

## AUTO-MOBILIZATION AND THE POST-METAPHYSICAL MYTH OF PROGRESS

TADEJ PIRC, Oddelek za filozofijo, Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, Slovenija

TADEJ PIRC: Auto-Mobilization and the Post-Metaphysical Myth of Progress  
FILOZOFIA 70, 2015, No. 2, pp. 145-155

The article deals with the idea of progress which is characterized by its permanent kinetics and motivated by the strive for immortality, even though every living organism is destined to be born, to live and, ultimately, to pass. World-history, as understood by Oswald Spengler and Peter Sloterdijk, is a metaphysical construction – a creation of humans, in which they dwell. Due to globalization processes the spatial and timely dimensions become so constricted that all relations vanish; this is the point at which all oppositions coincide and *being* becomes one with *nothing*. At the same time, this is the point of the disenchantment of metaphysics. The lost realm of the numinous is to be replaced by the post-metaphysical auto-mobilization which makes it possible for man to become one with the machine, i.e. the generator, or the (prime) mover that was never as immanent in the world-history as he is in the space-time of the post-metaphysical era.

**Keywords:** (Auto-)mobilization – Progress – Globalization – Immortality – Kinetic utopia – World-history – Sloterdijk

**Introduction.** Immortality. A careful and sincere consideration of man of the contemporary ethos cannot but conclude that there is no stronger or more striking motivation than immortality. It is the fundamental purpose of the humanity as a whole, as a species, and of each and every individual. In *telos* of immortality one can catch a glimpse of Darwin and Faust, or his creator Goethe. Immortality demands persistence in the more and more soggy and dark tundra of “the risk society” (Giddens 1999). Immortality demands perseverance which can be guaranteed only by the permanent progress; this anticipates growth, because the main goal here is that the culture as a political organism overgrows everything that is natural or biological. These are the skills in which the Western – or Fausian – civilization is the master of all masters. Growth and progress: towards what? And even more importantly: why? The paradoxical answer is announcing itself: towards death for immortality.

Nevertheless, even this makes some sense. At the point of convergence where death and immortality coincide one encounters a transcendental moment of the globalized culture. When globalization reaches the absolute, i.e. when it becomes total, then its mission – a total compression of space and time – is fulfilled. Everything that *is* shrinks to one single point which, on the one hand, contains everything that is (everything worldly and the potentials of it), yet, on the other hand, through its absolute it manifests a complete *noth-*

*ing.* Total globalization creates space and time compressed to zero (to nothing) in which specific entities lose reciprocal proximity and cram into one single *nothing* where all spatial and temporal relations (distances) vanish.

This unconscious absolute nihilism mandates unconditional fondness for the idea of immortality, moreover, it forces on human beings the constant straining for perseverance. This strive has many tentacles and it manifests in many forms in both the sphere of the natural and that of the political world; e.g., perseverance is integrated in the preservation of man, environment, nature, humanity as a species, living or economic standard (GDP or HDI) as a political indicator of the (political) evolutionary stage, defence of a territory, and preservation of memory, desire, anticipation and interest. Each of these strives – which are beared by immortality as their common denominator – is looking to fulfil itself directly by means of ecological policies (green agendas, subsidies, sustainable investments), besides that, the biotechnological research and experiments of gene and transgene engineering are subtly making its way to the forefront of the everyday life. However, the most persistent and the first true ally of immortality is the medical practice, which is – starting at least as back as in the Renaissance humanism era – adding fuel to the idea of man as an immortal being of politics, man who broke off any connection or relation with nature and absolved himself from the responsibility for the biological and nature itself.

**The logics of progress, growth and history as a geometrical ray.** “Towards what ultimate point is society tending by its industrial progress? When the progress ceases, in what condition are we to expect that it will leave mankind?” (Mill 1909, IV.6.1).

Towards what, then? Is the question posed by John Stuart Mill even meaningful, does it have any sense at all? Is it possible for progress to stop? If yes, then it has to *know* what it strives for in order to know when it achieved the end. However, it seems that progress – neither as a phenomenon nor as an idea – carries in its teleological inscription nothing else than only itself. It seems as if progress has no clue towards what it is progressing. It moves for the movement itself. “Progressive in its essence is only the ‘step’ which results in the increase of the steps’ abilities. This reveals us the formula of the modernizing process: progress is movement towards movement, movement towards increasing movement, movement towards the increased ability of moving” (Sloterdijk 2000, 32). One movement gives birth to another movement: more and more movement for an indeterminable aim. Therefore, one can consider being as being-in-movement.

However vague, this dynamic is not without structure; it is perfectly evident that it has its very own beginning. The first true – cosmological – beginning announces itself in the very moment in which the metaphysical questions of being as questions of existence itself are raised; the first beginning is determined by two fundamental factors: space and time. Following the first one, at least two further beginnings arose: the one which occurred with the emergence of the world-history, and the other which occurred as a result of the Enlightenment rationale. The former being the outcome of the Neolithic revolution, i.e. the shift of the idea of man and, no doubt, the human from the sphere of pure biology towards the sphere of pure politics (or – sociologically speaking – pure society); or, as

Oswald Spengler claims and Peter Sloterdijk bears in mind (Sloterdijk 2014, ch. 3), with the emergence of a *city*. The latter settled and embedded itself in the tradition and ideology of virtually every culture of the world after it spread swiftly on the wings of the Enlightenment generator throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe. As an ideology progress and growth are as old as (the world-history) man, however, they are especially precise in encapsulating the spirit of the time and space at the turn of the millennia. Now, more than ever before, this ideology strives for immortality and considers a morphological picture of (world) -history as a ray: a line which starts in a singular point – at the beginning – and runs into eternity.

Heidegger's being-toward-death (*Sein-zum-Tode*) (Heidegger 1962) is the perfect reflection of what the (Western) man is and what he is afraid of the most. Progress means progress in time from the beginning onward. After a certain period of time the moment of death comes – at least biology demands so. Every living organism is born, lives and dies, and it is exactly this model that is characteristic also of cultures and civilizations, which was analysed and described with the morphology of world-history by Spengler in his main work (*The Decline of the West* 1962). He founded his theory on the basic thesis that cultures and civilizations are living organisms, just like plants, animals, or people. Every culture has its beginning, course, and end. Every culture emerges, grows up, blooms, matures, and perishes as a civilization. It has its own soul, which is reflected in the artistic, political, economic, scientific, and religious forms. Spengler (1962, 14) points out eight higher organisms, among which he lists the Babylonian, ancient Egyptian, and classical or Greco-Roman culture that flourished thousands of years ago. They are followed by the Indian, Chinese, and Arab-Persian, which withered centuries ago. He recognizes the culture in Mexico and Guatemala as the seventh culture, which was suddenly eliminated by the Spanish invasion. Finally, he points out the Western civilization as the eighth civilization. It is not yet completed and has not yet failed.

Although cultural organisms differ in character, abilities and talents, they are all subjected to the same course. As a cultural organism, each civilization follows four predetermined phases. The duration of the phases does not differ much from one organism to another. In principle, according to Spengler, the life of culture as an organism begins in the *spring* period, characterized by a strong religious faith that gradually gives way to increasing rationality and materialism. These movements result in a period of exceptional creativity, which Spengler named *summer*. In Europe for example, this meant new discoveries in mathematics, almost simultaneously discovered by Newton and Leibniz. This was also a period of painting with oil paints and the flowering of baroque music, which was something completely different than everything known before (McNaughton 2012, 8). In the *autumn* period, materialism and pure rational mind-set completely dominate life. Creativity as creativity (art, philosophy, curious natural sciences) withdraws and gives way to opportunistic creativity. An opportunistic mind displaces ethics of responsibility, relativizes it, makes it flexible and pushes it to the point where it can no longer be regarded as a (substantial) constitutive element of the ethos (traditions and main ideology as a leading value system) of the culture. Here, the cultural organism transitions to a civiliza-

tion. The collapse of a common ethical core leads to tension between nations, social groups, and political factions, and the views, interests, and ideologies. After the battle, the most determined entity, which is often the peripheral one, absorbs all the others. It does not kill them; it only violates them with the superiority of the authoritarian empire. During the period of the empire, people become aware of the boundaries of pure rational contemplation. The result of this is the return to religion, which is based on those from earlier centuries, but practised in a different way and in accordance with the new, progressive way of life. It is about what Spengler “prophesied as the final stage of every culture: the state in which it is impossible to determine whether individuals are diligent or decadent (but diligent in what respect, and decadent in relation to which height?)” (Sloterdijk 2013, 154).

Progress, therefore, seems inevitable; as the dynamic of world-history it is embedded in the structure of each and every culture and civilization. The morphology reveals also the growth of the economic level of development, the artistic and intellectual diversity and complexity, the engineering and scientific inventiveness, the power of imagination and the knowledge of the world. From this we can gather that the Socratic oath to self-knowledge lies in the very core of progress as an ever-present element of every culture. It can certainly be interpreted in a Hegelian manner as well, however, the crucial difference lies in the concluding opposition: on the one side, there is the absolute ignorance (*non-knowledge*) as the only solid and true knowledge, therefore an *aporia*, and, on the other side, there is the absolute knowledge and the total and complete self-awareness of the spirit (*Geist*). Both extremes – absolute ignorance and absolute knowledge – are appealing in a way: the former addresses us with the satisfaction all along the way, when the latter satisfies us with the final result, which exceeds – both by strength and validity – all previous partial results.

Nevertheless, at this point Spengler maintains a perspective which is founded on much more *real* grounds. Based on the occurrences of the *real* world-history he depicts a morphological picture, a pattern which itself proved to be accurate and reliable in many cases. The research methodology he used is perfectly empirical and statistical: based on the historiographical research he depicted a course of the great cultures of humanity, analysed it and drew comparisons between certain repetitive motifs which are morphologically and formally similar from one culture to another. A simple argumentation following from two plain premises: that 1) all historical cultures have undergone the same development: beginning – course – end, and that 2) the Western culture is one of the world-history cultures; cannot but conclude that the end – or the decline/demise – will inevitably befall the Western culture as well.

We are faced with a clear and empirically substantiated argumentation which decisively negates the possibility of the course of history as a ray. It is impossible for the Western culture to arise, supposedly, in the Ancient Greece, traverse various consecutive eras and simply never end. Therefore, the idea of history of man who will live into eternity is senseless if not absurd. Besides Spengler, who, due to the inaccuracies stated in his major works, cannot be the only reference for this explication, we can turn to contempo-

rary theoreticians who debate biotechnology and gene engineering– the discussion itself implicates the expectancy of man’s demise.

The following question poses itself. What is the source of the idea of progress which is so strongly embedded in the ideological bank of the Western *ethos*? Permanent movement, perpetual dynamic of movement-towards-movement, the movement because of the movement itself does not allow the contemplation of its justification (legitimacy). Progress is manifesting the will to power which demands for the constant growth, because will itself demands more and more will, and the power soon loses its force if it is not building up itself. Here, we can see a clear parallel with the 20<sup>th</sup> century phenomenon (with roots stretching far back to Ancient Greece): *bodybuilding* or the body formation with the use of weight-lifts reflects a pure will-to-power-for-more-power. It is hard to say when the process of bodybuilding comes to an end, when the body is perfected and complete, and it is just as hard to demand of the bodybuilder to be satisfied with his work somewhere *halfway*. However, the problem of progress lies exactly here: it is always somewhere on the way, always moving towards *something* indefinable. “At the beginning of progress it was assumed, justifiably as well as unjustifiably, that it is a ‘moral’ initiative which cannot rest before Better becomes Real” (Sloterdijk 2000, 29). A step with which we make our muscles a bit nicely shaped, or a step with which we manage to raise GDP for at least 0.1 % is a step which approves and justifies our journey; yet, it remains a step which was made for the sake of the step that follows. And the walker keeps wandering aimlessly till the moment s/he loses all strengths or is simply hit by a car.

Each of the great cultural organisms to this day encountered different endings: from the weakening strengths which made them vulnerable to the ambitions of the peripheral forces, to the unforeseeable catastrophic declines. What prospects the future holds for the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennia man? According to Spengler’s morphological theory he is coming dangerously close to the end, some even claimed that the end already occurred (Fukuyama 1992). Apparently, we missed it, or – perhaps – invented new starts. Moreover, the inevitable end of history brought man to struggle with permanent growth, which is – in accordance with the progressivist ideology – on the one hand, increasing demand and, on the other hand, expanding supply, since everything that *is* – therefore, all the relations – concentrated in one simple calculation; and this is the calculation which includes growth as a constant. “The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his ‘natural superiors’, and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous ‘cash payment’. It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation” (Marx and Engels 1969, Ch. 1). Rationalization (or, economization) of relations and relationships demands of each of the individuals of the global society for seeking growth. This process is making use of the very same measures and features as does the *original* Western culture. Marxist discourse of the two antagonistic classes, Hegelian master-slave division, or the contemporary (journalistic) discourse of superrich and poorer-than-ever are all the multi-layered representation of

the one ethos, one ideology, one tradition. Rationalization and economization do not affect only a proletarian, a slave, and a pauper, it just as much affects a capitalist, a master and a wealthy man. It would be ignorant not to observe that the one who is analysing charts and graphs in a comfortable chair is in a much better position when putting up with the pressure of ideological integration than the one who is digging holes and carrying bricks at minimum wage, however, it is completely impossible to except anyone from the structure of contemporary (economized and rationalized) ethos. The social relations reification simply minds neither for the status nor the so-called class. The ones at the top and the ones at the bottom are merely two sides of one coin.

What could affect and add to growth and progress better? What could add more fuel to the growth of power than the power of rationalization itself? *Time is money*. Rationalization is offering a clear and decisive answer to this issue, since the globalization of the economized calculation demands and allows for the compression of time and space— after all, the compression of space is essentially the compression of timely relations. Every relation must in its power rise to such heights that it becomes able to cancel out the relation itself, since, consequently, the power of compression ultimately establishes the absolutely filled up space of the globalized market concentrated in a single dot (a singular cell).

**Mobilization for the compression of time and space.** Permanent dynamics for permanent growth, permanent mobilization for permanent progress, and permanent kinetics for permanent globalization. And then – *coincidentia oppositorum*: the convergence of oppositions which bears immortality. Dwelling into eternity, being-that-escapes-death, or being that flees death; this is where the permanent kinetics echoes the most, and it is exactly this permanent kinetics that is installed, or engraved as the generator in the very essence of the ethos of the new man. “The project of modernity lies, therefore, – and this has not yet been uttered sharply – *in the kinetic utopia*: the whole movement of the world is supposed to be a version of its draft” (Sloterdijk 2000, 20).

A utopian and blind belief that man is here to stay and take control of everything – including nature – can fuel itself up with the kinetic impatience and the strive for the progression in time. The permanent mobilization is forcing ahead, yet no one knows neither what towards nor why. However, at least the second puzzling question (*why?*) seems solvable: for immortality, after all, it is the perfect motivation understood very well by the *Dasein* in the mode of being-toward-death. The feeling of anxiety rouses and forces *Dasein* into mobilization – the uneasiness of being-toward-death is the motor of the modern man, and it is laying upon him the never ending permanent kinetic enthusiasm. Whereas the narcissistic belief of one’s importance and meaning for *everything that is* – the world, nature, everything alive – is the fuel which is a type of a renewable energy source, since it both fuels itself from within and reproduces itself. Therefore, narcissism is the only sustainable element (raw element), because it is engraved in the very core of ideological code of the contemporary man – both genetic and historic, or social – where it

gives meaning to the permanent mobilization, or, as Sloterdijk put it, the idea of kinetic utopia.

Giving meaning to utopia is by all means a masterwork of the general ideological apparatus which can be called *ethos*, whereas its psychological and social implications and application can be named *ethics* (or, morality). “What no one really wanted to know is becoming more and more evident. The thing which is not welcome as an insight, is forcing itself onto thinking with an unpleasant sharpness. Once uttered and disclosed secret brings to life the question: why this thing that everyone knows has not yet encountered the general recognition. A few urban planners and officers who were eager for speculation knew this first, dubious philosophers who did not have faith in modernity applied themselves, schizophrenics in the theoretic scene of large cities let themselves be intoxicated, a few mundane feuilletons tackled the issue, soon there will be a lot of those who will say they knew this from the very beginning. What exactly? Well, this trivial fact that the kinetics is ethics of modernity” (Sloterdijk 2000, 28).

A shift, reallocation, distribution, drive, transfer, rotation, growth and progress are reflecting the everyday discourse of the media and politics, and – consequently – a discourse of a *common* man; a citizen and a recipient of the mediated content. The circulation of the capital, or money, is the basis of the liberal economy, whereas the redistribution of wealth is the mechanism of the tax politics, or the mechanism of the welfare state, which is set to establish various financial and social correctives for improvement of the economic and social status of those who are unsuccessful in making use of opportunities on the free market. A shift and a transfer – of any kind – are keeping the capital, which is seeking after growth and progress, in motion. Driving is perfectly ordinary and everyday activity; to drive a car, a bike, to go by bus, by train, or to transport cargo, materials, products, people, to fly etc. The banality and the omnipresence of driving – which can be summed up in the *auto-mobilization* – is the outcome of the ethics of kinetics which controls the structure of the ethos of contemporary man. Man is no more dependent on water that floats material down the river and deposits it on the banks. Man is no more dependent on the natural mobilization conditions – he is no more interested in the direction of the current, the force of wind or the fact of the tide. Man is capable and qualified to mobilize himself, and with this he guaranteed for himself the basic condition – beside the belief in the reality of the kinetic utopia – on which he can surmount and ultimately defeat the spatial and timely barriers.

“Modernity realized at least one of its utopian goals, namely the goal of total auto-mobilization, a state in which every person of age moves her/himself behind the wheel of the moving machine. Because we cannot imagine the self in modernity without its *movement*, the Self and its automobile metaphysically belong together as the spirit and the body of the same moving unit. An automobile is the technical double of the principally active transcendental subject” (Sloterdijk 2000, 36).

The substance for an automobile as a technological product and a result of an exceptional engineering – based, of course, on the idea of an ingenious visionary – is technics which is a characteristic of man since the very beginning of world-history. The first tools

and utilities, e.g. a stick, a workstation, a flat stone, another stone for crushing cereals and nuts, etc. were manifestation of man's needs and strives. Prehistoric man was already showing evident signs of his power of imagination, with the help of which he later became the leading species on the planet. A hand soon became one with its tool; some tools were serving as weapons, and the other were useful as (working) tools. In any case, it was all about an extension to the hand, an extension of a human body to the measure in which – as Heidegger (1962, 98) claimed in a reference to the modern 20<sup>th</sup> century technics – the hammer became one with man. However, no other tool has added so much to the maintenance of the kinetic utopia as an automobile; it merged into one with its user, the driver, who is moving faster and more decisively than ever before.

With this an automobile is ascribed a special metaphysical, perhaps even a transcendental status, because in it the idea of kinetic utopia directly materializes itself. Moreover, in the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it became an imperative to every adult person, and with that it gained a status of the kinetic utopia artefact. "That is why an automobile is the most sacred product of modernity, it is the cult core of the kinetic world religion, the rolling sacrament which enables us to be a part of something that is faster than us. Those who drive an automobile are getting closer to the numinous, they feel how their little *I* is expanding into a higher *Self*, which makes the whole world of motorways our home and is making us aware that we have been called by something greater than a mere half-animal life of pedestrians" (Sloterdijk 2000, 37).

The auto-mobilization is signalling the desired shift from biological to political. Mobilization-with-a-purpose is a reflection of the politicized man, who is incapable of imagining standing on two feet by himself. Although he is walking in accordance with progress these are not some casual, ordinary, human (or animal) steps of an upright (erect) ape, but something completely technical – completely political. Many other animals are almost constantly moving, however, we must not misidentify this biological fact with the completely unnatural manner of dynamics, or mobilization, by which man abides; even though the basic motif for the both is the preservation of life and species, therefore it is the result of the strive for survival. And it is right at this point in which we collide head-on with the fundamental problem: man is denying his biological and natural core which is generated by the primordial desire for preservation and immortality. Man is not sincere with himself in ignoring the fact that – even though he is operating in terms of technics, technology and politics – in his core, he remains a biological being.

Post-humanism is trying to establish a distance at this point: if man as a social being was at least in some aspects (anatomy, physiology and herd logics) still connected to biology, the post-humanism of the third millennia is trying its best to disconnect man from of this vice. In all those centuries from the Renaissance to the so-called end of history the man of humanism did not succeed to forget about his own biological substance. Because of this, the post-humanist metaphysics interfered with the constellation of the post-historical world (or world post-history). With controversial and radical incursions into the self-image of the man of Renaissance-Enlightenment it induced a whole set of new grand narratives.

With the total auto-mobilization the dreams of the modern came true: man – *an ape walking on two feet* – touch the sacred prime mover itself; this was the actual moment of god's passing, and it was the ultimate point of transcendence's transcendental. It could be said that for a moment, which lasted approximately twenty years, perhaps half a century, man rode on the waves of the permanent kinetics, and he never even doubted nor analysed it, because it seemed like a first true (working) *perpetuum mobile*. Nevertheless, after this came the disillusion: congestions. "...where activated self-movement causes traffic jams and agitation there emerge the beginnings of experiences out of which the modern active traverses to the postmodern passive" (Sloterdijk 2000, 41). What else could have man done at this point than simply indulge in the great new project of post-humanism? Well, better this than to succumb to postmodern, which until this day – after so many printed books and uttered words – have not been properly explained; and exactly this is what justifies it: it is postmodern because it cannot define itself, nothing is True anymore, all the grand narratives have come to an end, and the truth became just another commodity. With this the truth was – as was Being itself – isenchanted and relieved of metaphysics. To state it again: this is the point where post-humanism sees and seeks an opportunity, because "regardless of passengers' level of education, they all get a hunch that this cannot last any longer" (Sloterdijk 2000, 37).

The truth, after all, lies in the *ethos*. Have we lost it? Has something as banal, yet terrible as are traffic jams announced the grand message of the end of the second millennium that *history, which means metaphysics and with it conditioned ethics, came to an end?* What I am trying to show is quite the opposite, since *ethos*, and ethics as its systematization, will exist as long as man will exist embedded in the system of structural relations. Although I speak of the post-human and post-metaphysical man – after all, one could also call him postmodern – is this still man who cannot escape the *ethos* as an ideological substance.

And what is the *ethos* of the post-human man? It is progress, growth, compression, immortality. Nothing new – only justified differently, whereas the key motif remains the same. "Only today are we forced to philosophically observe that Marx and Nietzsche claimed the same – he will to self-seizing self-production and the will to power (as an initiative of enforcing the interpretation of the world) are two alternative formulations of the same creative grand-attack of the active spirit on 'matter', for the same kinetic nihilism which comprehends being as a source of energy and a construction site, and nothing else" (Sloterdijk 2000, 60).

What Sloterdijk labels as the kinetic nihilism is the *ethos* of the present era. Since no nihilism meets with approval – even though it has been inseparable with man for the last three centuries – the post-humanism offers a solution: more mobilization for more compression. With the total globalization of being the ultimate dreams of globalization will come true. *The situation is critical*, the crisis is the *modus operandi* in which man is capable of orienting himself, and it is the atmosphere in which he feels at ease; the unbearable lightness of being is directing attention towards the anxiety of the being-toward-death, which results in the unbearable measure of uneasiness. Once again we are facing the par-

adoxical situation in which contradicts, or oppositions coincide; moreover, the power of *the situation* is justified with the promise of the new Truth that is the pre-stage of that actual compression which produces the nonsense of death, since it merges with immortality. With this the metaphysics of being-toward-death cancels out itself. Does this mean that it cancels out Being as well?

Because of the uncertainty and the additional uneasiness that accompanies seeking the answer, we should perhaps stop one step before – by mobilization, or the kinetics itself, since the key issue here is how to stop this train of madness or, at least, divert it. The real question is “whether is it possible for the modern whole to lose the mode of being which is ontologically determined by the being-toward-movement formula” (Sloterdijk 2000, 63). With the study of political kinetics in his work *Eurotaoism* Sloterdijk arrives at the usual philosophical conclusion, i.e. *aporia*, since, on the one hand, we can expect only the worst, and, on the other hand, we cannot think of any other alternative. “That is why it cannot surpass itself neither it can truly imagine a future for itself. If it remains doing what it is doing, then it produces the worst; if it stops producing the worst, then it stops being what it is and it becomes something significantly other” (Sloterdijk 2000, 244). And it is exactly this pattern in which man is trapped. Construction of a new man who exceeds himself – exactly this is the project of the post-human anthropotechnical zeal – is, by the analogy with Sloterdijk’s thesis of the impossibility of the end or surpassing of the modernity, infeasible. Therefore, man is doomed to himself, and with that we come back to the generator of the self-preservation instinct – narcissism; this time, however, from a slightly more nihilistic perspective.

**(Nietzsche’s) concluding remark.** Unattainability of goals and desires are what is most stimulating; and the impossibility of achieving goals is what only spurs and fuels up the desire. Consulting the theories emerging from the evolutionary biology we can gather that an organism gets old and dies because there are very few forces left which would enable perseverance of life after the reproduction period; some theories of the process of ageing (senescence) even claim that there is a limit to which somatic cells are able to split. The number of splits is with the increasing age of the cell apparently reducing (Fukuyama 2006).

The theory of evolution believes that there is no immortality. Man, as a human being, is born, lives, and dies. “Many die too late, and some die too early. Yet strange soundeth the precept: ‘Die at the right time!’ Die at the right time: so teacheth Zarathustra. To be sure, he who never liveth at the right time, how could he ever die at the right time? Would that he might never be born! – Thus do I advise the superfluous ones. But even the superfluous ones make much ado about their death, and even the hollowest nut wanteth to be cracked. Every one regardeth dying as a great matter: but as yet death is not a festival. Not yet have people learned to inaugurate the finest festivals” (Nietzsche 2003, XXI). And the myth of progress remains just that – a myth.

## Bibliography

- FUKUYAMA, F. (2006): *Our Posthuman Future. Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. London: Profile Books.
- FUKUYAMA, F. (1992): *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- GIDDENS, A. (1999): Risk and Responsibility. *Modern Law Review* 62 (1), 1-10.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (1962): *Being and Time*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- MARX, K. and ENGELS, F. (1969): Manifesto of the Communist Party. In: *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One*, 98-137. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- McNAUGHTON, D. (2012): "Spengler's Philosophy and Its Implication that Europe has "Lost Its Way"." *Comparative Civilization* 67 (Fall), 7-15.
- MILL, J. S. (1909): *Principles of Political Economy with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (2003): *Thus spoke Zarathustra*. London: Penguin.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2000): *Evrotaoizem. H kritiki politične kinetike*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2013): *In the World Interior of Capital*. Cambridge: Polity.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2014): *Spheres II. Globes*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- SPENGLER, O. (1962): *The Decline of the West*. New York: Knopf.

---

Tadej Pirc  
Oddelek za filozofijo  
Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani  
Aškerčeva 2  
SI-1000 Ljubljana  
Slovenija  
e-mail: tadejpirc1@gmail.com