socialism. Today in the spirit of Europeanization, American globalism (as a logical-analytical philosophy), nationalism, some religious organizations, these events for example, in our case at the moment, are taking place between Orthodox Christianity and logical-analytical philosophy and with pronounced layering from institution to institution, with additions of nationalism.

<sup>8</sup> In, *Gadamer’s ontological understanding, the subjective horizons “merge” in the sense of things that need to be understood*. “Understanding”, primarily, does not mean “transferring oneself into the other”, but “understanding a thing”. Simon, 2009: 96.

<sup>9</sup> It is clear that problems created by an ontological assumption can be greater than the problems which that assumption solves. Stegmeier, 2006: 278.

purpose of the “self-organization” of life in which knowledge has, as a form of determination, if not as the only way in the case of man, a decisive role. The self-organization of man is compatible with the self-determination of knowledge.<sup>10</sup>

The self-organization of knowledge is manifested only in the characteristic units of knowledge. Three of them are, so far, clear gnoseological forming-shaping models (constructions and reconstructions) of people, their communities and locations: mythic, economical and virtual. Why are these the governing models? Because they spread without limit and determine the general behavior of people, ... “the relationships between man and reality”, organization in the form of communities, their locations, identities and so on. This has never been then case with philosophy, science, art. There are no states, or even ethnic-localities where philosophy rules, or science or art (the forms of gnoseological symbolic systems) are the general forms of (self)organization. They, these symbolic systems of knowledge are important but not decisive; they can determine the atmosphere. However, this atmosphere basically has mythical, economical, or virtual features. The gnoseological symbolical systems, such as philosophy, science, art, can be located within the ruling models and can be determined by them. The ruling ones are those that are the constant “flavor”.

In the first model, as a principle of knowledge – “the central weight of meaning” (what is generally valid as |a strong oncoming presence”) is dominated by gods/deities (representational-symbolically) and they determine the system of knowledge and values, that is, the standards according to which everything is determined, “turn” man and his world.. In the second one it is subject-money (concept-capital) – “the spectacle of capital”. The third is only “building steam” and it is difficult to precisely determine the ultimate principle, system of knowledge and values or “what is generally valid”. “Premature articulation” would be, were the demise of the old and the hint of some new logic evident (the end of history in the sense that it exists but is still not here),<sup>11</sup> emerging in the process of the replacement of man by tele-technological knowledge and some sort of merger of the knowledge vector in the form of the mythical and modern (“postmodern religious fun-

---

<sup>10</sup> *The key term is self-organization. In pre-biotic evolution, self-gathering molecular systems become able to perform self-replication, metabolic functions, then mutations in the given group of planetary constellations.* Mainzer, 2006: 411. None of this, including self-replication, metabolic functions, mutation and so on would be possible without knowledge and information. Namely, the development of the living world is the development in the sense of a more complex (self)organization but also a more complex cognitive (self)determination. As the author states: *Brains are neurological systems which allow the quick adaptation to changing situations during the lifespan of a body. To put it simply: they can learn. The human brain is a complex system of neurons which self-organize in macroscopic patterns with the help of neurochemical interactions. Perceptions, emotions, thoughts and the world suit these neurological patterns. Self-organization of knowledge enlightens itself with the obligatory problem of visual perception. How is it possible for our visual system to recognize gestalt, (the form), instead of just a group of colored pixels? In the self-organized process of learning, the brain responds to various stimulæ with various groups of synchronized firing neurons.* Ibid: 411. The self-organization of neurons is already a consequence of self-determining knowledge. The situation is similar to the self-organization of individuals into communities.

<sup>11</sup> *The question of history in progress no longer exists, the main scheme or the regulation of crisis. There is no more rational continuity or dialectical conflict, only the marriage of opposites. Once global power has destroyed the universal, and the whirlwind of change expunged historical logic, there is only the image of virtual power and those who are angrily opposed to it.* Baudrillard, 2006: 121.

damentalism”), for “their new life” (symbolic-physical thought). The rule of the “pan-optic”, mass, physical, spatial with virtual additions – from the wheel to the computer.<sup>12</sup>

The models and systems of knowledge expand in the earthly space through the objectivization where it is, even in today’s dominance of the tele-technological system, primarily determined by the mythical model, then the economic and virtual one: we can speak of mythic, economical, and virtual geography and thus of a ruling atmosphere. This again determines the “orientation” of people.<sup>13</sup> These models are globally-earthly valid, but in a concrete sense we are talking of moduses of knowledge which shape certain peoples, communities and places on Earth. They are a mixture of the elements of the model, with the domination of the first, second, third and some sort of “mixes” and “surrogates”. There are no two identical moduses, just like there are no two identical communities or even places and finally individuals. In accordance with them we have certain – local atmospheres.

The basic task of philosophy is – the theoretical revelation of these forms of knowledge: models, moduses from the local to the individual. We are determined by them – I am how much and what I know. The revelation is the understanding of a certain atmosphere. It is not speculative, purely theoretical and relational-conceptual, and instead it ranges from the level of the understanding of symbolic and conceptual representations (and standards which are also included in them) such as what is (how) gnoseologically created and as such occurs and shapes people, “colors” communities and their locations. What we are talking about is a knowledge-standardizing or knowledge-value system, since the “standardizing systems” are primarily “gnoseological-symbolic-conceptual systems”.

\*

What is the road taken by questioning? The current concrete – local moduses of knowledge can be determined since we live in their atmosphere. Old and more recent ones (which certainly have a connection with the old ones as a tradition), which are related to us at a certain location such as tradition, culture and so on, cannot be understood directly, but only indirectly through the manifestation of forms of knowledge (artifacts, remains, means, written forms of objectivization of knowledge, oral ones) and the reconstruction of events within the framework of knowledge of symbolic-conceptual systems: mythical, artistic, philosophical, scientific.<sup>14</sup> This is a wide and very diversified field of gnoseologi-

---

<sup>12</sup> We will not deal with the mythological, economical, and virtual models of knowledge. Considering the fact that we are “drowning” in mythical and economic knowledge in the form of some working hypotheses, what we consider to be virtual is everything that “does” something “for man” or what is “artificial”. *The example of the wheel, given by Pierre Levi, allows us to understand how the same thing can at the same time be virtual, real and material: “A hammer can create the illusion that it is an extension of the arm, but the wheel is obviously not the extension of the leg, but actually the virtualization of movement.” The wheel as a concrete and material item performs, in another way, the very function of walking...And art is nothing more than the virtualization of what has been experienced.* Bernard Deloche, 2006: 129.

<sup>13</sup> Kasirera speaks of Kant’s musings on orientation in space, and thus of “mythical geography” - Kasirer, 1985: 100-101.

<sup>14</sup> We can speak of types of reconstruction: religious, scientific (within the confines of various historiographies, ethnographies, archaeologies, sociologies, linguistics, literary history, art history, geography, anthropology and philosophy), epic-literary-artistic and the shaping of public opinion.

cal attempts at reconstruction and the manifestation of “our” people or ancestors from the past as well, both in the sense of methods, and in the sense of sources, aims and so on. If we are interested in the former, concrete gnoseological mythic-representations, as they are present all over the planet and decisive for people (individuals and communities) and thus for our locations, we then focus only on them, their characteristics, locations, the circumstances of their formation. We would behave similarly even when thinking about economic or virtual representations.

From gnoseological forms, texts, sciences which deal with the reconstructions of (our) past we will extract segments, appropriate “samples” which back up our hypotheses, since their explanations would lead to chronicles and the philosophies of these disciplines. Thus it is the “task of philosophy”, but not, as we have said, speculative, purely theoretical, critical, but “regional”, “locally philosophical”, like some “epistemology of local knowledge”, “the living local atmospheres” (regional bio-gnoseology) is actually a process of “understanding things” (Gadamer) or some sort of hermeneutics. The understanding (“understanding of a thing”) of what reaches the limits of pragmatism in the sense of the questioning indication of what is irrational, wrong, destructive and to the projection of what it should be. The philosophic attempt is not neutral, and instead, as is the case with all philosophies and philosophers, is decisive (evaluative) and normative. This is a necessity which still originates only from the very features of knowledge, and it is to organize, redecorate, indicate however often it did so, and not merely to be true or false as was required of knowledge till just recently.<sup>15</sup> In today’s jargon, not to reconstruct but to deconstruct and self-produce. And according to some also (post) modern understandings of what a nation (community) is: “Deconstruction of the history of a nation means the emphasis of the contradictions on which it rests.” But as such, since it is a question of one’s own existence, then it is “subjective discourse and the object of psychological identification” at the same time.<sup>16</sup>

The “contribution” of the science has already been mentioned, and thus paradoxically our attempt (“to indicate what is irrational, wrong, devastating, to the projection of what should be”) is the merger of some sort of post modern relativism (on the other side of truth, lies and values in general) and scientific rationalism (but not the third paradigm of religious fundamentalism), based on the detailed reference to time/place which is determined as mythological (scientistic rationalism prefers the truth of knowledge itself), that is, the era which Ernest Gellner referred to as pre-doctrinated and doctrinated. What we want from our own cultural milieu (the postmodern position) is to illuminate and neutrally discover (the scientific attitude) its characteristics. This sort of approach is necessary, since, if we were to rely on scientific rationalism, then the question of the values and standards would be not deduced.

---

<sup>15</sup> Even the philosopher we find so “close” to us, Jacques Derrida, close to us living in the Balkans (since this text and the philosophical considerations behind it originate from this location), due to constant deconstruction, and never completed construction, answers the following question: *...is there any normativity in what Derrida is writing?*, decisively: *There is, of course, that is all there is. But if you implicitly ask me whether what I say is normative in the usual sense of the word, it will be more difficult for me to respond.* Derrida, 1993: 128. It is not “usual” since it is constantly establishing or eliminating or establishing elimination of knowledge which is constantly shifting.

<sup>16</sup> *In the current intellectual climate we could say that the world is not the overall group of things, but of meanings. Meaning is everything and everything is meaning, and the main spokesperson in hermeneutics.* Gellner, 2000: 33.

We would like to remain in touch with the values/non-values which are included in the decisive systems of knowledge, which are primarily religious-mythic representations, without at the same time falling within its limits. Because we are at stake, it is not difficult to fall under one's own limits and thus lose self-criticism. If we were to view things from a theoretical gnoseological or philosophical perspective (meta-empirically), we would take a value attitude to our own local, thus concrete, mythical representations as something which is also non-empirical. That is how we also satisfy Kant's attitude that "philosophy is knowledge of what is special in the general". Concrete mythical-representations belong to the field of culture or the field of manifested knowledge such as the dominant points of an elite ethnic-locality. The field of culture is not only made up of values but also of nonvalues as a mixture of "humanity and barbarism", "good and bad taste", "truth and delusion" (Gustav Radbruch). In that field of mythic-representation, as a form of knowledge, it surpasses or unifies reality, values and non-values.<sup>17</sup>

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century the metaphysics of subjectivity (the spirit) was deconstructed in every respect, up to the level of the subjectivity which was since the time of Vico and Hegel referred to as the "spirit of the people".<sup>18</sup> With this deconstruction, everything related to truth and the remaining values has been disintegrated or defragmented (the correct, good, beautiful and so on). What remains is the question of those who have not been able to build their identities on the metaphysics of the subject (the concept), but on identifications which are pre-subjective, that is, representational-mythological-symbolical-physical. Myth-representation, given through symbols to the myth-story, is the precondition for the one who accepts these symbols and the story, just like metaphysical awareness is shaped and objectified through concepts (ideas, the spirit). What we consider the basic "problems" today, are the common lives of various people... (postmodern life).

Starting from the mythical model and local moduses of the mythic-religious type, since they are the basic ones, the knowledge-philosophical road follows the movement along the line of "symbols" – "concepts" – "representations" – "general importance" or the "relevance sphere". Without any intention of entering the labyrinth of the problem of determining the general meaning of these concepts in the historical-problem plain, we willingly subsume them under "categories of knowledge". We do not take for granted that the mythical model is symbolic-representational. If what is in the focus is the economic model of knowledge or local knowledge, then it is conceptually-representational, and if it is the virtual one, it is informational-conceptual.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> *In addition to the attitude which is blind to values (the attitude of the natural sciences, SD), the attitude which values (three branches of philosophy: logics, ethics, esthetics, SD) and the attitude which is linked to values (the attitude of cultural sciences, SD), what also emerges is the spiritual attitude which overpowers values, the religious attitude. Religion is the ultimate confirmation of everything in existence, a mild positivism, which is used to justify and accept things, love, irrespective of the values of non values of the loved one, bliss on the other side of guilt and innocence, calm which transcends the mind and its problems, "a joyful metaphysical carelessness" (Šeler)... "God saw everything that he had made, and indeed, it was very good" Radbruch, 1980: 13.*

<sup>18</sup> *The belief that ethnos is an ontological category, determined through the metaphysical circular constitution of the "spirit of the people" with its own emotions, however effective it was in the creation of the states and other ethnic conflicts in Europe, during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, it was deconstructed and the whole corpus of "scientific" considerations based on this belief was deemed unscientific. Kovačević, 2006: 71.*

<sup>19</sup> *In comparison to knowledge, "concepts" and "representations" are its forms, along with sensory data, and ideas. "Symbols" belong to the categories of knowledge without which knowledge is not possible (we would*



Moving along this path, what is it that we reach in the end? Seeing how for the most part of this philosophical “essay”, as we have previously mentioned, we take into consideration the data from various fields of science, religious-mythological systems of knowledge, philosophical determination, artistic and so on. This breadth and the variety requires expertise, both specialist and general theoretical – philosophically focused on these areas, it is still necessary to explain the synthesis or the unification of all of that. Which, actually, indicates a suspicious endeavor. We have already said that knowledge organizes, but that it is relative. We would like to quote Bernard Deloche, from his study *The virtual museum*, which offers the following way out: *...you probably will not find any truly new pieces of information or sensational discovery...But, is it not up to the philosopher, who would not have to be a serious professional or have technological knowledge of all the issues it touches upon, to divert attention to the still unnoticed consequences of bonding? To merge texts, confront, trap his interlocutors with their own words and finally construct the image of all these different borrowed materials.*<sup>20</sup> We will also mention the structuralist term “bricolage”, in addition of the already adopted “deconstruction” or “re-sedimentation”, or the term that is closer to us, “making a collage”. This sort of research is found in writing in the form of a collage – a philosophical image composed of many texts. The collage has been done on a computer with virtual extensions or possibilities of inserting and erasing ... is one virtual collage...*by means of which the technique of writing is brought closer to the technique of painting.*<sup>21</sup> We will find ourselves in the position to form a textual image per se or, due to the movement of the textual image, to actually shape a film. . This film as a philosophical document, remains in some sort of “museum”, a philosophical movie theater, so that someone could “view” it.

The topic of the image is the atmosphere. Since it moves, then it is the atmosphere of the film and the film of the atmosphere. The atmosphere is a result of the self-organization of human communities through mythical, economical or virtual models of knowledge. We focus on the “atmosphere” which is necessarily the environment-state of each human community, group, individual. Namely, we are talking about the specific atmospheres in the home, family, state, at work, the street, all the way to the modern global atmosphere and so on,<sup>22</sup> which are determined by the models of self-organization. It is certain that the atmosphere, which has a decisive influence, is the one in which we find the ethno-locality or people. It represents a gnoseological self-construction or the product of certain knowledge.

Basically, the first knowledge of the ethnic-locality, which it uses to manifest itself as such are mythic-religious representations. They start from the “manifestations” of the physical, spatial, earthly, to the celestial, such as the light-physical or they move towards something nonphysical-spiritual. Almost in the form of a sphere, and thus not only verti-

---

like to add vice versa). Their number and types are not specified, but it can be considered that they are the subject, object of knowledge, logical forms and so on. In addition to that, we are specifying the sources of knowledge, just like experience (sensory), of the mind and brain (intellectual), where sensory experience belongs to the sphere of external influence, and intellectual to the sphere of thought.

<sup>20</sup> Deloš, 2006: 9.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid: 10.

<sup>22</sup> It is already redundant to speak of anything global, because the global today is localized thanks to the fact that “differences in space and time have decreased incredibly”. Earthly space today is the local space of very lively communication. The most distant community, ethno-locality no longer exists.

cal or just horizontal.<sup>23</sup> What is vertical is the knowledge position which is determined in relation to man, where he is conscious of or is already familiar with the verticality of his body, the relationship between the soles of his feet-the ground and the head that thinks. The knowledge projection and thus the atmosphere is on the vertical axis and reaches unfathomable transcendent "heights". Thus mythology and religion, metaphysics are moving in a direction which is increasingly overpowering the physical by the spiritual, space overpowered by time, the horizontal overpowered by the vertical. When we speak of the present, then it seems that it is the end of the modern era and actually the end of history, metaphysics and so on, the end of the spiritual and the strengthening or rebellion of the physical and spatial and horizontal, which is a consequence of the domination not only of the mythical, but primarily the economic, and virtual model of the self-organizing knowledge.

But, the atmosphere which is the subject matter of interest is not the atmosphere in general, but the one the author finds himself in. It is a form of a variation and observation "from" the situation or the local modus of knowledge. As we have already said: "Philosophy occurs from the local-earthly opinion as the theoretical knowledge of it". It is the "optics" of the mind or a theoretical insight, which moves, as "optics" through certain concepts, wanting to determine their differentiation or concrete specificity. Philosophy is a form of bio-gnoseology. While we gain knowledge through philosophy, we live physically in a certain location on earth.

#### REFERENCES

1. Burger, Hotimir, 2006, *Pogovor*, Jürgen Habermas, *Budućnost ljudske prirode i Verovanje i znanje*, Breza, Zagreb.
2. Baudrillard, Jean, 2006, *Inteligencija zla ili pakt lucidnosti*, Ljevak, Zagreb.
3. Deloche, Bernard, 2006, *Virtuelni muzej*, Clio, Beograd.
4. Derrida, Jacques, 1993, *Razgovori*, Književna zajednica, Novi Sad.
5. Foucault, Michel, 1994, *Znanje i moć*, Globus, Zagreb.
6. Gellner, Ernest, 2000, *Postmodernizam, razum i religija*, Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb – Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, Zagreb.
7. Kasirer, Ernst, 1985, *Filozofija simboličkih oblika, drugi deo, Mitsko mišljenje*, Dnevnik –Književna zajednica, Novi Sad.
8. Kovačević, Ivan, 2006, *Tradicija modernog*, "Srpski genealoški centar", Beograd i Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
9. Hume, David, 1956, *Istraživanja o ljudskom razumu*, Kultura, Zagreb, 1956.
10. Heidegger, Martin, 1985, *Bitak i vrijeme*, Naprijed, Zagreb.
11. Mainzer, Klaus, 2006, *Utelovljeni um, Filozofska istraživanja*, 102, God. 26, Sv. 2, Filozofsko društvo Hrvatske, Zagreb.
12. Ostler, Nikolas, 2008, *Carstva reči*, Geopoetika, Beograd.

<sup>23</sup> Mythological orientation is primarily in the shape of a sphere. Knowledge will only later, in the developed myths-stories produce representations of verticality. Orientation, using knowledge as one's standpoint, is something that even Kant dealt with, as stated by Werner Steigmeier, in his pre-critical discussion *On the first reason of the differences in spatial locations*, in *The critiques*, and the discussion *What does it mean to be oriented in one's opinion?* See, Werner Steigmeier, *Orientation in actions in shifting horizons*, from pg. 282 and on. According to Kant: *Orientation is the position of the subject tied to the world (the position of the body on the ground)*. Ibid, pg. 285. "The position" here, as previously explained by Kant, means the vertical positioning of the body, that is, the opposite location in comparison to the "horizontal surface" of the ground, on which one is standing (Ibid). Ibid, footnote 13, pg. 284-5.

13. Prole, Dragan, 2005, Pogovor, Izazov stranog u responzivnoj fenomenologiji, Bernhard Valdenfels, Topografija stranog, Stylos, Novi Sad.
14. Popper, Karl, 1989, *U potrazi za boljim svetom*, <http://www.baneprevoz.com>.
15. Simon, Jozef, 2009, Ja i njegov horizont. Metafora horizonta kod Kanta. Zbornik, Horizonti pojma horizont, Akademska knjiga, Novi Sad.
16. Radbruch, Gustav, 1980, *Filozofija prava*, Nolit, Beograd.
17. Selars, Roj Vud, 2004, *Kategorije saznanja*, iz, Aleksandar Kron i Staniša Novaković, *Realizam, naturalizam i empirizam*, hrestomatija tekstova, Institut za filozofiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
18. Štegmajer, Verner, 2009, Orijentisanje u delanju u promenljivim horizontima, Iz, Zbornik, Horizonti pojma horizont, Zbornik, Horizonti pojma horizont, Akademska knjiga, Novi Sad.

## MOGUĆE POZICIONIRANJE PUTA FILOZOFIJE

**Srboljub S. Dimitrijević**

*Ako je eliminisana "centralna težina smisla" i čak njegova disperzivna lokalizacija ipak se propitivanje ne može ukinuti. Ono se, kao filozofsko propitivanje, samo lokalizuje. Ovakva pozicija je bila oduvek takva, da bi se samo idealizovala do nekih hipostazirajućih visina. Put filozofije je povratak na početno mesno stanje ili konkretni život. On je uređen saznanjem i time obavijen neko atmosferom. Filozofija propituje tu atmosferu ili saznanje koje je produkuje. Reč je o lokalnim modusima saznanja, te i o tome kako su nastali, kakav je njihov oblik, njihova opredmećenja do onog najvažnijeg pitanja o načinu oblikovanja ljudi i njihovih mesta.*

Ključne reči: *lokalno saznanje, relativnost znanja, atmosfera, regionalna filozofija, modeli saznanja.*