

ISSN 1848-0071  
 7.038.6+111.1=111  
 Recieved: 2013-10-26  
 Accepted: 2013-12-27  
 Review

## POSTMODERN TECHNIQUE

MERICİ BILGIÇ

Department of Philosophy, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey  
 e-mail: [mericbilgic@gmail.com](mailto:mericbilgic@gmail.com)

Technology is a relation between human being and nature in general. The dialectical logic of technique is self-creative and alienating meanwhile. Nevertheless, postmodern technique of creativity has stuck in a vicious circle today by producing merely alienation. Creative thinking is a block itself against creativity. Our institutions with the discourses of philosophy, science and art are in the chamber of the vicious circle. This paper tries to give a clear and distinct definition of postmodern technique, and attempts to find a way out in an ontological discourse.

**Key words:** techné, dialectic, Plato, Aristotle, Heidegger, virtual multiplicity, alienation, enframing.

**Postmoderna tehnika.** Tehnologija je općenito odnos između ljudskog bića i prirode. Dijalektička logika tehnike je istodobno i samostvaralačka i otuđujuća. Ipak, postmoderna tehnika stvaralaštva danas je isključivim proizvođenjem otuđenja upala u začarani krug. I samo stvaralačko mišljenje predstavlja zapreku kreativnosti. Naše su ustanove sa svojim diskursima o filozofiji, znanosti i umjetnosti zatočene u tom začaranom krugu. Ovaj rad pokušava dati jasnu i razgovjetnu definiciju postmoderne tehnike i naći izlaz u ontološkom diskursu.

**Ključne riječi:** techné, dijalektika, Platon, Aristotel, Heidegger, virtualna mnogostrukost, otuđenje, postav.

### INTRODUCTION

The contemporary era that we are just in the middle of its concentricity is commonly qualified with being “postmodern” that was an invented word. The vagueness of its meaning works to cover and legitimate the irrationality of macro-economic politics. Since New York was taking over the intellectual and artistic periphery of the Western world from Amsterdam and Paris, the test of the culture of American market economy has been exported to Europe and to the rest (!) of the World. Mass culture with pragmatist values those were only economic was challenging the two European tradition, which were French enlightenment and English democracy. The *Postmodern Condition* of Lyotard

has sized up Europe via French philosophy: Negating the ideas of “totality”, “truth”, “rationality”, and affirming pure subjectivity are some other states of pragmatist motto “anything goes”. The idea of “theory for theory” that had been charged to distinguish the beginning of (Western) “science” from technology has been transformed to “theory for profit”. The same attitude has reduced moral to custom, art to craft. As Kant has basically formulated the rational creation of “beauty” of art by distinguishing it from “pleasant” that was belonged to some benefits of the chain of natural causality, we cannot talk about a postmodern science, moral and art anymore; they all have been reduced to an instrumental technique.

Postmodern technique is totally different than Modern, Medieval and Antique techniques. Today, technique is not a technique anymore, which is supposed to be the basis of all creation. Western tradition and civilisation is not in the position to reproduce itself because it loses its intellectual universalizability and legitimacy meanwhile. Postmodern “techno-logy” is the

functional reason of this most profound crisis of human civilisation today because it purposely and directly produces illusion like a great demon. But what is this thing called “technique” anyway, and how does it work today; we are going to re-examine this problem for looking a way to get out of this absurd absolute illusion.

## TECHNIQUE IN GENERAL

Technique is not the way of using some concrete objects or devices of technology but the cognitive source of all creative productivity in general. It doesn't indicate the conditions of object but subject. That is why it is so difficult to think of, to see and understand what the scope of the abstract idea of “technique” was. Technique is a creative act of mediation in a way of transition on the relations between subject and object or human and nature. The teleological target of this act of transition is recreation of the subject itself within this act via creating its object. The much a subject develops awareness on this transition that it had been caused by its own act, the much the focus of the act moves from object to subject itself as the target. Biological evolution of brain and cognitive development of human intelligence throughout civilisations is the proof of this ontological formulation. Human history also shows that this is not such a causality chain with one direction as a higher intellectual destiny of “goodness”. As a difference from animals, intellectual act develops a bilateral mediacy between consciously rational self-creation and subconsciously irrational self-destruction as well. Dialectical possibility of conceptual mediacy between existence and non-existence truly becomes a real part of life struggle for human intelligence. Thereby, the main intention or “meaning” of life is not only survival but an ending life in a shortcut

too; because life is deadly heavy, and cognition also inhabits this transcendental dialectical possibility.

Negative, dark side of creation or negation is always the beginning of a rational perplexity in a conceptual negotiation with some irrational appearances, namely unknown, unexpected or unacceptable counterparts of the rational side. Reason does always appear between the negative side of creation and negation of it as a negative negotiation. Before the cognitive level of dialectical negotiation, there is a perceptive level of an “animal faith” as Santana called; because an affirmative negotiation is not a negotiation at all, neither rational nor irrational; there is no reason in it. It is the place of subjective self-affirmation of the instrumentalist, pragmatist technique as only an appearance of natural causality.

Dialectical meaning of negotiation can simply be read from its Latin root. Negate or neg (no)+ing is *negatus* in Latin, which is the past participle of “*ne.g.a.re*” that was meant “to deny the reality”. *Neg.o-ti.ate* or *negotiatu*s also comes from the past participle of *ne.g.otia.ri*, which means “to carry on business”. *Neg+otium*, which is used for “business” means “to keep having more leisure (*otium*) to negate” or having a chance to keep “to deal with”, “to ménage”. [1] These abstract meanings come from a concrete job: Horse riding. “Ménage”

means to handle or direct riding a horse. *Negotiari* means “tackle successfully, to clear on horseback an obstacle that exists”. Philosophically, negotiation is ended up on the physical realm (if it is raining, it is raining); otherwise one would always find a chance in saying no. For human and social sciences, dialectical negotiation should be ended up with a rational consensus on negating absurdities of some possible scientific results of the opposition of a proposition or a state of affairs. Otherwise reason wouldn't ménage negotiation in a search for truth, instead power would ménage it.

There is nothing exist as reason or *ratio*, but reason is a result of a certain quantitative organisation under a universal concept, or matching some unknown multiplicity with an acceptable, unifying hypothesis under a general theory or a well-known framework. This is basically a dialectical syllogism, fundamental logic of truth inquiry, scientific, artistic and philosophical truth inquiry, and in the middle of this inquiry there has to be a truthful agent who creates his/herself within this transforming act of truth inquiry by organizing it under his/her *cogito*. Here, this mediating truthful self-creation is called technique. All the other techniques of different fields from univocal hypothetico-deductive method of sciences (namely Aristotelian *apodictic syllogismos*, and the process of finding a middle term) to equivocal, poetic, intuitive method of arts are used as sub-techniques of the technique of the dialectical art of self-creation (in the sense of Plato's *dialectiké syllogismos*).

Though we have freely tried to point out some main aspects of it here, historically, the idea of “technique” as a central philosophical problem has first been noticed by Heidegger. As all know very well, Heidegger's essay *The Question Concerning Technology* attempts to handle the idea of “technique” within the Aristotelian ontology.

He exhibits the relations of the Greek words *techné* (technique), *aletheia* (truth) and *poiesis* (art). Basically *techné* is a mood of *aletheia*, which makes the covered, absolute totality of truth appear and understandable. Heidegger's attempt depends on the Aristotelian Western tradition. Western tradition of science and philosophy is sourced from the Neo-Platonist theology and Aristotelian science. Aristotelian domination shadows Plato's own philosophy because the Western has learned Plato via Aristotle. But systematic philosophy and science is originally established by Plato's philosophy. First of all, this historical and intellectual mistake is needed to be corrected:

As he distinguishes it from *Sein* (being itself), for Heidegger being was not in itself but *Dasein* (existence) as the experience of being. “*Being is always the Being of an entity [Dasein]*” (Heidegger, 1962: p. 29). He doesn't want it to be understood as a subjective conscious experience, he rather considers his philosophical experience as an ontological, scientific appearance of truth. We doesn't subjectively experience and construct “being”. No matter how firm or rich, any system of some *a priori* conditions (like Kant's) as “*the possibility of sciences, which examine[s] entities [Dasein] (...) already operate[s] with an understanding of Being*”. [2: 31] As Hegel indicated, we find ourselves in the middle of mediation between us and the other entities within the framework of being which is framed by its epoch. But Hegel's *Dasein* is a completed absolute totality of subject or *Geist*, which is “*reduced to something self-evident- merely material for reworking*”. [2: 43] A completed picture of dialectic is not dialectic anymore. In other words, completed scientific knowledge is not scientific at all. Truth of being, on the contrary, is revealed as experiences of this world or of *Dasein*.

We primarily think in the dimension of language that corresponds and belongs to

being, and try to surmount “*the destiny of Being, the surmounting of Enframing*” of the framework of being in the epoch. [3: 41] Logically, knowledge of something is constructed on some more general concepts, like space, time, quantity, etc.. But “being” is the most general concept, there is not any more word with a larger extension to predicate on it, and so, logically it is impossible to have a knowledge on it. Meanwhile, all the other ontological knowledge is based or “enframed” according to the framework of the idea of “being”. On the other hand, all the images of representations of being are historically and accidentally filled up with the enframing way of or the technique of the epoch. So, we all are in such a world of epoch, namely in *Dasein*. There is no way out!

The entire philosophers search for a way out of this cage for thousands of years, since Tao’s principle of the unknowable, since Plato’s inquiry paradox until Descartes, Kant, Hegel and Husserl’s reductions. Heidegger considers technology as the creative and transforming way of thinking equipment over our world, *Dasein*. Technology is the connection between human being and nature in general, or between subject and object; and truth is appeared and concealed within the power and danger of this connection. In this sense, technology is an “enframing”, *Einrichtung* (standing-reserve), a contrivance, an arrangement *instrumentum*. So, resolving the problem of technology of time would reveal the truth of being. This actually is the most extremely complex problematic for the intelligence prisoned in the cage.

Heidegger rises up this solution from Aristotle. Let’s glance at Aristotle’s own conceptualisation in a spot. According to Aristotle, the rational side (*logisticon*) of *psyché* is consisted of two parts regarding the object. One part deals with *genos* –the things those necessarily so, and the other deals with *symbebecos* –the things those

accidentally so. The former’s objects are available in nature, and their principles are derived from the object, the latter’s objects are need to be created, not already exist, and their principles are derived from the creator agents. The cognitive faculties (*dianoethikes arêtes*) of the first part that is theoretical are *nous* (reason of philosophy) and *episteme* (knowledge of science); of the second part that is practical, are *phronesis* (ethical, practical wisdom) and *techné* (artistic creation). They all serve each other, and *aletheia* (truth) is the result of their total functions. Nevertheless, the power of decision (*proairesis*) for final, practical action is not one of the *dianoethikesarettes* because it depends on the habits of a singular personality, not on the general truth, which was a result of virtues, “praised habits”. If a person develops his power of *dianoethikes arêtes* (the cognitive faculties), reaches at *sophia* (theoretical wisdom), then his *psyché* is completed as a human, his *proairesis* (decision) would be a praised habit, a virtue to. [4: 1139a-1141a]

So, if we are interested in the way of creation of truth, like Heidegger, *episteme* and *techné* naturally gather a primal importance. Though Heidegger is a great master of Greek interpretations, he had chosen an over simplified way by picking up these two words [3: 13], and been chary of his interpretations. Heidegger is actually quite far from appreciating the idea of reduced totality of human *psyché*. Although, for Aristotle *aletheia* is based on the totality of *psyché* with all the cognitive faculties, *psyché* is in a reduction too, because human *psyché* reduces its experience to its rational side, to “knowing”, as different from animals. This was the earliest and first step towards Modern science, before Kant’s Copernican revolution, which reverses the fetishist, anthropocentric relation between the observers and the object or men and nature. But, after all of the Aristotle’s success, what was the way of having a

totality of *psyché*? According to Aristotle, as the first sentence of his *Metaphysics*, “man naturally loves knowing”. Yes, but why and how come? How the personal habits of *proairesis* would turn to be a universal virtue? The relation between knowledge and will, between truth and *telos* (end), which was (might purposely be) missed in Aristotle, had already been set up by his master Plato. Now the picture of the problematic foundation of human *psyché*, in the same sense, of human civilisation as well, can be completed by Plato’s contribution:

It is well known that Plato is the founder of systematic philosophy, namely the technique of self-creative thinking in a great philosophical, scientific methodology. This is also generally accepted as a beginning of Western civilisation. The relation between subject and object has been set up in an *erotic* way, instead of an *agapeic* one. An *agapeic* sensation, appearance or *aesthesis* is based on mutuality. On the contrary, an *eroticaesthesis* is certainly directed from subject to its object. Instead, *agape* is open to a mediacy in between, *Eros* inhabits a will to capture and conquer its object. This *erotic* obsession with conquest and certainty signifies the most fundamental turning point of Western civilisation. There is a fundamental anthropological transition in the idea of human being and civilisation. Human being, the matter of nature and natural gods, try to overcome his/her destiny, try to rescue from being subjected or victim of genesis by subjecting his/herself, and try to recreate his/herself based on a self-inquiry on the idea of what human being was, and reset up the subject-object relation.[5]

An attempt to escape from being an object of the object-subject relation that has historically and accidentally been set up already, and try to overcome your self-creation struggle is the basic problematic of the new technique or *techné*. We name this most fundamental turn as “*antropogonia*”

(creation of human), by referring to Hesiod’s book *Theogonia* (creation of gods). The transition of the technique in Plato was a messenger of a new kind of human being and freedom. All the technique of science, moral, art, philosophy in general would be different.

Plato’s *Eros* theorem can be read well in his famous cage metaphor. At the beginning of the book VII in *Republic* he sets up a stage for actors and audiences. The actors are the prisoners chained as standing up and faced the wall of the cage. Behind of them, there are some moving objects on a wall, and a fire behind the wall. The prisoners are engrossed in the moving shadows on the wall. They don’t know they were chained as prisoners, and they believe in the shadows (*doxa*) as true knowledge (*episteme*). For some talented students, the only way to turn towards freedom, and to see truth, namely the sunshine out of the cage is a philosophical education (*paideia*) with *dialektikémethodos*. In general, this is a turn from perception and natural sciences to cognition and philosophy. A talented (*dynameis*) *psyché* is able “to turn” (*periagôgês*) from the shadows, look at and participate in the lights of being (*to on*) and good (*agathon*), and “to see” (*noêsis*) the truth (*aletheia*), to uncover and recognise the cognition of being. [6: 518c]

The talented *psyché* belongs to *philosophos* who love to be close (*philia*) to wisdom (*sophia*). The nature of his *psyché* is *Eros*. In the mythology, “*Eros*” is the sons of *Penia*, the goddess of deficiency and *Poros*, the god of expediency. He is naturally close to expediency and perfection, like beauty (*kalon*) and good (*agathon*) while he is deficient in them, and has a tension in the middle. He is neither a god nor an ignorant. His *pathos* in the middle towards wisdom (*sophia*) is falling in love with beauty (*philokalos*). [6: 248d, 216e-217a] His technique is *dialektikémethodos*, to reconstruct or recall the knowledge of the



question and answer so as to awake the psyché. [6: 309c] Reconstruction of knowledge of the problematic point needs to have the knowledge (*episteme*) of it in advance. Additionally, its knowledge is not perfect, not in order, concealed, unclear (*asapheia*), it needs to be unconcealed, to be clear and pure (*sapheia*) so as to reveal truth (*aletheia*) by distinguishing it dialectically from untruth. [6: 510a] Finally, the *techné* is a reconstruction, a creation (*poiesis*). *Philosophos* is not beautiful himself; his beauty is originated from being a mediator to reveal the truth of being via his personal self-creative thinking. As it is true for any art piece, beauty of perfection is reflected on the psyché in a self-creation, instead of the ontological matter of the art piece. Art piece is only a symbolic form of a language system.

Creating or reconstructing a *psyché* and a state (*polis*) has the same path with three virtues: Wisdom (*sophia*), courage (*andreia*) and self-restraint (*sophron*, harmonious participation); and justice (*Dikeion*) is the common target of a *psyché*

## HISTORICITY OF „TECHNIQUE“

As we have philosophically exhibited, Plato too has the ideal theory on the definitions of “technique” and “human”. But historically, what does happen when *andreia* (courage) of soldiers or *sophron* (necessities) of bourgeois governs the city, instead of free inquiry of *logisticon*? Today we have such an experience over the history of two thousand five hundred years after Plato so that politics is a subtitle of economy, instead of ethics that determines the laws of self-creation. The much rational and conceptual negotiation is mastered the much irrational fragmentation and destruction is inclined. “*Summum jus summa injuria*”! [7] Theoretical inquiry of implicit virtues does uncover and explicate the

and *polis* (state) for perfection of unity, namely for universality of human being and human civilisation. If the logical side of *psyché* ménages the other side, namely the survival, animal will and anger (*thymoeides*), and the necessary, addicted, vegetal desires and needs (*epithymetikon*) (like, food, sex, etc.), than, wisdom respectively determines courage and self-restraint. Logos creates a harmony, and everything proceeds their original ways in justice. The key point is education policy of state. It creates mutuality between self-creation of soul and state (gods). The unity of principles or ideas of sciences as a methodological framework would make gather universality, a meaning, an understanding over the idea of technique of self-creation, self-revealing of truth, and *vice versa*. [6: 423a-445e] Solidarity on justice and truth, and love of wisdom (beauty and good) goes with freedom of soul, and creates free man or woman who is equal with the king, who does obey none of the authorities, except his/her own logical authority, in a difference with animals, slaves and ignorant masses.

irrational, destructive side of human *psyché*. Rational self-inquiry arouses libido too, and desires become greatest enemies in a vicious circle. A cognitive question “why should I pursue self-restraint and reason” may turn to an empirical question “should I pursue self-restraint or justice; why should I not to steal or make the others obey my desires, etc.”? The horrifying history of colonisation, economic-military World wars, post-colonial globalisation can be read as the Hegelian concept “unhappy consciousness”: Being locked in the enemy, which is a desperate vicious circle of self-creation. For example, German science, art and philosophy were at the top level of the World at the time of Hitler. Hölderlin’s poem can be read just in

an opposite of Heidegger's read: "Where you find a saving power, groves a danger also". Consciousness can develop an advanced blindness.

An error theory of the ideas of "human" and "technique" has been expressed well with Marx's concept "alienation". If there is not a relation between the subject agent and its produced object, then this relation in an action doesn't help to recreate the actor subject. Reproduction of human life naturally and dialectically inhabits construction and destruction, unification and alienation of human *psyché* together. [8: 103] The aim of an action of a poetical creation of *techné* was to create a beautiful action so as to exhibit the truth of the action as a being. Therefore what is created in this *techné* was the actor him/herself. In philosophy and science, the act of loving wisdom and knowledge is a love to pursue theory for theory (not for profit), and this act turns philosopher and scientist to an art piece; they autonomously produce themselves by producing their objects. Philosophical *techné* produces a harmonious unity of the faculties: knowing, desire and action. Otherwise *techné* produces heteronomy, slavery by fragmenting the faculties. As Marx thinks, history of civilisation is a history of alienation too. Because we don't simply produce the things of inferior structures, we produce instructions of superior structure too. What we produce becomes our master, and determines our subject-object game. We lose our control over the institutions we produced. This is the cardinal factum of the historical developments. [9: 23] In this sense, the masters of the Modern technique, the bourgeois too become an object of their action, they have been alienated too.

What does distinguish Modern technique and alienation in a dialectical sense? Heidegger gives an exact ontological definition of Modern technique. The dialectical alienation, or as Heidegger said,

"enframing" as the meaning of technique, becomes the common factum of the Modern era. Human being has been enframed within the shadows in the cage, stuck in darkness, enframed themselves in their enframing technique. They have focused on "becoming" processes (*genesis*) of shadows, instead of truth of "being", try to reserve and ménage it. "Enframing" has established itself in the Modern idea of object, which is called "*Be.stand*" (being-reserved) in German. In the Modern technique, everything is ordered to stand by, and kept ready for further ordering. The attitude of Modern subject towards its object is attacking. It is interested in catching and gathering the truth of natural processes so as to store and ménage the natural, social forces. People is recognized as labour force, a mass of marble as a statue, a river as a generator, etc.. Though the Modern technique takes its objects as an instrument, and deals with it as a storable, objectifying, quantifying, manageable material, the word "*ob.jectum*" in Latin, originally means "stand over against", which was "*Gegen.stand*" in German, simply means "being-there" as it should be, instead of "being-reserved". [3: 17]

Heidegger's interpretation is not the whole picture of the history of "object". Even "*Gegenstand*", which is the Medieval meaning of object, is the reason of its Modern meaning: "*Bestand*". The Modern idea of *objectum* has a full forced determinist power, empowered by the Christian idea of "*hypothesis*". In general, "being" as a universal term is named *ousia* in Greek. Through the theological reconciliation of Christianity and Roman polytheism, the equality of three Gods with the One needed to have a rational explanation. Then, "*ousia* has theologially been divided in three *hypothesis*, three *substance* or three *subjectum*. [10: 228] Therefore, "being as it is" has been divided and turned to be an invented *objectum*, which had "been put standing over against"

*subjectum*; and then being a subject in a society, even being exist as a *substantia* has been needed to be recognized by the Church. The subject category has been decorated with some divine powers as *essentia*, and the rest has been pulled out of it, and threw on front of its feet as *existentia*, *objectum*, and stands for a divine order. So, being-reserved is so close result of it, as close as one thousand years. Here is the Modern subject who sees himself in a privileged, on top of a

determinist relation with its object. He has taken over the destiny of his relation with truth from Gods but in new divine role. This strict deterministic relation doesn't let the truth of being be revealed. The determinism in the Newtonian mechanical physics, colonisation, slavery, missionary and industrial revolution are some immediate results of the perspective of Modern enframing technique.

## POSTMODERN TECHNIQUE

Critical reflection on drawing a line between in – out, or being under a certain amount of stress for identification over the differences between in and out creates such a conceptual alive universe that any intelligence directly finds the truth of itself in its dialectical relations. Being aware of the line drawn by your limits is to know thyself, γνῶθι σεαυτόν as it had been written at the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. On the contrary, a total identification of differences between in and out is the definition of paralysation of an organism. If the ready-made conceptual constructions of the general ideas and values of a civilisation completely cover a natural, human intelligence, then it is paralysed, and becomes an alienated, artificial intelligence like a machine.

Historically, the Postmodern transformation of technique and its alienating results are the continuation of Modernity. By the end of the Middle Age, there was the famous bloody Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) between Catholics and Protestants, which had created a sharp alienation in Europe. Authorities had been invited to find a solution. Theoretically Descartes' *Cagito* experience had satisfied both universalism of Catholicism and individualism of Protestantism. Descartes' wrong but breakthrough solution over the religious problem had participated the end of

Middle Age, and the beginning of Modernity. We are also in a deadly, global alienation process today, and our study is based on some new *Cagito* meditations. As Descartes asked, we ask too: How can we know that our senses did not stimulated by a Demon?

Today we rightly deserve to direct this question to everybody at a much higher level. People lives almost for eight hours in a screen, eight hours sleep if stress allows, and the rest is for consuming – producing machinery job. Our brains are constantly under a stimulation bombardment. Art is a subject of consuming and wellness. Science is a subject of profit and control, namely of hi-tech. People have no an ideal "Soul" model, a concrete God or a merciful King so that one can directly be in a mutual relation with their face. Today, state is faceless; we don't know who they are. They supposed to be an ideal, lawful general intelligence. Governments are the manipulating masks of the states, and people don't know who is behind it there? Sometimes, they are obviously a devilish demon doesn't hesitate to be seen so. There is dark gulf between governments and the voters.

Our institutions or super structures of our own civilisation are out of control, as Marx had defined alienation. Our jurisdiction system, economy, family values,



religion, citizenship, they all have been badly manipulated; they become a big lie if you like to say so. This is the pragmatist mass market culture that consumes the others. It is almost the same for Istanbul and Hong Kong, for Baghdad and New York, For Paris and Marrakesh. Our institutions have already lost the connection with truth; anything goes and we individually cannot chance this run. There is no room for recreating our institutions. Our personal inner-struggle for freedom is desperate too. The whole population of countries are the subject of taxation, and victims of bank credit system, so that banks are proud of their massive success. Citizens were born within a big debt. There is not any personality that people could ask for justice by trusting in some basic principles. "Justice is (interpreted) in favour of power." In the mass culture, it is not possible that one can face with him/herself, and see how far he/she has been alienated from human nature. Life runs like a kind of a fast funeral ceremony. Today, the dialectical problem of freedom is neither between religions like it was at Middle Age nor between aristocrats and people at Modernity but between the whole world screen and the surrounded lonely individuals. Individuals have been surrounded by mass media, marketing, finance, plutocratic (politicians and business people) governments that controls legislature, executive and judiciary. Let's call them "Geist" but this one is an evil Geist. The tension in our world today is not between global and local but between global and individual. The local is exhausted already, what you see with local values is a made up monkey.

How can a Damon manipulate our understanding? In his Fourth Meditation, Descartes indicates the origin of our wrong cognition and sinful decisions: "*since the range of the will is greater than that of the intellect, I do not confine it within the same limits, but extend it even to matters I do not*

*understand*". [11: 42] This is exactly where Kant had warned us to be critical over the ideas of pure reason; otherwise we fall in a dialectical illusion. Additionally, in the First Meditation of his *Cartesian Meditations*, Husserl also proposes the idea of phenomenological *epoché* (bracketing in ideas, and being critical without judgement) that reduces psychological self-experience to transcendental self-experience or Transcendental Ego. [12: 26] We all are looking for a way of avoiding illusions. Today, each individual is more close to this Demon than God. This omnipotent Demon appears within a virtual multiplicity; it maximizes the whole scene around us; every piece of info indicates and serves to him, and is directed against individuals.

Virtual multiplicity is the new way of technique of thinking. Truth appears in multiple ways as virtual reality as far as it works for power, not as a real reality or truth. This is the new logic of global totalitarianism. Reconsider Heidegger's definition of modern *techné*, "enframing" of the technique determines its object as "*Bestand*" "being reserved" as storable, objectified, quantified, manageable materials of the nature and human nature as well. Today – let us call it – "postmodern technique" is virtual, and enframes and ménages the virtual reality of the appearances of being. The potency of the omnipotence Demon determines the virtual potencies, powers, instead of being itself or the natural powers themselves. Postmodern technique is experienced as financial techniques and cognitive technologies. Every part of reality can be represented as a piece of info, and can be re-storable, re-producible by an economic power. So, you don't need to spend an effort with sweat and blood for determining the natural powers, but you can determine everything by determining their determining technique. Financial techniques with cognitive technology enframe the enframing Modern

technology. One can determine a harvest of cereals by playing on the cereal market stock exchange by a financial interference with a computer full of information from all around the World; or a powerful one can inhibit a farmer to harvest some local crops by using the law of intellectual property rights, etc.. This aesthetically beautiful technique is the reason of the barefacedness of our institutions. No one can sincerely understand, and honestly ask a reason for the practices of the institutions; so, nobody can participate, justify and reproduce them with profound, free critical reflections. At least, they have no universalizable rationality because of pragmatist attitudes. Postmodern technique is in a similar situation with the Medieval “unhappy consciousness”, like in the metaphor of a high castell under a treat of the sorties of a demon over the people who desperately try to climb up the walls again and again. Simply, postmodern *techné* is duplication of Modern *techné* as enframing of the enframing techniques. Besides, it tragically runs in the name of “socialization” and “democratization”.

The problem of alienation too is shaped within this postmodern duplication formula. In the Heideggerian interpretation of Modern technique, enframing of human nature was the reason of alienation; namely, people cannot face with the appearances of the nature of human being, because the Modern technique itself enframes and destroys the appearance of truth. In another word, the Modern technique that was the creative way of revealing truth is a block itself for revealing of truth. The chance is a danger too. In the same sense, after taking the Aristotelian words *aletheia* and *techné* in consideration, Heidegger noticed the importance of the word “to turn” (*periagôgês*) in Plato’s cage metaphor. The chance to “turn” from the shadows of the cage to the lights of ideas is also the danger itself too. But this danger was the only connection with truth, and the only chance of

the Modern people who had lost the connection with truth. For him, solution is in where the danger is available. “*The danger is the epoch* [from Greek *epoché*, “the self-withholding”] *of Being coming to presence as Enframing*”. [3: 43] So, the prisoner can turn the true knowledge (*episteme*) on being (*to on*) by studying on shadows (*doxa*) of becoming (*genesis*).

However, his interpretation on Plato is exactly what Plato was against. It supposed to be a study on being, not becoming, primarily on prisoner’s being. Interpreting “to turn” with the word “danger” shows that Heidegger had totally misunderstood Plato. The truth that is revealed by a mediating thinking on an object is not the truth of the object, but the truth of the subject who is the being in a mediating self-creative thinking between subject and object. This truth is the truth of *Sophos* whose nature of his soul is *Eros* who had fallen in love to complete himself. Because of his mistake, Heidegger considered the object of creative thinking as art or piece of art, not the artist him/herself. Now, not a danger, but considering an ability of soul to turn, the two foldedness of the postmodern alienation inhabits such a potential that, people are alienated to their alienation; they have lost the way out, because they have no distinction between in and out, they are paralysed. First of all, they need to be sickened from being a fake man or woman, and then he/she would comb out the sticky ideas from his/her soul. This is a lifelong cultural psychoanalysis, and a search for a simplest way to his/her own self-consciousness.

Therefore, in Modern Technology, the lost truth is not the truth of human world or *Dasein* in general, but the truth that would be revealed as truth of the *Sophos* who has self-creative critical reflection. Truth cannot be revealed by studying on it, but by educating the talented souls. Education is not to force the student to learn some know-

ledge, but to practice of looking from a correct perspective so as to awake the philosophical talent of *Sophos*, so as to get him to turn and see (*noêsis*) the *aletheia*. It means that Modern technique of thinking has lost a kind of human intelligence who has fallen in love with revealing truth of his/her soul with full of inspirations of freedom. Postmodern technique also alienates people from all possible talented souls in them who have no idea that they had been alienated from a *Sophos* kind of human nature. This is the new environment of today that makes a

chain of slavery from all great specialised productions, and makes these people “master slaves”. Postmodern technique is a so manipulating technique that covers too much folded theoretical spheres of thinking in a multi-virtual reality. Against all these stimulations of Demon, some talented Psyches may find a self-creative way of thinking technique that philosophically showed how to look from a correct perspective, from which we too look for here.

## REFERENCES

- [1] See, “negotiation” in *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*. Volume II. Merriam-Webster Inc .Chicago (1986).
- [2] Martin Heidegger. *Being and Time*. Trans. Macquarrie, J. & Rabinson, E. Harper & Row Publishers. New York (1962).
- [3] Martin Heidegger. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. Lovitt, W..Harper Torchbook.London (1977).
- [4] Aristotle. *HΘIKA NIKOMAXEIA / Nikomakhos’aEtik*. Trans. Babür, S. AyraçYayınları. Ankara (1998).
- [5] Even though, Vedantic tradition is the first and the most fundamentalist master of resetting the subject-object causality, it was on an opposite direction, and tries to put human *psyché* back as the matter of a ready-made divine historical determinism in the cast system, instead of putting the agent freely on front of the results of an individual philosophical inquiry. Even Buddhism and Taoism were not able to get rid of their cultural boundaries. But the socio-cultural practices of the Ancient Greek cities had this inquiry freedom.
- [6] Platon. *Complete Works of Plato*. Cooper, J.M., (Ed). Hackett Publishing. Indianapolis (1997).
- [7] "The utmost right the utmost wrong".
- [8] Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts [1844], Fromm, E., *Marx’s Concept of Man*, (87-197)., Trans. Bottomore, T.B.. Frederick Ungar Publishing Company. New York (1963).
- [9] Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, F. *German Ideology*. R. Pascal (Ed.). International Publishers. New York (1939).
- [10] Edward Pols. *The Acts of Our Being*. University of Massachusetts Press. Amherst (1982).
- [11] René Descartes. *Meditations on First Philosophy with Selections from the Objections and Replies*. Trans. Moriarty, M..Oxford University Press.New York (2008).

[12] Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*. Trans. Cairns, D..Kluwer

Academic Publishers.Dordrecht (1999).