

EDITORIAL

The canonical timelessness of philosophical research can not entirely relinquish the study of the subject of contemporaneity or its corresponding phenomena; for only by confronting the topical object does the researcher experience the necessary self-inquiry. From the subject (contemporaneity) to the researcher (contemporary philosophy), a reflection takes form through self-objectification of one's place and role, the result of the research being continually questionable, as is the permanence of historical and social conditions.

If we continue to try to classify and understand the present within the framework of the so-called postmodern project of pluralism, we must take the intermediate evaluation of the past decades of integration, expansion and globalization of every sphere of daily life both as a cue to reconsider the development of the philosophical thought, its fate in new or emerging geographical dimensions as well as a cue to reconsider its behaviour in newly emerged implications between the global and the local. In this the field of knowledge is not excluded.

The awareness of the destructive logic of monological interpretations and various centralist tendencies has revived, (at the least) in the field of knowledge, the hope of liberation from the recent patterns of marginalization and the appropriations within the separate cultures. This has undoubtedly been aided by not only symbolic, but predominantly political and technological opening of borders and contacts with different 'explanations'. The encouraging aspect of globalizing the sphere of knowledge, which has on one hand narrowed the distances and created new areas of encounters between different horizons of

interpretation, has on the other hand also gradually lessened the differences between the horizons themselves.

Connecting globally does not eliminate the logic of uniformation, the same as striving for global interconnectedness does not guarantee plurality as such. While the uniformation of knowledge does not necessarily follow the aggressive patterns of subordination of the other fields of knowledge, the so-called Information Age given its own tendencies of expansion demands choice or selection (of equality). Selection through the canons, both written and otherwise, gradually narrows or 'defines' the field, the guideline of the definition simultaneously leading to its impoverishment and the principle of monosemy to deprivation of the dimensions of its sign. The philosophical sign, with its problematic abundance of non-redundancy likewise contracts in its own self-reference. So does philosophy itself, while operating with this sign, lose contact (and the advantage of the contact for further reflection) with its own, as Deleuze would put it, territory. All the while, specificity and difference, the two main criteria for the rebirth of plurality and the emergence of diverse areas of reflection, are being lost. To imagine the diversified field of philosophy as a homogenous reality does not add to a better quality of life in a world that at first glance paradoxically appears to be simultaneously both increasingly localised and increasingly globalised. We would benefit from viewing the diversity of cultures and cultural products as an area of exchange or one of diverse views that are in certain instances shared, in others contradictory.

The presentation of the diversified collection of the Italian thought, at the same time so near to us yet so distant due to 'our Mittel-European tradition' was, because of its independent development of numerous aspects of contemporary philosophical currents, a logical choice to open and shatter aforementioned moulds. In search of a different kind of a highlight into the modern times and considering the Italian (and global) situation we, on such an occasion, started with three interrelated phenomena (representation, virtuality and democracy) and based on those set three related thematic sets:

a) The mediatization of politics, the unstoppable expansion of the society of the spectacle and the complexity of placing democracy within the framework of genuine representation are phenomena that the reflection of present times finds difficult to avoid. However, their danger does not only lie in the increasing form of virtualisation of the everyday and with it the parallel shrinking of areas of political participation (certainly worth critical thinking in itself). It would seem that the crisis of politics is merely a reflection of a much wider

crisis of subjectivity: the space of consciousness as the space of reflection and criticism is gradually running out of resiliency. They lack the ability to resist not only the *Techne* capable of forming and guiding the subject's desires, but also the form of technics that is progressively merging with the world and is weaving the space originally intended as the space of realization of the subject's sovereignty.

Within these frameworks of shaping the space of the subject's realization we must redefine the relationship between responsibility and subjectivity. How can we today shape the thought of sharing, caring or hospitality? How to answer to others and for others in an epoch, where the distinction between private and public, between the economic sphere and the political one, between a self-interested act and a collective one, oriented towards building a common place, simply seems impossible and unimaginable?

b) The image revealing itself to us puts philosophy before a task of rethinking, re-evaluating, and designing the idea of reality; not only social reality, but reality as such (*tout court*). This does not necessarily compel us to fall under obscurantism of those that through the presentation of a world composed only of its images and infinite possibilities of their interpretation merely tear apart former 'readings' of the world and reality. This sort of 'obscurantism' actually abandons the whole history of intentions and concentrations on each individual project of emancipation and with it the placement of the subject within it.

Are we then regressing and returning to a renewed albeit thoroughly deconstructed metaphysics? If we here refer ourselves to a recent debate that began in Italy over the *new realism*, it would be sensible to ask ourselves, which is to be the role of the philosophical thought in the time of a renewed crisis and a renewed expectation of epochal changes. Which is to be the role of philosophy summoned by the multitudes to 'enlighten them'? With this in mind it would be useful to recollect that we are dealing with the same multitudes, which simultaneously prefer to turn away and look for shelter in outlived, perhaps even archaic ideas and explanations of the world, when faced with philosophy's polysemous answers.

How then is philosophy to confront the present crisis, be it of economic and/or 'spiritual' nature? Should it remain faithful to crisis as *krisis* as judgement – separation – choice or should today's crisis be read and accepted as an extreme situation, in which we see doubt as an unacceptable luxury, making us choose a more pragmatic approach? In short, which is the fate of the philosophical thought? Are we to return to the superior, ivory position that remains

removed from everyday happenings and is because of it short-sighted and deluded by its own luxury of contemplation? Are we (again) to opt for 'changing the world'? Are we not facing a (renewed) paradigmatic juncture that compels philosophy to thoroughly reflect on its own rules of the game?

c) Where do we dwell? This is the question with which we wish to thematize the entanglement of the local, the global and the virtual. With it we do not intend to overlook those connective elements that join us into a collective, although polysemous idea of European tradition; a tradition that is still present today – even if perhaps only behind the scenes – in shaping our understanding and practice of philosophy.

Considering what we have in common, which should the coordinates of our thrownness and historicity be today? Which should be the framework of our belonging? How can the bond between the (interconnected) owned, possessions and possessing be analysed today?

8

Last but not least, if we take into consideration the entanglement of the 'philosophical writing' and the language, what does it mean in this day and age, to philosophise 'in Italian'? At first glance, the answer seems predictable, when read in the hegemony of the English language, imposed – and enhanced – by new methods of evaluating scientific work. However, the meaning of the question is directed elsewhere: what kind of a relationship should philosophy have today towards the centre – periphery dynamics, or towards the mechanisms that organise cultural production in general? Is it true that the philosophical discourse is transforming into one of the goods the media offers, seeing that media as such is not by any rules bound to critical thinking?

On this occasion, I would especially like to thank Giovanni Leghissa and Dean Komel for their help with the content and technical design of this collection.

Translated by Špela Gnezda