

UDK 13 + 159.9

TO THE PHENOMENON OF SEEKING

Anna Hogenová (Prague, Czech Republic)

Abstract. Phenomenology of seeking, the problem of time from a phenomenological point of view, the meaning of time for the present and future

Key words: Seeking, phenomenology, temporality, will to power.

О ФЕНОМЕНЕ ПОИСКА

Анна Хогенова (Прага, Чешская Республика)

Аннотация. В статье обсуждается феноменология поиска, проблема времени с феноменологической точки зрения, смысл времени для настоящего и будущего.

Ключевые слова: Поиск, феноменология, темпоральность, воля к власти.

Motto: “*This dignity is the pain of inner faith of the path to the beginning*”. In Heidegger, M. *Das Ereignis*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 2009, p. 278.

Pain belongs quite naturally to our world, evidently we cannot completely remove it ourselves. If it were absent we would not be able to experience the dignity of the beginning, the venerability of home and scenery, the untold splendor of human decisions which are pure and sincere. Kant once said: nobleness touches the heart, beauty “excites”. He is right. Beauty typically only provokes man, it heightens the intensity of living, it shapes our relationship with beautiful things. But beauty does not provide modern man with what he needs the most. What is this? It is the need to return home. What is home in this sense? It is the beginning, it is our source, it is what rejuvenates our daily life with the marvel of living, meaning and content.

In other words, we perceive everything in the given moment as existing; it must reflect from a horizon which we carry within ourselves, without us even

Anna Hogenová – Charles University
Pedagogical faculty (Prague, Czech
Republic).

E-mail: Hogen@volny.cz

Хогенова Анна – доктор философских
наук, профессор кафедры философии
и гражданского воспитания
Карлова университета (Прага,
Чешская Республика).

knowing it and is the focus of that which is essential in our consciousness. We are predetermined without being aware of it and without being able to appreciate it. We realize this in a theoretical sentiment based on distance from the whole of the world around us. And this is a condition for seeking our home, for seeking ourselves, for care for the soul. Care for the soul is nothing other than seeking and seeking is questioning and finding answers.

The first word is the answer, Heidegger frequently asserts this and we tend to agree with him. We are prompted by something which is beyond us, something more powerful than our will or our understanding. The command which is a question comes from nowhere and the word which is the answer is only the consequence of that which first prompted us. We are not unambiguous subjects which can manage on our own. It seems that Cartesian subjectivism is not as basic as we all think these days. Our freedom is not only a manifestation of our thinking, our will, be it will to power or will to will which we can be seen all around us these days. Seeking transform into finding the correct type of seeking and man is then often confused, i.e. he needs to find. This is our most commonly seen position.

Seeking is a completely natural human action and we also see it in animals. Animals are constantly seeking something, sniffing around if they are dogs or fluttering around if they are birds. These days we often see individuals that show direct assertiveness. They are young, beautiful and extremely self-confident. This type of person does not seek. Why? Because they have already found that which is essential. Of course, this answer is rather lame. If we have found that which is essential then we would not need the peak that these people need. What is going on here?

To better understand a position it is better to approach it from the absence of the position. *“Everything positive is especially defined from absence”*. (Heidegger 1989: 439)

If we take seeking away from these people, then they become the persons who understand everything, who see into the future, are “in” and not ashamed of their certainty, show it and demonstrate it. Why? Why must man show his conviction? Certainty of this type replenishes life so it needs no recognition from the outside world and if it does need recognition it is not certainty, it is only a game of certainty. And this just goes to show that young people, young presidents of large companies, young newspaper editors etc. do not seek. Something is not right here. Seeking belongs to life, these people however have already ‘found’. Doubtlessness is a sign of “will to power”, which these days has the form of “will to will”. In contrast, everyone who doubts is an old structure and must be removed as soon as possible so they do not interfere. How are we supposed to understand it all? We soon notice that the whole planet is veiled by this certainty in the form of the Internet. What would passengers of the Titanic think of this?

Almost all of the great thinkers liken man's life to a journey, the Bible included. The journey is always a type of wandering; essentially wandering belongs to our life. In other words, we wander even if we are in control of where we are going. Wandering is a necessary addition to our life movement. Therefore, Jan Patočka often writes: it is necessary to care for one's soul. How do we care for our soul? Only by questioning. Questioning keeps us on the right path.

Without questions man is at the mercy of chance, which is understood these days as being an absence of the objective of our lives as a whole. Everyone tries so hard, they work to death, they are constantly in control, but where does it all lead to? What goal awaits us at the end of this life? Is there eschaton? To quote Václav Bělohradský we live in an age without eschatology. This means that our will is only the will to ourselves, to our subject, to the meaning of our work, but only within ourselves – it is an image of the will to will. If man does not ask and is sure then something has happened around us. He does not seek because he does not have to, he does not believe in care for the soul. Why? Because his truth is based on the systems and structures that have been seized upon by education.

An economist does not doubt, a lawyer does not doubt. Often you may hear a lawyer say that: "It is not about ethics but the interpretation of the law". Such a lawyer believes in the systematic rationality of the codes of the individual laws as would a caveman. A caveman does not seek, he knows. How does he know? He does not know but this does not obstruct him in the constitution of his ontic certainty. He lives by realizing his will. He does not seek the origin of this will; he lives in the acceptance of a modern myth. Only we should remember that a myth exists where man already knows before he even asks and where "guilt wanders". We know this from the work of Jan Patočka. Have we found a new myth? It is not possible. A myth is always a pause in a seeker's aspirations. Mythical people do not seek, they do not have to, they have already found. Only they cannot say what they have found.

The path to understanding positives leads through absence, i.e. through one of the four forms of Aristotle's contradictions. If we want to understand seeking it is only possible through not seeking. Strange, very strange. Why does man not seek? He does not have to; he is not compelled to seek. This lack of compulsion shows us that the given individual has been awakened to the fact that something is missing. Our man is not missing anything. He is content. How do we know that we are missing something? Only if something is missing in the context of the phenomena of things around us, something is absent, something is there but in the mode of absence. That which is not here is the absence towards presence. Presence is not only "now" but it is something extensive because it contains the context of the phenomena of individual things. We see that time is not linear as physics has taught us for centuries. Living time is temporality; it is not formed by linearly determined points which we call 'nowness'. Human existence exists in a different time to stones or waterfalls.

We spread our lives over time differently, hence we speak of temporality. When we enter a room we immediately know which room we are in e.g. the kitchen. We have something within us which prepares us to know what is going on. This is the mystery of the temporality of man which in phenomenology is called Dasein.

Why does man not seek? He does not have to seek, he does not need to seek, his Dasein is immersed in that which he finds to be complete and finished. He is a mythical man who knows before he asks. Such a man does not have the sense to think he needs to seek something, he is trapped in a horizon which does not rouse questioning, he is fine where he is. Maybe we should say that such a man lives in a trance, but Patočka has already said this about mythical man. Can the entertainment industry help man “seize” his seeker’s aspirations? Does this entertainment deprive man of the possibility of his own self-cognition because self-cognition is based on self-seeking?

Not seeking and self-assurance are characteristics of modern day man. How is this possible? We are faced with something indescribable, Heidegger calls it “die Gegnet”, which cannot be translated with a single word. It is not the objectiveness of the world which stands before the subject because the subject and object would disappear; it is not an area of causal relations i.e. determined scientifically, because causality is only a fabrication of history. In contrast, we find ourselves somewhere where our will to assert ourselves on others is silenced and vice versa our Dasein in such an instant resembles waiting for something from the outside. In such a lingering we are not led by external needs and we are beyond the destructive reach of economic laws.

Then we find ourselves free from that which creates us, i.e. the spring from which our lives originate. How do we unearth this spring from which our real life flows in as a journey? We can only reach our essential source through seeking, questioning, wandering and doubting. Life cannot be a plan based on a rational scheme and a conquest of contemporary science. Planning is nothing other than scheduling by calculation. But our journey is affected by chance, not the chance which is called Zufall in German but the chance which falls into our life movement, which causes a change in direction, which carries with it considerable questioning, which conveys seeking. Chance of this type carries with it questions which we are often helpless to answer. Even helplessness is a standpoint which belongs to an honorable life like a shadow does to a tree. To exclude helplessness means only one thing: to assert one’s will on something which is neglected. Die Gegnet is not a subject; it is not a concept which can be understood or defined. Here end the possibilities of Cartesian perception. It is important to open oneself up to something which creates openness but does not cause it over time.

It is necessary to stumble upon aletheia – truth. But this assumes that we can find a horizon that shows us existence and we are willing to know this

horizon. This is the chance we spoke of earlier. It is necessary to open up, to cut loose in order to encounter chance which is nothing other than contact with a horizon which shows us that which we know. It is a horizon which is a specific type of openness that has been closed to us because we were too preoccupied with existence in this openness. Then follows a phase of questioning because we find ourselves through seeking, which is 'good' seeking.

It seems that where a certainty of knowing everything reigns, questioning fades away and a phase of primitiveness follows. We are afraid of this.

Natural science describes a very exact perception of existence. It has instruments that improve man's perception, e.g. microscopes see far closer than man. But a scientist does not appreciate that the intention of his focus on our common world is part of that which opens the world in this historicalness, i.e. where we find common existence accepted as the essence of being. This essence remains concealed, it is not sought after. Therefore we describe things as a set of functions, we do not see the thing itself which becomes in all things together. We are functionalists who base our seeking on two basic assumptions: causality and the objective being of existence. To enter a new horizon of seeking we need to experience a disturbance in the certainty in which we live. And this is the basis of questioning in science, it is essential to open new space for questioning. There are various techniques for doing this but techniques are only techniques, i.e. an instrument which cannot dispel the acceptance of the horizon in which a scientist lives.

We realize with concern that not even war or human tragedy can help these convulsive functions in the possibility of new horizons of thinking and evaluation, as they would mean a change in basic human attitudes. The last two wars are strong proof of this. Hence it is important that care for the soul, which means asking seeker's questions, becomes the basis of upbringing and education. To awaken oneself and others to seeking has become the principal task of educators, teachers and parents.

Whilst seeking it is important to differentiate between questions of principle and questions which lead us in a certain direction. Heidegger calls this the differences between *Grundfrage* and *Leitfrage*. (Heidegger 2009: 4) Questions which lead us along a certain path are not seeker's questions in the original sense of the word. They are questions which were regularized by scientists as being scientific, and hence dissertations are written without problem. Everyone on the committee accept that it is problem free work. But seeking is only present where there is *Grundfrage* (the big questions). What are these questions? They lead us to the source of the problem, i.e. not only a description of the most common problems in science. If history could only describe with photographic accuracy then it would behave like technology.

To understand takes priority over to know or to be informed, i.e. to be introduced to phenomenal and thus imagined forms. For example, a historian who is an expert in the history of Czech Television and can remember each and

every presenter from the 1950s to-date is be no means a thinker but in essence he is a pool of superficial information which anyone can find in the archives, he is in essence a technician. But this is now true in many scientific disciplines. Grundfrage has been replaced what we call Leitfrage. These technicians do not understand what openness is and that only man can appreciate openness in which existence displays existence. A dog or a fly cannot achieve this, only man can appreciate the background on which the world is depicted as a whole.

Only man has the key to the whole and the ability to see and understand the whole is the essence of a seeker's art, and that is the basis of scientific work, the basis of such a philosophy. Correctness – $\rho\theta\sigma\tau\epsilon\zeta$ is nothing other than "re-presentare", which is rearrangement. But the path to this is not sign-posted. It is necessary to reach the original logos, original recollection; but this original recollection cannot be given as a sum of the parts labeled and defined but must be given as an original single whole. Thus, an expert in the history of television cannot be an expert; he has no basis which is history as a principle. This historian's knowledge is on a preordained path, i.e. he knows only questions which do not establish a principle. Therefore, the following is valid: *Rückgang in den Anfang ist das Vorspringen des Kommenden Kommens.* (Heidegger 2009: 6) (A return the beginning is a forerunner to an imminent arrival).

The beginning is also what Nietzsche was thinking of when he spoke of *der ewige Wiederkunft des Gleichen*, the eternal recurrence of the same. The same can also be found in the different, to see the same in the different is an example of Grundfrage as opposed to Leitfrage. The latter is only found in analysis that does not find the original logos of things in simplicity. Care for the soul should seek only what is simple in original recollection. Therefore epimeleia is the methodological basis of seeking, which comes after the basis and not only after a description of "flat ideas".

The most important thing for seeking is something that no one thinks of at first, it is Heidegger's creation. It is a lingering in self-surrender (Gelassenheit), it is a lingering "between" (Inzwischen). Where is it? It is in conflict and in the space created after parting from the en-counter (Entgegnung). Heidegger often speaks of the conflict between the world and the Earth and the separation from the en-counter between the gods and human beings. It is the quaternion that appears between the world, earth, the gods and human beings. To be in the center of this imaginary cross means to be with oneself, to be home, to be happy. It is a recollection, a coming into view, which we call Er-eignis. Hence man must perceive distance and closeness differently. It is necessary to understand the phenomenon of approach, it is an important condition of a seeker's aspirations as it forms the distance from things which allows them to be shown without the concepts we carry inside us even if we do not know about it.

Therefore when we speak of care for the soul we speak of seeking the correct distance from our own soul. As we all know it is always dark under the lamp

and the whole problem of self-seeking and *Er-eignis* is finding the distance from one's self. Why is a front-line experience so important to Patočka, Weischedela and others? Because by lingering in *Dasein*, man loses because he loses the fear of his own death, the fundamental motive of his existence, which he prevents being merged with the third referee, which we wrongly call: the absolute. The moment we are not afraid of death we obtain the path to something which cannot be expressed as a concept, therefore Patočka speaks of negative Platonism, life in truth. This is the moment when all of the dunes on the Moon are gone, life obtains value again. But why? Because only man is able to rise above himself and linger there. This is what care for the soul is all about; it is where we have to take our students and pupils. But it is not that simple, we have to also take them somewhere unspeakable. Hence, it is important to have distance from ourselves based on an approach to oneself. It is this approach to oneself which is a principle of care for the soul.

Questions create tension and within this tension we approach what is important, without us even knowing it. It is organization, arrangement (*dispositio*). Therefore everything which can organize and arrange in this way belongs to care for the soul, it is art, it is fantasy, it is poetry. Not merely rational calculators or tuition of market processes from a fiscal point of view. Hence, pragmatic practicality, which modern European governments strive to achieve the most, should not be paramount in the education of man. It destroys the fruits of the whole of European history, it destroys humanity. Europe was built on the profits of Greek speculation, Christian inwardness and enlightenment and the result of this interaction is called as it was in ancient Greece i.e. care for the soul or *epimeleia*.

Das Leuchten – der Strahl des Sichverbergenden. (Heidegger 2009: 32) Again due to difficulty in translating we have left the idea in its original language. It is the difference between *lichten* and *leuchten*. This first is to lighten, and the second is to shine. To lighten is something slightly different than to shine. To shine is to illuminate some part of the earth; it is also the part which is taken from the darkness of everything else. The rest is concealed. Both the world and ourselves belong to everything else by way of the source of light. The more we shine on a subject, the less we return to ourselves. We remain concealed. This is also the reason for ergotherapy. But our problems cannot be solved in this way; they are only concealed, subdued. What is a completely performing society? It can be understood as the source of this light which allows us to forget ourselves. But this hinders recollection and ownership. Where is the possibility to be alone? Only at home, but at home there are media like the Internet and television, and these can have a far more effective influence in the above-mentioned sense.

Was not the shepherd better off when he was entirely reliant on himself? He had his work, this was the pasture, but this did not take everything away from him, shepherds knew the stars very well, they slept with their animals under the night sky. To lighten the darkness, however, means the realization that we must

shine ourselves. Why does to lighten not mean to shine? Because a dark sky shows us the stars which we cannot see during the day. What does it prevent? Light conceals, it not only illuminates but it also hides. Even darkness can lighten (lichten). We can say that darkness can shine under certain conditions. Therefore, absence is so important – the category of our cognition that Plato brought us. Being is not revealed in existence; even if we illuminate it with the strongest source of light possible.

Being is only revealed in those who are able to lighten existence by the strength of their pervading cogitation; however it is necessary to rouse man's interest, to awaken man to himself, that which is sought by all others but not himself. Because leuchten – to shine is led by the will to power, it is our view on the world thus managed. How does this happen? It is simple, our life possibilities are passed on to us and we use them as if they were our own discovery. This is a modern problem and therefore we permit ourselves to write about the problem of seeking. It is also about us seeking ourselves. Chance is the illumination of our deeds and motives. Hence, Jan Hus states: *And he who acts against his conscience makes a path to damnation.* (Hus 1975: 238) On the one hand a judge has a conscience which lightens (Lichten), on the other hand he has so-called rational reasoning but this belongs to leuchten, to mere enlightenment, which is governed by man's own will.

Lévinas speaks of legitimacy, legality and diarchy. Awakening is a part of correct seeking and has the form of lichten not leuchten. Of course methodological seminars, which are sometimes the greatest of terror, are not lichten but leuchten. Scientific questions must be a result of lichten – to lighten the whole issue. This is half of all scientific work. Scientific work carried out as nothing more than a company job has nothing at all in common with real science. Therefore, there are so many scientists these days that resemble technicians or craftsmen, who from a philosophical point of view are one and the same. Seeking does not teach in methodological seminars that should prepare an undergraduate for honest scientific work. To shine means to pour light onto something, the rest is concealed, it remains in darkness; however, to lighten means something completely different, it means to understand the essence of things.

All $\sigma\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ (signs) are an example of leuchten, because something shines and the rest plunges into darkness. Signs have never been of great importance but over the last century due to their high functionality they are understood by people as being essential. The whole of computer philosophy is based on symbols, it is based on the logistics of old Viennese logical positivism, and this is the way it is to date. Few realize this, however, and so politicians are convinced of the essence of things only through signs. The major role of mathematics and experimentation is here to the fore. Economic mathematical models represent reality and practice shows us how often these models are only signs in the function of mere leuchten. Symbols govern our decisions about the future and

our lives in the present. Few realize that reality and signs are two different things. It is artisan thinking which can shine but not lighten. Hence, Heidegger characteristically points out that: *at the same time δοξα is not made by human beings, it is not distinguished by human beings – they take it as presence itself, which it is and it is not.* (Heidegger 2009: 35)

But because modern man wants everything to be certain he must oversimplify in order to obtain this unequivocal certainty. Without certainty there is *Raub* (robbery), violence, as we see all around us on nearly every corner. This violence is given as *το χρεών* (necessity). And so *αδικία* (injustice) appears among us, about which Heidegger states: *Αδικία means: self-nay-conjoin to unconcealment, and hence to create an appearance called δοξα“.* (Heidegger 2009: 39) To create an appearance of necessity – this is the basis of survival these days. Whoever has the strongest will wins. This is the same in business and in science and in matters of thinking. This appearance is accompanied by the need to be modern, i.e. to use modern instruments like computers etc. But often it is not only a necessity; on the contrary it is something which is non-essential proof of quality, something which is only an appearance. Therefore, we must learn to see in the plurality of simplicity, which has the character of solid clear crystal, spoken of in ancient philosophy.

Seeking must be calm, without tension, unease, without self-interest or “bossing”. We do not find other questions and suggestions lurking here which would make it uncertain and derail it. Of course today’s thinking is often understood as being *Griff* (a holding violently) and grasping. This has often been the case in history. Today the severity of thinking is explicitly taken as a concept. But it is not. The rigorousness of thinking remains conjoined to the essence of truth in a non-visual way, i.e. through speech. We are reminded that speech does not always involve words, talking is only connected with words. The gap (*die Fuge*) is a space which is important for the approximation of that which is essential, i.e. the truth. Where all approximation of truth is worn out by meeting the conditions of logical correctness, there is no truth, there is orthotes. But this is the case in most scientific work; hence we often bypass the truth. Seeking opens that which approaches without interest in the results of these activities. It is not about an achievement or a number of publications, it is about the thoughts which are contained within. Thinking is not a like hammering in nails which we do based on methodological guidelines.

If we seek something then we seek in some type of horizon. Most people do not realize the significance of this horizon. The horizon remains concealed. It works the same way as a whole without margins; we conceive it only if it rises or falls, and only through questioning. Therefore, questioning is a devotion to thought and questions are more important than answers. In questioning there is always a horizon in which the question has its place and sense. Parmenides’ statement reflects the truth: *Estin gar to einai* (thought and being are as one).

Heidegger would only reiterate the validity of this statement: *Truth is τὸ ἀυτό, arising from νοεῖν and εἶναι.* (Heidegger 2009: 59) Truth refers to an important light cast on the world around us. This horizon is important. It is necessary to realize that methodology carried out strictly and voluntatively, passes on the horizon of young thinkers as the only possibility of thinking and they are unwittingly manipulated. This happens in several fields of scientific work without the leading methodologists even realizing it. Thus a thinker's work is choked and suffocated. Usually the positivist horizon is passed on because it is controllable and demonstrative. Therefore, our history books never turn into telephone books.

Ancient thinkers often used idioms in order to express the truth. Why? Because idioms have no horizons, or in other words, idioms do have horizons but they are very wide. This is how it was for e.g. Heraclites, Parmenides, Anaximander etc. Original thinkers use idioms like something that is beginning, because that which has begun enters the world with horizons, it is not given beforehand. Hence philosophers' beginnings are almost always the most important. They give rise to horizons in which *εἶναι* and *νοεῖν* are the same. What do we as modern human beings do?

We often rush towards things that are modern, and so these beginnings are concealed, their horizons are shaded in so-called "modern questions". And so philosophy transforms into anthropology, exploiting the validity of existence, which arises from technical science. It becomes a generalization of technical science, i.e. anthropology remains on a horizon of Cartesianism, without us even realizing it. Sometimes, and more often than not, philosophy becomes politology. Socrates and Plato are only taught politically and from a modern point of view of power. Who gains power over others? This is a question which interests modern philosophers. These people are not philosophers but politologists, the horizon of their questioning is shifted to modernity, i.e. to the area of interest in "who from whom?" to the area of realization of "the will to power".

Seeking has become a technique because the essence of being is the will to will. It is not only the will to power but the will to oneself. Why has this happened?

Heidegger answers this in countless explanations: because existence has been torn away from being and humans have forgotten about being. If man is only created through existence, then this is an inevitable nihilism. Why? The answer is not simple. Existence is inexhaustible as are phenomena which reveal themselves in the world, but this is everything which existence can pass on to us. It is the same as if we will own all the treasure in the world. We will own it but then what? What can it give us, how can it complete us? It can be hubris. It can be the pride we feel for collecting these things, but then what? Nothing. Things around us are changeable, they belong to *panta rhei*. Even the richest of people willingly take their own life from time to time, how should we understand this? Existence is not enough to fulfill one's life, something else is needed.

And what is this? It is being. And if being and truth are one and the same, then it is only a recurrence of the legacy of old Parmenides: *estin gar to einai!* It is truth itself, but truth which does not dictate the will of an individual human being or a group, but truth which is being itself. But modern man lives only for existence and not for being. Actually it is important to state that modern man does not know about being, he has forgotten about it. Hence, seeking is based on prescribed methods which we herald as descriptions of mere objects, i.e. adjusted existence.

Here lies our own misery. Heidegger says: *Metaphysics in its entirety can be identified from three aspects: as the rule of the philosophy of life (a value image of the world), as engineering (planning calculations) and as history (the calculation of planning)*. (Heidegger 2009: 90)

If thinking becomes calculation and methods it means that most of our contemplation is order, rule, *die Ordnung*. Then of course whoever is responsible for organization shall be the most important link in the chain of those who should cater for the lives of others. And so we see individuals around us who are responsible of the implementation of rules and those who are responsible for whether this implementation is done correctly. They concern themselves with correctness and they mostly work to extremes, therefore unforeseen accidents appear in the world which cannot be eliminated. Correctness cannot be the basis of truth. Adoration of systematism is proof of the hollowness of existence and its relationships.

In essence, adoration of correctness is only adoration of managing procedures of individual steps. This happens everywhere we look. The goal of these procedures is the thing which is not managed. No one is interested in the goal, it is uncontrollable, it is missing, eschaton is missing. Hence the will to correctness is itself enough in the end, and the will to power transforms into the will to will. This is a paradox of our present day. A so-called *escape to comparativity* (Heidegger 2009: 91) is typical. Everything must constantly improve and the essence of improvement is felt as the certainty of existence. Everything must increase in quality; if this increase stops it is bad. There is a cessation. Thus, events were reformed as an ontological basis of human life and society. "*The will to will has become the reality of reality*". (Heidegger 2009: 93)

Reality only exists where there is overpowering (*Übermächtigung*), which we have already discussed in this book. This is of course our present with all of its indicators. How do we transform substantive seeking? It is seeking which is a stampede to that which is modern, that which is new and novel. Hence journalists attend various lectures and seek ideas, new words; they seek that which would be new. They are lead by a comparative of their own growth. Television programs are watched from the point of view of ratings and people in broadcasts revolve based around this. The parameters for business are the same as for the media. Something similar has been introduced in universities. Science must grow, we

must follow individual scientists based on citations in selected journals etc. What man is missing in this situation is tranquility, Epicurean gardens, a calm soul (Galéné tés psychés). Hence we increasingly plunge into the arms of the peak. The peak becomes a necessary part of life in a comparative, life in which the essence of being is found in the will to will.

“The will to will governs the machination of *absolute certainty in rule and understands that this must be established first and then the rest (culture and spirit, or the absence thereof) can be built around it*”. (Heidegger 2009: 93) Rule is a condition of everything else, this seems like something Aristotle might say, of course Aristotle realized that “*techne tychen estrexe kai tyche technen*”, Art loves chance; and chance, art but our present does not take this seriously. Everything must be governed even government itself, the only thing that is missing is the final meaning and objective. Eeschaton is missing.

The will to machination is Machenschaft and the rule of systems is Gestell – this is our present. Scientific work machines business interests that are missing a link in the production process; it helps to determine the mood of the population, to form a basis for the decisions of politicians.

Scientific work has become practical and pragmatic. Applied research is important for science. Basic research is understood as being a waste of money. How can philosophy be so popular there days? Philosophy lives on just as it has done many times before. Art must mask itself as a gainful occupation; hence television channels are actually only “channels”. The ratings of a program are a basic stimulus for controlling Machenschaft in the management of this media. Everyone is a manager and manages based on Gestell, without them even knowing about it.

“*Europe is a planetary adumbration*”, (Heidegger 2009: 95) by this Heidegger wants to simply point out that Machenschaft and Gestell are not only a local matter but they seize the whole planet, and we are a witness to this.

“*Evening is a festive evening like the eve of a festival, it is the completion of the day of the first beginning, it is the coming of nightfall and the beginning of night as the passing to another day, another beginning*”. (Heidegger 2009: 96)

The beginning returns only as a passing to the next beginning which will be even more incipient than the first. The beginning is not only caused by causal movement but it is the miracle of birth always first and last and this is what must be most cared for in seeking. But our methodological courses for the preparation of scientific workers only teach beginnings, this is part of Gestell and Machenschaft. The whole of society is interwoven with causality, which governs and controls these processes. Only the objective of processes in the whole of society is not clear, in the sense of “*clare et distincte*”. What does Heidegger think of this? His answer is thus: “*The western world is a world of night. The present night is not only unhealthy but it is without health, hence it emanates world history without the world*”. (Heidegger 2009: 97)

Here the writer wants to imply that we live in existence and for existence and we have forgotten about being, which is a condition for revealing all existence. *“The western world must become the saint of the night, in which poets will wander from one world to the next. Only in this way can world time originate”*. (Heidegger 2009: 97) We lack a lingering in undecidableness, we have no patience, we know not how to wait. We want everything immediately in an instant form, and this is our mistake.

Seeking also means a lingering “in a hole of being”, i.e. in emptiness and dismay. It is necessary to endure the arrival of this woefulness. To endure these moments in life means to face them on a journey. Only such a stance brings a reprieve because not even this “arrival” can be eternal, it must end. And here is the hope in Plato’s well-being. Ultimately, we are convinced that through all adversity rules something whole, something which is good. Would Heidegger ask the following question? *“Why is the evening the first sign of arrival?”* (Heidegger 2009: 98) In the evening we are tired, hence hope comes at this time.

Today’s life is a subjection to rules. Even these rules are governed from a higher point of view. Everything is governed so that we have the feeling that accidents are as it were eliminated, nevertheless they occur more and more. It is because the governing of society by these rules is only a delusion, abeyance (Unentschiedenheit) governs in truth and in reality. If it is something important, it is seeking the path from our wandering, and that is a return to the beginning. It is not a shining technological future; seeking must be done in a new way, more deeply and more sincerely. Methods that are prescribed and sometimes implemented by our scientists are not enough so the situation should be explained by philosophy, this is its duty!

The thinking “more geometrico” creates a world in which everything is governed. Even government is governed, the only thing missing is a goal. What use are hills, cars, washing machines, or computers? What use is the splendor of our appearance if we are clothed in fashionable brands? Man does not need many things in order for him to live, unbelievably he needs very little, after all the world around us is huge and gives everything the opportunity to live whatever living form it is. The simplest things are concealed and human beings do not see them, just like the Emperor’s new clothes.

They see only existence, they do not see being, they do not want to see it. Hence: *“An unconditional method of management is the management of management”*. *Management means division into sections (sectors), in which we ourselves must be arranged for machination, which controls everything for use in the service of ‘will because’ (in culture, in some of its sectors)”*. (Heidegger 2009: 109) Machination is everything in the world which is decided upon *beforehand*. For this to be true, it is a condition of this pre-decision which we call aimlessness. Hence the world becomes an image; an image can manage, can break up into sectors of meaning. Everything is planned and calculated, hence seeking in

science and philosophy transforms into this method of calculating and controlled management. Thus, we have so many managers, so many presidents, so many bosses etc. Heidegger would add: “*New types of governance, new values are merely an unconditional outfall of metaphysics*”. (Heidegger 2009: 110)

That which was not previously objectified becomes an object and begins to work as a means to the will to power; race, instinct, emotions etc. all belong here. Race differences are constituted through ideology; instinct and emotion are developed through the media and managed culture. Seeking has been destroyed, in place of seeking there are managed and controlled methods of methodologists, which are the most important part of assessing the significance of scientific or philosophical work.

We have managed to cancel out seeking, leaving only controlled research which very often toyed with issues but did not provide us with anything new. Why? That which is most important is missing, seeker’s questions, which would mean entry to a new horizon. Everything is managed, determined, terminated. The most important accessory to our lives has become a work diary; life has changed into a succession of doubts which have been transferred to us. At first we do not see it as our own problem. This is the rule of the phenomenon Gestell. The last remnants of philosophy transform into the convulsive forms of thinking which we see in anthropology and ontology.

Man is most often understood as a biological, historical or other system, but we do not find the truth. The truth is missing in the sense of *aletheia*, which must be separated from concealment.

To think about differences between being and existence is not just a logical antithesis. This difference is always *der Abschied* – a parting. It is seemingly a parting of both sides of the antithesis. Why seemingly? Because it is not logical. It is not Aristotle’s four types of opposites from his *Metaphysics*. It is not opposites at all. Sometime we use the metaphor of a background which projects existence as if on the silver screen. But even such a good metaphor is rather lame. Being is not a background, it is something else. Hence similar to Heidegger we say that being ‘nothings’, that being and nothing are one in the same. For a Cartesian’s subject-object way of thinking this is complete nonsense. We know all too well.

Being can only be approached through enowning, *Ereignis*, or as Heidegger puts it: “*Das Sein aber istet als das Er-eignis. Es ist nicht immer.*” (Heidegger 2009: 124. (Because we believe in mere existence, without mystery or distance from what is sacred, everything transforms into a wilderness. Nietzsche made this clear. This wilderness is the basis of living nihilism from which we are only cast loose in a false enowning, which our youth call the peak. The only thing that remains is to influence things and people. This influence is the essence of the will to power. It is simple, just as everything essential. This influence is nothing more than *die Wirkung* and from the emerging reality *die Wirklichkeit*. Only

that which influences, which forms the intensity of an experience, is actually real. Each intensity is strength, it is power in the form of strength. Even peak is a mere upsurge of this intensity which is understood these days as the essence of being. Strength, power is only shown in der Wirkung. In other words, if we want to show that we exist, we must develop strength in influencing. This means that we must project this strength onto people and things around us, we must influence them intensively. Only from this point of view can we understand why politicians must be constantly in the forefront of media attention, why they must be seen on the television and in the newspapers all of the time. This brings us to the word *Übermächtigung* (a drive towards overpowering) as the essence of present life as a whole. The essence of being is the will to influence. The problem is that the overall sense of this influencing is missing, eschaton is missing and this is the basis for understanding the postmodern age. Nietzsche really is a modern prophet.

Estin gar to einai (thought and being are one) – hence the difference is always pain. Why? Kehre, a return to the beginning, is a parting from existence (Abschied); it is an escape to solitude which resembles death, an overwhelming parting. Such a parting is always painful and sad. We sense the denial (Verweigerung) of being. This denial is the most important manifestation of being. The basis of our lives is connected to pain and sadness attuned to being itself. So the attempt to cure all sadness and pain is a source of misunderstanding of our human existence. Doctors just do not know it. Life is a gift beyond our powers, Hrubín and many others understood this. Only Cartesianly educated intellects think that pain is only negative, something which we must chemically eradicate from human history. Why? Because we are technicians of life, technicians of health, technicians of education. And that is the real image of Cartesianism.

We rush in our thinking and in scientific activity. The race to finish first is the greatest obstruction to philosophy and science. ‘Nothing’ is only an absence of existence, ‘nothing’ is something original in the sense of a basis and not temporal succession. In Heidegger’s opinion absolute ‘nothing’ does not exist: *“This thinking is too hurried, not only because ‘nothing’ transforms into negation, but because it cannot think, ‘nothing’ is just as original as being itself”*. (Heidegger 2009: 133)

Because we rush in our thinking we do not know how to linger ‘between’, in an undefined space, we lose the opportunity to reach that which is significant. The beginning not the start is always significant. The beginning is born; the start is merely the reason for the sequence in causal succession. To explain everything using start means to not understand that which is most sought. Ratio cognoscendi is not enough for us, we need ratio essendi. If we only accept ratio cognoscendi, then we are governed by Aristotle’s time, i.e. the consecutiveness of causally linked actions. Then historicism rules in a form in which Sir Karl Raimund Popper did not appreciate. But that which is essential in the sense

of ratio essendi, is not bound to linear time, on the contrary it is the temporal consecutiveness of Aristotle's past, present and future linked to praesence. Here temporalization rules.

Only on the basis of temporalization can we perform daseinsanalysis in the way Martin Heidegger, Jiří Němec and Medard Boss all envisaged it. By changing the view of time and its essence we have changed the methods of learning, i.e. the methods of our own seeking. "*Metaphysics know only the truth of existence*", (Heidegger 2009: 174) states Heidegger. The last great metaphysic was Friedrich Nietzsche, so man also sees himself as an existence, and methods of seeking are only methods of finding existence which is to a certain extent clare et distincte. Hence methods are prescribed and science must be governed according to them. Man must mature even for his own experience, authenticity. He cannot imitate others' experiences. It is necessary to choose one's own path. And this is nothing more than finding the other. The worst is when the difference between the same and the other disappears. Then everything either becomes the other or the same. The first is treated by doctors; the second has obtained the name modernity. Both alternatives are alienated, which is bad. A transfer of possibilities is found in both alternatives. To mature into your own means only one thing: to care for the soul throughout your life.

"*The essence of existence is unique*", (Heidegger 2009, 189) this means that if we live authentically, then we experience everything for the first and last time. It cannot be absolutized but the center of human existence is found within. The paradox is that if man wants to be true to himself then he must know the whole without margins, and this is a question of thought, i.e. care for the soul through questioning.

"*Death relates to Dasein, not to life*", (Heidegger 2009: 193) states Heidegger. This means that life is something more than a manifestation of our existence. How can we understand this connection? Put simply, possibilities belong to life, and these are not always an existence which is immediately stored away. They remain as real possibilities in our soul and wait for realization at the entrance to a phenomenon. Consequently, they resemble a shadow which belongs to the shade of things, but they are not these things. Life is something which biologists cannot define. Possibilities which are shown intentionally belong to life, this means, deeds carry them inside as if they are their own, they penetrate everything, sense. And this sense lives on; it lives even after the death of its bearer. That is why totalitarians are so scared of righteous victims.

And so John Hus is not over and done with even if the whole world would wish it. Their intentions which permeate their actions are something which cannot be destroyed. Circumstances which the future brings will always open this hidden sense. It will always appear for the first and last time because it has the character of the beginning, not the start.

“Who is man – is only felt through experiences with being, otherwise no description helps, no new values, no new rules”. (Heidegger 2009: 196)

I. Kant knew that if we ask the question “what?”, then we reduce man to an existence, we have stripped him of his dignity and honor, we have reduced them into a mere means. Man has his roots in the truth of being and being nothings, it is molded into possibilities of our seeking and finding, i.e. in care for the soul, which is done often without words or only a few words i.e. through singular enowning of actions. Then it is Er-eignis, it is enowning, which outlasts regular time and is eternal. Seeking is not only a method of finding existence and its functions, i.e. a description of that which is in question. Seeking is mainly: “Attention to that which is simple, which is pain emanating from difference”. (Heidegger 2009: 200)

This simplicity is grasped by our thoughts, senses, atonement. It is Vorfinden, finding, which is nothing other than: “An encounter of a kind different to an encounter with existence”. (Heidegger 2009: 206)

Therefore the same methods cannot be applied to philosophy and to natural science in everything and always. Consequently, a theorist of existence, a technician cannot make decisions on philosophy. “Da-sein is not existentia, actualitas, reality”, (Heidegger 2009: 206) it is presence, temporality, which has been examined in detail several times above.

REFERENCES

Heidegger, M. *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 1989.

Heidegger, M. *Ereignis*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 2009.

Hus, J. *Výklady*. Praha: ČSAV 1975.