

STEFANO ULLIANA

AGAINST THE  
DICTATORSHIP OF CAPITAL.  
*NEW PHILOSOPHICAL, POLITICAL  
AND EDUCATIONAL LINES.*



**AGAINST THE DICTATORSHIP OF CAPITAL.  
NEW PHILOSOPHICAL, POLITICAL AND EDUCATIONAL  
LINES.**

By  
Stefano Ulliana

Smashwords Edition

\*\*\*\*\*

published by:  
Stefano Ulliana on Smashwords

*Against the Dictatorship of Capital. New philosophical, political and educational Lines.*

Copyright © 2013 by Stefano Ulliana

Web-page of the author c/o Smashwords.com:

<https://www.smashwords.com/profile/view/StefanoUlliana>

## **Index**

[Chapter 1. Introduction](#)

[Chapter 2. A first proposal for a critical point of view](#)

[Chapter 3. For a cultural and pedagogical Revolution](#)

[Chapter 4. The moderate solution opens to that reactionary one](#)

[Chapter 5. The real solution is the revolutionary solution \(even in educational context\)](#)

[Chapter 6. Conclusions](#)

[Chapter 7. Notes](#)

[Chapter 8. Some bibliographical indications](#)

[Author's page](#)

The idea of freedom, a new and recent idea , is already disappearing from the costumes and consciences, and liberal globalization is going to be realized in the form exactly the opposite: that of a police globalization, a total control, a securitarian terror. Deregulation ends in a maximum of constraints and restrictions , equivalent to that of a fundamentalist society.

Jean Baudrillard, *The Spirit of Terrorism* (2002)

## Chapter 1. Introduction

The definition of post-modernity as the tension of the spirit towards an open and indeterminate plurality of conceptions and concrete cultural achievements may perhaps allow the development of some general considerations, with preliminary value and having the function and purpose in order to contextualize a possible theoretical critic to its concept and its practical applications, especially in educational and teaching practices and processes.

Identifying the revolutionary horizon of XIX and XX centuries with the construction of real socialism and thus establishing a line of fatally deterministic development of universalist thought that mixes in quick succession Enlightenment, idealism and Marxism, Jean-François Lyotard seems apparently to welcome and develop further, in *The post-modern Condition* (1979),<sup>[1]</sup> the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, explained by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer in *The Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947).<sup>[2]</sup>

Considering objectivity as the ideal and the result of the progressive development of the forces of economic production and modern politics, inside the transcendent and absolute horizon of the State, post-modern position unifies and identifies in totalitarian thought and action both the thetic phase of capitalism and his antithetical one, that of Marxian socialism, in its Leninist and Stalinist version. Both of these phases would be united by the emergence of the violent and constrictive universality, that firstly submits the collective action to the exploitation of nature and to the necessary and massively increase of the profits of the capitalistic class of owners and then, on the contrary, it apparently aims to overthrow the previous purposes in growing the common power of the communist society, but bureaucratically directed and organized. In either case we would see the manifestation of a desire for power and control, whose claims blatantly contradict the perspective of universal human liberation and, in socialism, even the perspective of that natural one. It would therefore be necessary, according to Lyotard, to abandon the universalistic prospect, to find a much wiser and realistic contact with partial situations and with actual movements that could autonomously govern them from inside. Only in this way – a way that apparently would make Lyotard's position similar to that of the aleatory materialism of Louis Althusser, or the situationism of Guy Debord – you might escape from that truly diabolical temptation, which ends to reverse initial positive intentions in a disastrous, contradictory and counterproductive, global result.

Following in this way the demolition that Adorno makes to the systematic Hegelian dialectic, which ethically requires the alienation of the real to itself, thus counterrequiring the reversal of alienation, Lyotard – as indeed the same Althusser – reestablishes in a Marxian way the world on its own feet, accepting the non-necessity of reversal, as a warranty for the ideal operating of the real – not totalitarian – liberation of man and nature. Then the full and entire rationality is not made from

the determining horizon of alienation, but on the contrary is established by reassuming the production central point, which alone can guarantee the expression of a common and collective joy and happiness: the possession of the production and vital center enables that nature and humanity identify themselves to the movement that develops all their expressive potential. Here then natural and human creativity come again, becoming the touchstone of the whole political and existential practice, while the dialectical relationship between man and nature and man to man rises again to immediate and spontaneous method for searching their own autonomy and freedom. Art, ecology and civilization of tolerance become forms of self-discipline of humanity, in the fight to prevent and inhibit the sliding of the whole world into barbarism and the destruction of humanity itself, when not even into the destruction of the entire life on the planet (see the publication of the Journal «Socialisme ou barbarie »).

From this point of view and along this horizon the transformation that the capitalist system was wildly compelling from the end of the Second World War was to be treated as an apocalyptic rush to self-destruction, camouflaged and disguised by the subtle plan of the media (see the critic to the “pornography of the media”) and by the obliged self-reference of the ideological capitalistic system, set by the organization and direction of a totally pervasive cultural industry.

So if the alienated real is not realized, what is likely to be confirmed is only a negation, a forced self-denial: authentically a total and comprehensive self-denial, as a revenge and residual effect of that failed achievement. In this case only the identity of the system will be able to preserve itself from the difference and from the possible alteration or transformation of the whole system of its relationships. In the other case she will lose herself and vanish. So that is what has traditionally been considered as negative – all that does not integrate, more or less knowingly, in the system – to reveal within itself the potential of the victory and the actual success of the project for a human and natural liberation. To prevent this project the system has only to declare as a form of violence and/or abnormality this prospect of liberation, using its negation of the active and conscious negative. It's in this close and self-reflexive dialectic that western states' powers are now locked in, while a separate and abstracted conception of law and legality has emerged, together with a newly authoritarian method of realizing executive powers (above all emptying of the autonomy and the democracy of legislative powers)

Consequently it is not difficult to link the first, positive, form of post-modernist critic at this form of self-reflection to French critical tradition of the '60 and first '70, engaged with French May (1968) and expressed by the reflections of Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.[\[3\]](#) The free power of desire and its irreducibility to the alienating discourse of domination and control would have inevitably led to the victory of that liberation's project, to the extent that its message would have been widely recognized and fulfilled with a rapid and radical popular diffusion. The



system would have then used a distorted and perverse form of desire to prevent this dramatic outcome: it would have used – it's using and going to use – most of all in those countries that are peripheric to the principal production centres, or in its popular classes, the images transmitted by communication media to implement consumistic and capitalistic values and principles.

So, as Adorno beheaded in his *Negative Dialectics* (1966)[\[4\]](#) the absolute, reversing in the abstract and metaphysical separation of itself, leaving only the determinate negation (of a particular negative) operating as a critical or resistant fixed point dissolving the process of alienation, Lyotard prefers to use all the critic proceeds of the new disciplines oriented to the liberation, as a pragmatic instrument, oriented and dedicated to the creation of a new horizon of meaning, able to build new meanings and existential determinations.

But Lyotard's position seems to progressively gain a turning point. Denial of the absolute and of the identical One becomes in Lyotard immediate and spontaneous affirmation of positive and joyful freedom inherent in the particular existent, therefore overcoming the shallows of pessimistic thinking from Frankfurt School, who saw the affirmation of existing only as a final and definitive outcome of a deterministic process, inevitably made by a separate and abstract metaphysical entity. The other in general then becomes the one that is particularly different, the dialectically and creatively different. So that the differentiation process takes an egemonic point of view. At the same time the contradiction, rather than remaining unchanged, is not only revealed, but most fiercely fought to avoid once more the authoritarian and totalitarian outcomes of a higher Hegelian synthesis, initially liberating. Opposition and synthesis are beheaded too, as the new form of appearance of the Absolute. The differentiation process has to gain an open horizon.

The story of the true and the real regains its earthly roots, refusing now to always be quickly plucked away and so sterilized. The method of interpretation and value is reincarnated in a subjective common project, to reopen the historic achievements of the movement itself towards an age of peace and justice, freedom and equal love, among men and towards nature. The messianic spirit and attitude then replace the apocalyptic ones, just because the latter remains the impossible abstract and a separate space of generalized and discriminatory judgment and salvation, especially being realized through the maximum of negative infinity: the final catastrophe. The utopian horizon, reconstituted by Adorno through the example of anti-classicistic music (see atonal music of Schoenberg), is then confirmed and strengthened in its nonconformist and anti-consumerist opening by the reaffirmation of the original infinite, that is creative and positive dialectical. What is intimately creative and dialectical breaks out again to revitalize the tired, apathetic and indifferent, horizon of meaning in post-modern Western societies.

Gained again the original infinite, Lyotard seems to consider only – and this is the critic due to his position, leading to unexpected consequences – the appearance for which that central principle

produces differences, expresses open differences, without any possibility of an ideal and real unification. The atomization that can result from this process would then be justified to ban what is considered – perhaps under the influence of the Freudian psicanalisis – as a regressive movement: the return of the great Mother Goddess, infinite and positive goodness. Lyotard seems therefore to remain as trapped between the rejection of alienation and the rejection of its negation, as if he had determined the irreversibility of the linearly determined process of Western societies, a process that led the same ones to their final phase of post-modernity. The end of history as an overcoming project then becomes the uselessness of philosophy itself, which no longer has a future project, but must instead fight his own reducing to the handmaid of the image (project wanted, certified and approved by cultural industry of the capitalistic ideology). Eventually the end of history is the end of every transformation's project regarding economic, social and political relationships: killing philosophy with the ideological principles of capitalistic powers (differentiation, competitiveness, selection and order, defined according to the merit criterion) thus throws away every real possibility for freedom and equality. Submission to the legality of the fittest – the dictatorship of national and international Capital – and submission to merit become the two spearheads through which the capitalist system thinks he can preserve its own hegemony of determination.

If the image then becomes – as it has become in the biopolitics of power (as differential and identification image) – its rapid spread and multiplied diffusion, within worlds one another limited, then the position of the French philosopher may not be able to make any resistance to the wind of neoliberal globalization/relocation. Without any real ideal of equality – thrown away with its stand-in (the mystic of merit, always heteronomous) his refuge within each world risks the drift of self-enclosure, together with the disintegration (extreme precariousness) of the subject (human and natural subject). In this way the critic thought by Lyotard can be inverted on itself: without that real ideal the same original infinite inevitably fold to the determinations of the fittest (the dictatorship of the Capital). Proofs of this are the many variants of right-handed postmodernism, perfectly integrated to the capitalistic system (often appropriate to make a more reactionary world). Just at the time when the rhetoric of good, open and welcoming, liberal society – Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1945)[\[5\]](#) – shows the rope, overwhelmed by the substance and the tools of capitalistic desire for violent and overpowering conquest and domain (neo-Imperialism of the Capital).

The continuation of the traditional conception of Western thought – the Platonic and Aristotelian derivation of the linguistic egemony – has only resulted in the fortification and the absolutization of the image, in its form of unique reason and in its matter of closed and bounded universe, with any future except its recovery and its radical deepening, in the multiplication of paroxysmal forms of expression and in their “natural” selection, decided by the shape of a power that seems to be mainly



selfjustifying through its negative and repressive intervention (social neo-darwinism and neo-authoritarianism).

## **Chapter 2. A first proposal for a critical point of view**

This superimposition of the image in its separated and abstract reason, with its relative and connected absolutism, is the form through which capitalist globalization claims to affirm ultimately itself, for finally realizing in the history of the entire planet Earth the traditional Western metaphysics of identity, with its eternal triad of determination (natural power, human artificial infrastructure, theological-political recomposition).

In the historical and ideal development of the Western civilization the economical phase now prevailing – with the globalization of the capitals and of the goods, with the ideological renewal of the ancient axiom of the unique world and thought in a neoassolutistic and iper-bourgeois version, with the development of the nets of communication, production and exchange of the assets and of the raw materials, with the general movement of the people and of the workers – seems in fact to constitute new conditions for the definition of an instrumental painting of reference, that develops the function of fixation and consolidation of a permanent and unambiguous image of a world society not further modified, unalterable in their determinant conditions, as if it represents the ultimate and unsurpassed level of the entire human civilization, the final culmination of his historical process (from the first collective forms of civilization, born in the plain between the Tigris and the Euphrates, to the modern skyscrapers of western megacities).

Without resistance, opposition and possible divergence in the general aims, institutions and instruments of persuasive public communication seem to focus world public opinion towards a reality that is asabstract and at the same time an effective one, the more considered with value and cogency, the more negative the effects of his speech and action actually are: they direct the attention towards a collective concept and practice, that constitute the actual picture of the separate artificial power, of the hegemonic power of humanity. The artificialisation of the world and of nature can be seen in the architectural designs of Western cities, where the eradication of natural form is the eradication of exemplarity of the natural liberty from the horizon of the human being, a form of psicological preventive counter-revolution, that annihilates the human creative image and its desire (see, on the contrary, F. L. Wright, *The Living City*, 1958).[\[6\]](#)

Faced with the ecological, economic and social crisis caused by the system system's coryphaei will reproduce the same action as the only measure and instrument of salvation, almost suggesting a kind of impure worship. In a recovery and reuse of the religious-philosophical setting which has greatly influenced the ideological axioms of Western civilization – Orphism and philosophical

speculations of Plato and Aristotle – the figure and the image of the **abstract and finishing infinity** reappears on ideological world scene as the unique rational instrument, that is able to bring to the internal determination the consciousnesses, putting together the end of the material relationship with the strategic aim of the total overcoming of natural dependence (artificialisation of life): *i.e.* death with salvation in the separate location of the complete artificial world.

Taking again the traditional form of the Christian transcendence and making her immanent, dying at the same time to nature and rational becomes the tool for the new general functional survival from death herself: so art (see G.W.F. Hegel's philosophy) and God (see F. Nietzsche's philosophy) were quickly passed at the end, and so the same philosophy does it now, while Western politics itself, now downgraded and devalued in administrative tool of economic decisions, preaches the generalized abdication to the animal forces of the free market and capitalism.

In a fatal succession the end of the first English industrialism – striking, revealing and prophetic was the critic of Mary P. Shelley in her *Frankenstein, or the modern Prometheus* (1818)[\[7\]](#) – had in fact its immediate consequence in the English and Western imperialism at the end of the nineteenth century, when resistances of the criticism of first Marxism and Nietzschean immanentism were demolished, thanks to the destructive forces expressed in the first World War. The creative movements and dialectical critical thinking of the first '900 were then quickly eclipsed in their artistic (cubism, russian futurism, surrealism, dadaism), political (libertarian communism) formations and scientific avant-garde (quantum physics), thanks to the recovery of scientific, political and theological **realism**, bringing the whole world into conflict for the second time, in the race for selection of the most suitable to serve in the role of the dominant and hegemonic nation, globally and worldwide. A realism that is continued in the ideological clash between Western capital and state-capital of the Eastern States, but found in the movements of the years '60 and '70 an ideal embankment – at political (decolonization's world movements; French May, 1968; italian movements, 1968-1973, 1977), scientific (new physics of strings' theories) and theological (Liberation Theology in South America) level – even if only temporary, unfortunately, to the overcoming of the forces that pressed for the absolutisation of the economic powers of the Capital itself, again globally and worldwide (from the '80 onwards). Having defeated firstly Nazi-fascism and subsequently Soviet socialism, as in a Hegelian resumption of oppositions, the advancement of capitalist globalisation has forced definitively, concluding the constituent process of Western civilization, using the criterion of a total and violent instrumentalization to profits for everything and the principle of a newly authoritarian order (hierarchically structured following excellence and merit). At the end of the '90, though, particularly in South America several popular movements for socio-economic and political equality have began again their process of liberation, overcoming the neoliberal governments that were the ultimative effects of the previous national dictatorships put up

by CIA and the United States in '60, '70 or '80: Venezuela (with Hugo Chavez), Argentina (with Nestor Kirchner), Ecuador (with Rafael Correa), Brasile (with Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva), Bolivia (with Evo Morales), El Salvador (with Mauricio Funes of *Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional*), Nicaragua (with the return to power of Daniel Ortega of the previous *Frente sandinista de liberación nacional*), Uruguay (with José Mujica) followed, more or less closely, the indications coming from the alter-globalist movement (Porto Alegre). In their battle all these social movements and/or States have enjoyed the support of the Cuban revolution (from 1959 onwards dedicated to the liberation of the peoples of the entire South America).

All these social movements and/or States have now to face the new three-headed hydra of the world dictatorship of Capital, led by the Western principal financial and political-military institutions: I.M.F., M.B., European Central Bank, European Commission, U.S.A. government, N.A.T.O. In the material and structural space that have to assure the growing of speculative profits the oriented and ideological, superstructural form of this dictatorship is identified by the concept and the praxis of the **necessary One, the real ideal of the new world order**.

Referring to One political reason, faith, theological and scientific explanation western ideologisation led in fact to the final conclusion the process of abstraction and separation, which marked its ancient origins, its development in the Middle Ages and its cyclical recovery in the modern and contemporary ages. In this way it has now definitively overturned and flipped the original image of a living, creative and openly dialectic power (see the Presocratics' philosophy) into a mechanical and instrumental one, which combines in itself and adds the destructive aspect of its civilization – the old *Ares/Mars* – with its apparently transformative and productive function – the old unity between the exchange capacity of *Hermes* and the virtue of simulation by *Apollo*. The new negative finalization – negative of the previous positivity and determination of the original infinite – exhibited by this equally negative horizon of thought and action – as a new *Athena* – so has the appearance and positive illusion brought by individual and collective self-exploitation, which – as novel *Atlas* – can carry on their shoulders all the weight of the new world, that is now in a different way widely opened. In this way, in fact, the true opening of infinite was replaced by the fiction of an image, an idol. The weight of the new world – the classic world – brought within itself the necessary negative effects of its negative settings – the cumulation of dispossession, exploitation and alienation (with their related violence) – as well as the expectations of an open, vital conversion and of an happy and collective transubstantiation, related to the previous originary practices, now no longer achievable, but only disguised (*i.e.* remember Eleusinian mysteries). In this unbreakable circularity – the traditional circularity that is present in the Western conception of **sacrifice**, which is implemented in its evolutionary history by the practice of civilization – the dark and hidden divine power – the ancient *Artemis*, separate and destructive Goddess – is apparently

reversed in the arrangement of a positive intellect and will, because they both actually – like a new *Apollo* and a new *Zeus* – reproduce a **patriarchal order** in the world, that now in its new version combines to the original Orfism the evolution of the Christian tradition and, from the beginning of modern times, the technological engagement and the separate decision-making power (in accordance with the transformation of public powers towards political and institutional **plebiscitarism**).

In this context – that is theoretical, practical and productive – **self-exploitation** (as the contemporary form of sacrifice) rises as the central element and the essential function of the capitalistic system: it allows that the alienation – that is necessarily and continually requested by a cultural and political horizon that holds the heteronomy as a fundamental and basic criteria – can be recognized as the unique mode of selection and of improvement of one's own existential condition: a path and an access to the integration and to the social stratification of the tasks that the capitalistic system realizes. The necessity of alienation is not lived as a mean for a self-denial, but rather than as a *viaticum* of salvation for the social elevation, again in a secularized version of the traditional religious salvation (see T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 1651).[\[8\]](#)

As a way which carries out to the new salvation self-exploitation easily accompanies that animal power that can not be eliminated, under the penalty of dangerous and uncontrollable shocks: the reflection and fear related to a common danger. The emergence of a common enemy to the order and logic of the bunch guarantees – as a left wing – that required elevation, which is otherwise brought to completion thanks to the same right wing of self-exploitation, thus establishing a perfect mechanism of self-empowerment, based on exclusion and even on the elimination of the other and/or different, with an identification to **the logic and order of slavery**, judged as the most perfect way to oneself freedom and to open and subsequent psycho-social rewards. In this way it appears that **banality of evil** – H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem – A Report on the Banality of Evil*, 1963[\[9\]](#) – that is commonly recognized in one's continued and normal proactiveness, or that is titillated by illusory dreams of social progress, while the end of humanity surpasses fast, obscuring rational, natural and environmental existence.

The environment and its ability to support the human species and other natural species is asking us to revolutionize also that moderate way of thinking, which goes under the name of **sustainable development**. Here, in fact, the negative and blind use of the concept of purpose, obscured in its primary ecological and social determination – it locks us the open and aware vision of the alienation imposed by the same concept of sustainable development (profits must work with nature and human exploitation) – is forcing us to compact ourselves in an animal way, within those boundaries and limits which are already the reason for the crisis, not yet its overthrow and its solution. In the concept and in the praxis of sustainable development capitalist alienation is not, in fact, put into

question, but only moderated by the conservation of the support of natural and human energies. In this setting the conservation's concept is considered in a conservative, not revolutionary, way. It is in fact the abstract separation fielded and radicated by the absolute artificial – necessarily free from any conditioning – to constitute the positive reason of that amorphous unity without direction through which it qualifies usually negatively the natural and collective power (an alien rationality). But preserving the absolute artificial of capitalist ideology it implies again the concept – the concept and its related practice – of Nature's body as negative, such as a material mass, devoided of any intelligence. A conception which comes directly from the very distant religious and speculative origins located into Orpheism and Platonism. But it is such a Nature that can and should be balanced in that tradition by a special torsion, which turns the disability – the detachment from the penetration of the sacred original, and from its self-centered development – to the greatest power: the power to create with images and reason. In this way the negative is reversed towards the positive: the amorphous and collective nature turns and transform herself into an identifying/locating and mutually dialectical reason. From this point of view the development has always been sustainable, as it has always managed to create **a plan for a division**, which has turned upside down every negative affect into a proposed positive. There is therefore no unsustainable development, into this logic, because it would amount simply to a lack of development, the lack of the possibility for this plan of division (and, most of all, of support). Without this plan of division (orfic and platonic one), in fact, it does not establish nor the concept of Nature as negative, or that of Reason as positive. In this conception Nature and collectivity have to remain without any doubt a supporting matter for the general purposes of transformation of Reason. (from an alien razionalità to a proper rationality).

This plan of division is to allow **the separation and the communication** between the vertical management and control functions and those of material production, which are also taken inside and standardized to the general system of the organization. It is not difficult, then, to consider the development of the main currents of Western philosophy – Platonism and Aristotelianism – and the sciences that they has brought to life as a sort of continuous and progressive refinement of the concepts and relative praxis of **self-denial** and **alienation**. Their tradition have been denying **the original power of infinite life** – her continuous creativity and her interdialectical ability – and have been translocating it in an abstract and separate world, to guarantee and justify through an alienated image the power of the human species (really, the hierarchical superstructures of social domination and control). It was the reason as understanding to enable this step, while transforming and turning downside up – with a translation and deviation – the originally opened infinite into the human concept of a closing and limiting God (for a closed and limited, unique, world). Here the **necessary and ordering One** comes to its birth, becoming the touchstone of thinkability, organization and

finalization of the entire existing entities, which are now debtor to it of their own birth, as well as their own death.

As the establishment of the civil becoming through the self-denial and alienation builds God through the functionalization and manipulation of death, so the original cult in the great Mother Goddess is covered and canceled, along with all its mystery cults, by the imposition from above of the scheme of the Olympic gods, which intertwines in the process of the new classical civilization the combination between the warlike engine (*Ares*) and the replacement of the original reality, practiced by the couple exchange–simulation/rational imagination (*Hermes/Apollo*). From this moment the **original infinite** – which is both creative and dialectical (natural and rational) – is first transformed through a diagonalization into an abstract finishing infinite – it is the **Orphic position** – and then goes back to being recognized at the beginning of philosophical speculation with the **Ionian philosophy** (Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes) as a rational image of infinity – so still creative, but now doubly dialectical, both horizontally and vertically – then be resumed from the speculations of **Anaxagoras** and **Empedocles** and eventually confronted and removed – at least according to the new ideological appearance – firstly by the setting of the philosophy of **Plato** and then by that of **Aristotle**, which encodes the final determination of the closed and limited world through the perfect and complete **principle of the act and of the potency**, that is subjected to it.

The upper reference to the principle of the act then extended from antiquity – with all the dogmatic decisions of Christian thought (from **Augustine** to **Thomas Aquinas**) – the theological, political and natural constitution of the world into the post-classical and medieval Europe. Later, during the transition that defines the opening of modernity, secular rationalization of this same horizon (**Descartes**) in an ethical, religious and political sense will involve the inclusion of the fundamental instrument of clarification – in an hidden recovery of the Orphic tradition – and of **the dialectical distinction between entities** (*res cogitans, res extensa*), which has distant platonic origins.

At this point the modern world in its most properly human dimension seems to split itself from the natural plant, which had instead been reopened by the concept and practice of the **rational infinite** of **Giordano Bruno** and **Spinoza**, without forgetting about the influence of the next vitalists in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Again considered in its creative and fundamental function, it is reincorporated in the human world through the research and the imposition of the so-called **laws of nature** (universal natural necessities). Having been reencapsulated in the closed necessity emanating from the traditional concept of One – indeed necessary and ordering form – the infinite natural reverts back to the basic condition for the rational affirmation of human freedom (**Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel**), so overcoming the romantic perspective, able of renewing the sense of the infinite in its original prospective.



The struggle between **positivism** and **marxist** or **nietzschean** critics of the existing world – of its socio-economic and cultural organization – opens the triple birth of contemporary world. The first and the second world war, the next ideological tension between the Western capitalist world and the Eastern communist world mark the stages of the progressive advance of **globalization** towards its ultimate and final goal: the establishment of a system of Being, where, first of all, there may be **an essential separation, between freedom and necessity**. Along with this separation the axis that ensures the transformation of the latter into the former is made out and is placed in a central position, where it turns downside up. The **turning of necessity into freedom** makes the amorphous unity and the blind purpose of Nature to emerge again. This unity and blind purpose – a real neutralization of the critic reason – again dispossessed of their form and their smart purpose, become the basis for the uplifting of a standardized human rational intelligence (as it can be seen in academic and scientific Western universities). In this way the exploitation of Nature becomes the *condicio sine qua non* for human freedom. But human freedom is – in the system that historically has been coming out – the final arrangement and organization of the existent, according to the criterion of capitalist profits' maximization. The economic system that supports nowadays the survival of human relations in the Western capitalist nations – to continue to reproduce itself without solution of continuity – needs the continuous and constant sacrifice of the subjects (human and natural ones), the transubstantiation of natural goods and human lives in merchandises, determined in their replacement value of the integral sum of human and natural relationships (**relationships and ways of natural and rational creativity**). In such a way the ancient principle of the equal and loving freedom is replaced by the emotional/rational criterion that presides over the conformist logic of the herd (thus giving birth to the corporation form in institutional life), while the instrument that always presided over the free self-affirmation – the singular and collective self-determination of the democratic process – capsizes and overturns itself in the form of self-exploitation, so obeying the criterion of the dominant socio-economic group, which is able to determine heteronomously reasons, means and purposes for every subject.

The economic, social and political order, that is predetermined by the hierarchical setting imposed by Capital, becomes the new divine standard, which allows the creation and transformation of natural immanent necessity into general human freedom. Of course, the general and apparent openness of this human freedom hides and conceals within itself – like a dark and evil cocoon – the hierarchical organization of the real enjoyment of this same freedom: here the social pyramid is equally narrow, steep and fierce in its exclusions and selections, though apparently open, friendly and benevolent it shows on the outside, for purely rhetorical and persuasive (ideological) purposes.

What breaks and tears then this veil of Maya, designed to secure the continuation of Western civilization as unchanged? And, how does teaching perspective wanted by this system change, as a

security for its convinced maintenance by the new generations? To respond adequately to these questions and to envisage a solution to the intimately contradictory and destructive problems imposed by the capitalist system itself it is necessary to open a suitable set of reflections, capable to turn again upside down – in a Brunian and Marxist sense – the reversed and built downside up capitalist world, built in its history by the progress of Western civilization.

### **Chapter 3. For a cultural and pedagogical Revolution**

It's war – which now occupies the place previously conquered by the separate and abstract infinite (the God who is the fetish of human power) and that is properly defined infinite and preventive – to tear and finally rip the veil of Maya of Western civilization. External war directed to enemy nations of the neoliberal order, that's defined in an Orwellian way of thinking “humanitarian war”, and civil war against its own people, put in place to eradicate any possibility of real right to freedom and equality for its citizens, often implemented by authoritarian means (use of legality released from the right, and bowed to the logic of the economic and institutional stronger powers, use of the cultural and ideological traditionalism and national identitarism) and by the control of the media vehicles.

While previously the instrumental use of war – think of the reminded function of *Ares* in Greek classicism – was functional to remove and replace the archaic mentality, rather linked in certain agricultural and pastoral or commercial contexts – think of the Minoan archaic civilization – to the inseparable practice for the immediate peace and collective justice, but remained limited, as an hidden motor, by the civil alliance between the activities of commercial exchange (*Hermes*) and the activities of political self-glorification (*Apollo*), now the war has been assumed in the sky of an hegemonic and absolute principle, so imposing a total militarization of the entire cosmos, which is now totally subordinated to it (like an aristotelian general). The absolute image of politics as a mean of resolution, for the most part peaceful and adequate, of the internal and external problems – image that is dear to the rhetoric of the classical tradition – now apparently turns upside down in that of the preemptive removal of the enemy, both internal or external. Really, this apparent transformation has nothing conflicting with its own premeses and with its own purposes: in fact born as a desire for power and conquest, Western civilization since its distant cultural roots proceeded to build – gradually and with continuous resetting and thematic enrichment – an imaginative and rational appropriate exclusion and, thus, elimination of every enemy or opponent. Now globalization is definitively realizing these premeses, resulting, however, a split between a previous ideological appearance – the rhetorical persuasion of an open society, which is to be inclusive and welcoming – and its substantial reality, represented so tragically by the effective and efficient pursuit of its

military and totalitarian objectives (subordination to capitalist exploitation of natural and human resources of the entire planet). This split is now reducing for the benefits of the militaristic and totalitarian component, through the manipulation of the current economic crisis, which takes away legitimacy and space to the previous rhetorical illusion.

It is still this split to set an insurmountable contradiction and to generate the essential problems that afflict the educational systems of Western countries. And that reduction also increases their explosion. Therefore, the solution of these problems – bullying, indiscipline, cognitive disaffection and moral disengagement – must be found first of all in a cultural and political revolution, which must be conducted before out of our classrooms, on pain of its complete ineffectiveness and total defeat. It must focus on the reconquest by the parents of our students of the awareness of the indivisibility of their own and other people's freedom and equality. And it must be then conducted within our classrooms, because it is from the future that we can build now that will depend on the future of human and natural life on this planet. Most importantly, then, because it is only the direct and immediate method that is triggered in the recapturing of spontaneous and self-determinative process that is the winning solution to the general cultural, political and educational problem and thus prevents such a conquest can or should be delegated at performed procedures from outside of our classrooms, or imagine they can come down from above, in an institutional and controlled way. Autonomy doesn't come from eteronomy, anyway. Especially since the control exercised by the capitalist scholastic institutions may be directed either towards the mere and simple neutral confirmation of the rhetorical persuasion previously indicated, or why the same capitalist scholastic institutions are tacking towards the hidden and latent justification of the brutal logic that drives globalization (with the criterion of a self-assertion received from an heteronomously recognized award).

Three different proposals for a solution to **the general educative problem** must, therefore, be analyzed. What could be defined as **the moderate solution**: it aims to assert that good and persuasive rhetoric of the open, inclusive and welcoming society, but does not consider the sources and the basic conditions that prevent it from objectively obtain its real and equal development. Then **the reactionary solution**, which accepts instead the objective limitations above mentioned, to carry out a brutal selection (of ethnic-religious behaviors or towards particular formations of class). At last **the revolutionary solution**, which provides for the overthrowing of the reactionary logic, that is now insistent, through the re-establishment of the principle of the equal and mutually shared liberty, through the method of individual and collective self-determination (radical and not delegated democracy).

#### **Chapter 4. The moderate solution opens to that reactionary one**

The moderate solution is the one indicated by the kind of rational and argumentative horizon, which does not require the questioning of the actual driving the linearly determinative transformation operating within the development of Western civilization: acquiring more and more of natural goods and the forced – getting tougher, meticulous and organized – subjection of every human subjectivity. It does not require either disabling and replacement of instruments through which the same transformation has come realizing: the destructive capacity and that of conquest put up by the instrumental finalization of everything.

In this case neither the natural processes of alienation, neither those of social hierarchy and functionalization are not affected: here the State retains the exclusive domain of internal and external forces, the coinage and the cultural training, through which the expression of the purposes of the community can – as it should – implement and lead to fulfillment of the ideals of an abstract equality and an apparent freedom. In this context, in fact, equality is only the common submission to the cumulative logic of capital, while freedom lies solely in the abilities and virtues of mutual identification and selection upon the bases of **merit**. Concrete operational schemes, which can be placed within this lively pragmatic framework, are those formulations that accept and support the post-modern society and impose the need for **sustainable development**.[\[10\]](#)

So while the modernity had opened a horizon of sense, motivation and meaning that seemed to end with the universal affirmation of the ideal of substantive equality (not merely formal and bourgeois equality), post-modernity reverses the positive value of rational and imaginative infinite, judging that its separateness and formal abstraction could not determine if not in a negative way the finiteness who was called to define (by clarifying and distinguishing every entities in a dialectical way). This infinite could not then explicit itself if not violently – in a totalitarian way – because it was motivated by **the concept of a closed universality**. The necessary universality would have in fact eliminated any glimmer of freedom and openness. In this way, post-modernity accepts the conclusions reached by the liberal critique to systems of real socialism. But if this critique maintained, despite of its eminently rhetorical function, the expectation and the phenomenal appearance of an undisputed freedom, post-modernity seems really meant to erode all the gains made thanks to the civil and rational criterion of intellectual clarification and by the imaginative method of dialectic co-determination. Now post-modernity cancels, suspends and reverses the ideal to perfect equality in a regressive term, which requires the cancellation of intellectual clarification and the deletion of dialectic co-determination. The political compromise of Western democratic societies, that emerged after the second world war, is now deleted: the ideal of equality is overthrown by the regulation of differences, while the civil engine previously linked to the desire for emancipation collapses thanks to an apparent lack of distinction of roles and perspectives (with

a hypertrophic plasticity of adequacy). Without any apparent direction, without unity in the movement, the social reality eradicates all the instincts that previously had assured mutual confidence between rights and duties, to denounce all forms of higher legitimacy as a form of coercion and illegitimate duty. All carriers of socialization and of address are delegitimized in advance. Authoritarian society apparently falls down, with all its integrative institutions (schools, barracks, universities), while the disintegration of the purposes and means for individual fulfillment leaps to the eye of the social consideration. Removed and thrown away truth, morality and justice, what remains is **the disintegration of the subject and society**, a reflection of functional disintegration of nature, of her breakdown into the elements relevant to the production – and reproduction – of capitalist system. Alienation is replaced by a madness that is immediately consumable and fruitable, where the splinters of what formerly constituted parts of individual historical continuity now become disruptive effects of a far more overwhelming authoritarian compression. The same hyper-binding determination of Capital remains and indeed is in fact accentuated, which now turns into a real, immediate and direct dictatorship. The past, which can not pass, of its accumulation orients itself into the future, to integrate the parts of the world's population that will probably be more intimately close to its values of absolute commodification (see China's, India's, Brazil's and South-Africa's new middle and upper classes). The rest of the world society – in the proportion of 20/80 – is declared non-subsistent, if not yet non-existent: it will be erased from the plans and programs of integration, which is now seen as the greatest danger to the stability of the system. The fulfillment of its human rights with the enjoyment of the related natural resources would, in fact, imply the necessary transformation and the possible revolution of the system. In a short and simply way, the end of the capitalist system.

For this reason, **the theory of sustainable development** – the theory that accompanies on the side of natural image the post-modern political theory, turned instead to the new image of humanity – runs only the risk to ensure the survival of Western societies and the preservation of its ruling neoliberal classes. Especially it risks to ensure the preservation of the capitalist engine in the economic movement, that submits every existing creature on this planet to enhance profits and that, with the logic of necessity, reverses the apparent development of global forces of production in a hierarchical transformation and distribution of world working forces, so further processing the class distribution of wealth on a planetary scale.

The theory of sustainable development provides for the need to balance the engine which steals natural resources to transform them into goods at the disposal of mankind, in such a way that their distribution would satisfy the basic human rights – now and for future generations – and the conservation of the engine and organization of capitalist economy, which stabilizes the production and commercial distribution. So then linearly determined – it is the linearity of the development of

Capital strength and power – nature conservation is aimed at the preservation of the material bases of the production and distributive system, which submits Nature to anti-ecological transformations<sup>[11]</sup>, alienating and separating its organic parts according to apparent objective purposes – construction of goods and of objects (to the satisfaction of basic needs and of those which are induced by these ones, together with the realization of the tools needed to this satisfaction) – which multiply constantly the subtraction of natural substances and goods. All Nature must therefore be made available and to be transformed and absorbed into the aims set by capitalist production, while at the same time and paradoxically she must remain stable and a continuous material and energetic basis for her own self-alienation. It is here that the natural self-alienation joins, accompanies and blends with the human self-alienation, just requested by the post-modern theory, into the subsumption moved by the **authoritarian image of infinite war and global militarization**. As if the feudal system would have taken its revenge on the total and definitive system of modern capitalist productiveness, it is the preservation of the imperial nature in its reasons that supports the denial of nature and humanity. The theory of sustainable development, therefore, turns immediately to the practice of that unsustainable one, precisely because of the desire to maintain and preserve that subtractive, transformative and alienating engine, that is rhetorically presented as a neutral and positive motor of present and future human goods and of present and future natural disposition (conservation). As the positive post-modern theory prepares its own negative inversion – that's why reality becomes an imaging simulation – so the theory of sustainable development prepares its own negative inversion into the negative end of nature (with the absolute value attributed to the artificial disposition).

The energy problem, the problem of an ever more dizzying and exclusive finding of raw materials worldwide, the need for their processing at the lower running costs, of their production and trade, they are the terms by which **a worldwide extended ecological democracy** is really and dramatically abraded and thrown away from the scenery of world public discussion and decision. The process of **concentration of ownership** and the consequent **standardization of the major mainstream media** – with precise and certain effects on approval in the academic culture and general mental predisposition, thanks to the influences spread onto urban, architectonic and artistic forms, and in the filmic and journalistic spread of popular culture – guarantees that one side of the dominant economic and political power is preserved and strengthened, thanks to the continuous and obsessive reproducibility of the exchange between reality and imaginative fiction of existence. The taste – with identification and projective functions – for the strength and the instant power is represented at every level, along with the necessity of its ability to dominate and control, while the intensity and sensational of images replace the depth of intersubjective emotion (with the desensitization against real life appears in fact that in respect of death), the subliminal projection



replaces empathy and willingness to conscious transformation (selfishness identity encourages proprietary and selective mentality).[\[12\]](#)

In this imaginative way **the absolute artificialization of human and natural purposes** transforms definitively the fundamental anthropological pattern – the necessary connection between the theological, political and natural aspect – showing the infinity of its power in the act of its domain, of its conquest, of its control and conservation in the worldwide territory of its action and of its continued operation. It is not difficult to see, therefore, how this arrangement has, then, deleterious and harmful resulting on the psycho-social context and on that educational one.

The soul of world dominant politics crushes in fact that of the society, which reacts immediately for the survival integrating itself into the dominant pattern – open to the need for domination – and so forming a general purpose for the collective will of full and conscious (universal) adequacy. In its proper way the soul of the society projects and reverses this univocal conformation within public institutions – even under the continuous stimulation of the ugliest media examples, capable of provoking **the deepest reactionary spirit** – thus claiming for **the absolute discrimination for merit** and for the relative evaluation for every operator (cultural, public and civil ones). Here at last the epiphenomenal criterion of merit – in this historical moment virtually undisputed – appears. The global criterion of merit is in fact on the one hand showed as the principal selecting tool, and on the other hand, however, is concealed and hidden in its heteronomous origin and in its own heterodirectional purpose.

As if we were at this historical moment in the last and final phase of secularization and materialization of the theological (and political) modern horizon, the separate cause of the accumulation of Capital and the otherworldly purpose of its profit disappear and reappear as the simplest cause and purpose of its politics, society and institutions. The ancient and medieval **merit** requested by the grace and divine Providence is now converted and transubstantiated into the very Calvinist **need for success**, success at any natural and human cost, which can be immediately obtained and reached without resistance or opposition. Through the canon of success politics satisfies society, makes responsible and inform the institution that merit must be recognized, to bring to fruition the desires and purposes of the society itself.

For this reason the children/pupils of schools in the advanced capitalist countries can not escape from **a contradictory tension**, between the weight of the ultimate recognition of a merit that is asked and imposed on them and the difficult, selective, discriminating liberation that this necessity – if recognized and internalized – in power guarantees. A truly superhuman and continue tension, which animates negatively every initiative (that are therefore not spontaneous, nor creative or dialectical) of the learners themselves, who remain – however and always –the investment capital for the expectations and – more often – of past or current frustrations of their parents. With a need

for recognition and empowerment which is reflected by the boys and their parents up to the teachers and the entire educational institution.

Here appears the contextual and methodical **opposition** between **the pedagogy of success** and **the one that lives of creative and dialectic spontaneity of the learners**. From the first school classes the pedagogy of success inhibits from the beginning the ability and the expressive (natural and rational) power of the learners, turning them into their opposite, into a reflection of conformity, imposed on the parents themselves: learn how to make yourself a tool in achieving your purpose. Initially a tool for themselves, becoming later – growing – an instrument for and in the hands of another one.

In this case pedagogy of success opens in capitalist societies, with that first phase of alienation, the pedagogy of working-classes, the preparation of detachment (then **self-detachment**): an self-detachment from oneself and proper natural and rational rights. With their transferring to the causes and purposes of the upper and outer adult world. It is clear that this original self remains to establish the possibility of a nostalgic reminiscent of the time of freedom, that is now impossible, or it can become the basis for further processing and for a complete revolution of our educational system and for the construction of a free and fraternally equal political life and society, which can be respectful of our, substantially equal, natural and rational liberty.

**The original and positive infinity, a creative and dialectical one**, for humanity and for nature itself, so keeps open the dynamic dimension of the infinite One (that is the theological aspect), because the image of humanity itself is not locked into an anthropological scheme of conquest and domination, of control and of a necessary and preventive repression (that is the political aspect), so that the opening movement of the creative nature in general (that is the natural aspect) safeguards the dialectical relationship, which is her expression, her principle and cause (that is the intellectual and rational aspect). The dialectical relationship, in fact, holds and expresses the opening of the original creative infinity, puts it in motion around that pivot alternative – the One, in its being and not to be[13] – that is at once intelligence and rational open horizon. An horizon which is not closed, but rather liberator and not oppressive or domineering.

Perhaps, then, this is the meaning and significance of the **universality**, that the last Baudrillard – *The violence of the global* (2003)[14] – asked to be an insurmountable bulwark against the dark horizon and negative closing of capitalist and imperialist globalization. Perhaps, again, it is in this perspective that may be addressed again – for a re-enactment, extension and radicalization – the speculative proposals with pedagogical values by J.J. Rousseau,[15] I. Kant,[16] C. Fourier,[17] M. Montessori,[18] W. Reich,[19] H. Marcuse,[20] E. Morin,[21] C. Castoriadis,[22] Don Lorenzo Milani[23] and U. Bronfenbrenner.[24]

Otherwise, the closed horizon of globalization will act according to a negative logic, where the need to avoid the possibility of a destructive and definitive intervention will take as its own actual image a positive, even if distorted and unjust, purpose, which is declared inevitable because apparently needed (according to the actual logic of crisis and its relative state of exception).<sup>[25]</sup> In this theological and political perversion, acting in any context of ecological or human crisis – and it is really an actual perversion, because the good is achieved by an evil – the act of domination and absolute control of the general purposes through **a totalitarian instrument** – that is continuously testable and modifiable, because of its pre-orientation, pre-finalization and predetermination – becomes essential and indispensable. On this side of the problem the negative logic, imposed by Capital through the current financial and economic crisis for debts, establishes a totalitarian instrument, thanks to which the separate and abstract world of capitalist determination is shielded from any interference or organized opposition.

In the so-called **knowledge society** cultural control, public opinion and, thus, the proper training of teachers become the first step of a process, which hopefully and in a predictably way – through the proper legislative constraints – will take place in the building of a pre-oriented and predetermined society. Builder of tools or final reference tool for those who must serve as secondary and practical instruments, the academic professor and the school teacher become together the central pivot for the training of the whole society. While the academic professor retains his freedom of research within the limits established by the capitalist ideology (with few exceptions), the school teacher becomes instead the term of exclusive reference to that self-negative axis previously indicated, thus becoming the lightning rod of all the negative situations – of failure, or lack of motivation, or even amorality – that are possible in the scholastic development. Instrument to the self-instrumentalization of the learners, he begins to be judged, evaluated and paid – or fired – for his successes or failures on training (see the Italian I.N.Val.S.I.).<sup>[26]</sup> This causes the recognized phenomenon the self-isolation of the teacher, which is simply and purely a form of vital defense, but in the long run determines his actual depersonalization and the fall of his motivation to work. As the secular version of the theological *Son* towards the heavenly *Father*, the school teacher does the will of the academic professor, to die on the cross of non-recognition by the learners' parents. He is then saved and resurrects, just when his success is the image and reflection of the success of his pupils, depending on whether or not they have learned and acquired the mentality of self-sacrifice. Remembered in a perpetual future memory, he eventually rises to the sky, thanks to the *Spirit* of self-denial and self-mortification.

Then it does not become difficult to overthrow this point of view, identifying those who do not submit themselves to this negative logic – and so (pre)judged as rebels – as the hope for a different and better world. It might seem paradoxical, but the same negative phenomenologies, considered as

pathological determinations, might provide in the world of education positive explanations and tools for the edification and building of a truly better society. The failure, demotivation and the amorality – so (pre)judged – might otherwise emerge as the first denied acceptance of that alienative process, the rejection of their own self-instrumentalization (especially of that one coming from parents), a deliberate and conscious form of closure in a horizon of ignorance and arrogance (bullying) as a response of freedom to the authoritarian and segregative will of parents and teachers, who, with their repressive intervention on one hand could therefore seal and complete the negative response of the system as a whole and on the other hand induce the counter-negative response of the pupils.

It is clear that no teacher will ever accept that bullying, usually exercised against the reference models of the class or on the more sensitive boys or girls of the same one, can be the solution to the problem of education for a real freedom and equality: however, rather than to exclude the bully on the edge of the class and to protect the safety (but also the loneliness and the isolation) of the best students (or those that are the most sensitive), if the teacher should use all the potential benefits mentioned above (proceeding from a creative and dialectical setting), to implement them in the truth and goodness of a knowledge and an effective – and not hypocritical – morality (put in place because due), maybe then the same class would enjoy the opportunity to rebalance itself in a series of horizontal relations, that upheaval those vertical and hierarchical ones – built and constructed according to the aggressive, violent and exclusionary, logic, of the pack – which have as a leader the same bully. If in a certain sense it could be true that, in a so apparently and paradoxical way (really wanted), the best outcome of the traditional education is precisely the the future success in the life of this cut and determination of behavior (the aggressive one), then the persistence of these same phenomena in the contexts of the current classes can not and should not – as it is being touted in a manner that is not at all innocent – be imputed to the freedom and equality preached and practiced starting from the cultural revolutions of the years '60s and '70s, but – just on the contrary – to the desire to neutralize their potential and actual results.

Bullying is in fact the reply on sixteenth of the aggressive and violent logic of the capitalist system, a winning form of adaptation and learning – that unsuccessful is for those subjects who suffer from forms of cognitive disaffection or moral disengagement – for school-age children and youth (think to barracks life) to the socio-economic and political dominant logic, which is hierarchical and authoritarian, exclusive and discriminatory. What is excluded and discriminated against are precisely the virtues and the ability needed to build a society, that can be free and equal in relationships: a democratic society. So the cultural radical revolutions of the years '60s and '70s were precisely the preemptive solution to the problems related to bullyism or cognitive and moral disengagement and detachment, not their inoculation.

For this reason the neo-authoritarian solution – or its reflection in that neo-authoritative (with all the baggage of American derivation of tabs and operating practices and procedures) – with the preservation/selection of the best pupils, the removal and segregation of the worst ones after an ineffective training and the putting under preemptive custody/control (pharmacologically) of the elements too sensitive and/or aggressive, will certainly not cause any real solution to the current, negative effects – those which are recognized as such by the children themselves – but rather the contrary will cause that deterioration and darkening of the quality of inter-dialectical relationships, which have in the reactive and reactionary denial of the spontaneous, creative and dialectical, form their effective pathological and malignant cause.

In this way you will discover that the neo-authoritarian solution – or that neo-authoritative one – it is simply trying to maintain systematic and functional organization of teachers and schools that move along the neo-traditional axis. A conscious attempt at the start of the great mass of necessary losses and narrowness of those successfully managed. For the rest: are we or not in a generalized war (market competition)? Victims must then be beforehand accepted.

## **Chapter 5. The real solution is the revolutionary solution (even in educational context)**

How, then, can we overthrow this state of affairs and re-establish the truth and moral value that creativity only can restore the foundation and the axis of thought, social-political action and education? How can we safeguard that dialectical opening, without which every relationship of freedom and equality implodes in the fiercest and unjustified of authoritarian regimes (social, pedagogical and political ones)?

The immediate answer to these questions is: restoring in individual and collective consciousness the sense and meaning of what we mean as the infinite creativity and its free dialectical movement. Only by going through the spontaneous flow of a fraternal and equal freedom we will expand our horizon of observation, in its deliberating and practical dimensions, so recognizing and justifying an amplitude of right (and law) which is not anthropomorphized, nor fetishized, or required for the survival of the capitalist economic engine, thereby freeing in the living image of the rational and infinite open multiplicity – in its real impredetermination – the concept and the practice that reconstitute the original meaning of human thought and natural action. In this way restoring and expanding without limit, not the heterodetermination of a monolithic reason – that is the principle of a will to power and of a total and absolute domination – but rather the opening of a desire that does not want to control and conquest, but instead the mutual happiness, joy and liberation, for the whole mankind.

For this ancient reason, it is therefore necessary to reflip all directives, motivations and legal, political, social and pedagogical justifications indicated by the fatal necessity of the patriarchal and Western capitalist development, creating a new kind of ***Manifesto for a new communist planetary movement*** (which has to be anticapitalist, feminist, animalist and ecologist). In this *Manifesto* all the elements, that make up the fabric of the human and natural will, have to be taken into account and carefully considered, developed and twisted. In particular:

1) with regard to the aspect of **the fundamental theological horizon**, it will be necessary to replace the god Moloch of the necessary and ordering One with **an infinitely open One**, married with the concept and the practice of **a loving and equal freedom**, which is inalienable, in the same time a natural and rational one, present in every being and motivating (ennobling) each being (spirit of the A-theism).

2) Unlock with this substitution the patriarchal organization of Western societies, **demolishing the concept and practice of absolute identity**, which is subordinating and hierarchizing the subjective will to an objective intellect of domination and conquest (which is the source of self-transformation into an instrument, that is hetero-determined and hetero-oriented). This psycho-sociological, epistemological and pedagogical revolution needs to enter at the educational level the practice of a creativity driven by the **free desire**, rationally careful not already in that the freedom of one ends where that of another begins (see the classic concept of mutually negative liberty), but on the contrary thinking and acting so that where the liberty of the first is born, then even that of the second has her birth – for the reason why she is complementary dialectic to the first one – following the point of view of a **dialectically positive freedom**. According to a pedagogy of relationships, every authoritarianism will consequently and logically be deleted. The implication related to this revolution in education is the transformation of the same imaginative rational plan that supports the definition of the mind, of the sensitivity and of human action (**for a new epistemology and ethics**). A further consequence of this revolution will be the transformation of the teaching method, which will now have to be careful in the first place to the delineation of the historical development that exists between the classical transcendent vision and that immanent and revolutionary one (as opposed one another). To give an immediate example with the disciplines of science and philosophy, it can be developed in a way previously synchronic and subsequently diachronic the analysis of the series of problems, which radiate from the fundamental one, the relationship between the composition of matter and the forms of energy; while in the field of philosophy it may be given development to the problem of the relationship between matter and the form of the *Spirit*, precisely according to the transcendent or – to the opposite – immanent position. Other literary, artistic or technical and technological disciplines will benefit from the plot of the first two, to develop both their plan of dialectical and historical evolution, and the synchronic interlacing



between the ongoing challenges of the contemporary world. With the effect of further enlivening and bringing new ideas to the general design, of giving new movement to the initial framework – which is moving, however, by itself, according to the image of the theological-political and revolutionary natural principle – made up by the first two disciplines and by the other cultural orientations. In this way it would open a new conception of teaching, through the establishment of a series of units, which would at the same time modular, thematic, problematic and perspective. With the same **openness** that vitalizes the existing beings, this conception would develop the **critical spirit**, without which there would be no real movement and progress.

3) Given the difficulty of the design and general planning of teaching, the processing at central and national level of the plans of action for learning should engage in **forms of self-government**, which have not to fall into the false choice between concentration or separation/relocation of the powers and of educational and managerial autonomy of the different schools. The same project planning of lifelong education should then be connected with the transformation of the modes themselves, through which the process of information and democratic self-formation constitute themselves, avoiding the current functional divergence between a popular type of mediatic information and top-down imposition of a cultural uniformity. To solve these problems of coordination the general patterns, included in the plans of educational intervention (up to the so-called lifelong learning), should not only allow, but also impose the maximum dissemination of the practices of self-government and self-training, achieving self-determination in the sense of that open and mutual possibility, which only manages to preserve the creative sense of the dialectical exchange. Then the original creative spirit will merge spontaneously and freely with the real-ideal movement of anti-instrumental realization, established by those general schemes. In this way the power of the State would in a communist way dissolve itself and disseminate in the free and equal vitality of its democratic organized communities. The arrangement of State appointed to this dissolution and diffusion of power would see then the necessary creation of **academies and schools addresses**, thought and organized on the basis of regional/provincial point of view, according to the purpose of liberation from capitalist exploitation and alienation (so at the opposite of current regionalist reform made up in Western countries, based on the private and profit determination for education and training). These academies and schools would have the task of developing general research, inseparably connecting the resolution in a revolutionary sense of energy, eco-socio-political and scientific-philosophical (broadly cultural) problems.

4) Removed the traditional, rational and natural, image – that has spanned the entire history of Western ideology (from Plato and Aristotle, Plotinus, to Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, classical German idealism and the recent american renewal of the neohegelian spirit of the world) , for which the necessary order was identified and is identified, immediately and completely, with the

subordinating and alienating hierarchy, with an autonomous dynamic boost to transformation and reversal (of the necessary death into the possibility of a new life), through the manipulation of passion for the exploitation of Nature and for the justification of violence and human suffering (because the natural one was previously canceled and overshadowed by the primary necessity of that exploitation) – the new and ancient rational image supported by the open infinite One, that is creative and doubly dialectical, opens **a new psycho-social conception**, with revolutionary effects in the same restatement and redefinition of the internal functions of singular and collective mentality.[\[27\]](#) This will make it possible to move from societies based on the concrete act of searching, selecting, deleting and reverse re-integrating of the inverted negative (excluded first and then forcibly reversed), expressed through the classical function of the scapegoat (remember the image of Christ himself, who within the Catholic dogma is overthrown by the figure of a rebel to that of the eminent guarantor of the new order), to a society that rejects this form of definitive self-cancellation. This revolution, as it has been said, can not fail to have an impact both theoretical and practical at the theological level: the traditional fence of the sacred, the isolation and separation of absolute power, through which violence and human conquest have disciplined and penetrated the entire Western horizon of existence, are demolished and opened to understand the radical expression of mutual desire and mutual social acceptance, banishing and rejecting any practice of hetero-determination or hetero-orientation. Only **the practice of forms of direct democracy**, in every sphere of human activity (into the economic one, in particular), will ensure the cancellation of that essential instrument to the negation of liberty – exchanging the real-ideal movement and its order with the hierarchy – which will restore an ideal and a reality of equality attentive to the most open of the diversities.

5) The opening of the imaginative and rational horizon will then orient research, spreading it into every human subject, towards the liberation of all existing beings, canceling the difference and traditional opposition between human and natural world. In this way it will be able to recreate the conditions for common and mutual recognition (ecosocialism).[\[28\]](#)

6) It will therefore be necessary to implode the separated and linearly determinative organization in its verbal, discursive and working tradition, for a **re-naturalization of human civilization**, which will have to be attentive to the singularity of all the creative-dialectical processes, and which at the same time tries to develop **a different concept of rationality**, not rigidly measuring and calculating, aimed at the exploitation of Being for the continuous accumulation of goods and/or Capital profits. A rationality which will not be based on the undisputed transmission of the exclusive possession and the heritage of Being, but on the sharing of every relationship and the equal exchange with the existing open world.[\[29\]](#)

7) In this process of re-liberation of true and real, material and vital (natural and human), powers should be used all the most recent acquisitions and suggestions of the **counter-economy**[30] and of **a new science**,[31] completely disconnected from the interests of Capital (and for this reason censored and ridiculed by Academy).

Having been represented victorious at the end of the twentieth century as a unique entity, sole agent and exclusive purpose for a Nature, a reality and a reason that are more and more abstract, capitalist economic, social, political and scientific **Imperialism** goes now unfolding worldwide in an absolutely new totalitarian and violent way. Identity, unique necessity and sole order, embodied by the headship of profit – as a new form of the separate infinite – the form/matter of this **Empire** moves, transfigures and deports – having acquired and endorsed in an Hegelian way the antithetical tools of the previous antagonists (the Nazifascist violence of the material order and the Stalinist organic formalization of the command) – Nature at the abstract level of political reality and the latter to the upper and separate level of economic management and governance of the world. In this way science itself – in its natural, biological, anthropological and theological dimensions – is reduced to ideological forms, which are functional and adequate to the preservation and maintenance of the totalitarian vision and practice of **a restored One**, with its own absolute necessity and its absolute order (now embodied by the institutional figure of the executive president of the U.S., with its courtiers – Federal Reserve, I.M.F. – riders and judges – N.A.T.O. and Patriot Act).[32]

The Big Bang theory – the secular and modern form that best supports the traditional creative vision, where God expresses himself in the universe from the apparent nothing – the selection theory based on an intelligent and predetermined design – where life is always in the domain of a separate and abstract God, both for non-human forms and for the human ones – the concept of God as absolute identity – who precludes in the absolute negation all forms of creativity and continuing revelation, so offering the privileged battleground for new political and religious wars – are all **forms of ideologized science**, with or without the recognition of its main actors: the scientists. To the opposite, almost to revive the ancient forms of wisdom and religious knowledge, there are the creative and logical openings revealed by the new physics of string,[33] by evolutionary biology and anthropology[34] and by the theology of continuous creation and revelation.[35]

But the infinitely open God/Goddess is fought, again, in his re-emergence by the current secular forms of the ancient Olympism and Orphism (or Gnosticism and Manichaeism): now the global circularity of the planetary animal blood (raw materials, plants, animal and human beings), its renewed and continuous perfusion and sacralized dispersion – through the infinite war and the continued dispossession of the planet's natural resources – raises a new absolute power, where civilization seems to rise again, on the positive effects of the pile of rubble and waste that are

negatively dispersed. A new absolute power and a new desire for domination and conquest reassert themselves – in an infinite way – when the contemporary Orphic emphasis of Olympism – the artificial that becomes absolute – leaning in persuasion to the inevitability and necessity of the negative, which itself has previously caused – calls for submission or destruction – in a global and generalized manner – of natures, of realities and reasons, which do not bend and remain creatively and vitally irreducible to its imprisonment, its suffocation and its deliberate elimination. The spark, then and to the opposite, of the ancient creed – and its immense and unstoppable power – in an infinite life, which is creative and dialectic, where the movement for freedom is equal love, reopens the path to the regeneration of the concrete, real and true, spirit. The *Spirit* of and in the relationship.

8) Then only the **sciences of the relationship** in physical, chemical and biological field – with the discoveries and theoretical implications related to the so-called cold fusion – then into bio-psycho-sociological ones – with the new theories of natural and human intelligence – and eventually in that socio-political – with the development of new themes and settings related to new forms of energy production, economics, and ecology, ending with altermondialist texts or those of the theology and philosophy of liberation – will replenish firstly an insurmountable embankment against human and natural apocalypse and then finally start the opening of a new era of peace and justice on this planet.

## Chapter 6. Conclusions

In the current phase of economic globalization and world politics, while the space of the absolute Identical is occupied by its current communicative version, the same rapidity in the worldwide spread of communications merges with their preventive control, aimed at the refined manipulation of rational emotions, which they want to convey and seductively, repetitively or threateningly, to impose. The control of social communication at the global level, the restriction in access to informations' processing and critical comments, the construction of a world public opinion and a *consensus gentium* to the approval of pre-oriented strategic, political and economic, purposes of the global financial Capital, the pedagogical institutionalized orientation to the versatility in instrumental use (which is heteronomous and heterodirected) of one's own skills and experiences, are the cognitive and pragmatic behavior of a steel cage for our consciences and our habitual unreflective actions. The accentuation of the ideal and practice of power and potency in all spheres of individual and collective life – through the transmission and dissemination of its social image at a global level, with devastating self-multiplicative effects, unreflective themselves – resulting in amplification of the demands and pressures required to maximization of total productivity, the

multiplication, and at the same time the diversification of performances, required in the workplaces and at schools, their organized self-significance (with at the opposite a real absence of sense and meaning), the dispossession of the actual democratic decision by the ruling class of the world economic and political power, represent the progressive and deep sedimentation of the social and class division that pervades the global community today. At the same time the alienation of the imaginative production and creativity – the final transformation of the real economic basement into that financial (which accompanies the transformation of the real into the abstract) – functionally obscures the subjects – the places and institutions (W.T.O., I.M.F., W.B.) – which have self-conferred to themselves the reason and the power of that separation and of the total dispossession of the real power of the democratic world. The same monopoly of violence and exploitation, in its human and natural version, is obscured in its statement of principle and in its multiple finalizations, with the rhetorical cover of perversion and instrumental use of the sources of international law and its own organizations, places and application tools (see the instrumentalization of U.N. powers by Western governments since the first war against Irak, in 1991).

To this extent and level of institutionalized and rhetorically justified and protected violence, preserved by global media, apparent social disintegration becomes in reality a controlled and conscious planning for the domination of the creative source, in its individual and collective form, while the eradication of democratic power at the grassroots level counts as psycho-social dispossession of every thrust and/or energetic-emotional spontaneity. So while the creative source is separated into the new abstract, metaphysical sky, occupied by worldwide operations which speculates profits from trading financial markets, the human subject undergoes the full divestment of its autonomy and of the same awareness of its presence and existence in the network of world relations. Deprived of itself through the dissolution of his immanent rational and imaginative horizon, the human subject suffers the loss of power of its own operative virtues, which are brutally and from the beginning of their training – no longer only in an educational way, but also in a communicative one – transformed, inhibited and neutralized through mechanisms and behavioral patterns, which must be integrated in a pragmatic horizon of reference, that has to be absolute and universal: the general horizon of exchange and of self-alienation, preparing, enlarging and then constituting, step by step, that particular of every individual story (firstly at school and then at working).

So whereas previously the time freed from work – freed by technological innovation – became the occasion for regaining part of one's own subjectivity (reconstitution of the productive forces), in the current phase of capitalist development, totally employed time into the job means just deleting and absolute negating – in principle – any attempt to repossess that own subjectivity. For financial global Capital every human subject has to be spossessed of its own potence and power, to leave

total space and time to dominant ideological and practice overdetermination. And this is precisely due to the **identification of the personality with work**: it is thanks to this identification, in fact, that the maximum of self-dispossession and self-alienation tips in an apparent technological multiplication of one's own power (still favoured by the purposes of the subliminal forms of video-playing in Western societies, as every teacher sees in his own pupils). The man, once he is made an instrument, identifies himself with the power of the instrument itself: so making himself an instrument for the purposes of the instrument itself (and this is alienation), which were— since the initial gestation of Western civilization — the purposes of the control for the domain and the conquest. Having been self-instrumentalized, man becomes again the Lord of creation: the *dominus* of nature, in all her reality, her movements and purposes. Most importantly, thanks to the absolute artificial, he becomes the Lord of her creative and genetic abilities.

In this theoretical, productive and practical context — where negation opens alienation and subsequently to the affirmation of freedom and autonomy of the instrumental — what space does it remain for the previous democratic trend, for its political and pedagogical dimension, then for liberty and emancipation, for the structural equality of all human beings, from birth to the end of their existence? Little or any space (and time) at all. Gradually — but also very quickly (with the same rapidity of the neoliberal economic cycle) — everything that had been conquered thanks to the struggles of the '60s and '70s, both in social and labor rights, both those relating to education and citizenship, all is dismantled and turned upside down. As the desire for true and real democracy becomes the taboo of the new politics and the same formal bourgeois democracy is gradually being sterilized in its components, in the elements and tools that were the most progressive, up to the final loss of the same rational horizon that justified their creation and use, so the same emancipatory trend of pedagogy is absolutely blocked by the establishment of new projects, programs and plans for a differentiated, specialized and individualized, education. The autonomous power of decision and guidance on future life is in fact more and more absorbed in the story of determination and definition established by the neoliberal economic point of view. What's more, this same heteronomy and heterodirection — which is the cause of that differentiation, specialization and individualization — is sold as the form through which it gives substance to that will of final emancipation, with a full and complete counterfeit reason, image and reality. The same plasticity and malleability — that is the famous **flexibility** — requested for the education and training of the future higher social classes (**upper flexibility**) becomes an absolutely fantastic form of rhetorical persuasion, exercised and aimed at the same middle classes, to tickle and solicit their aspirations of social advancement, through the identification proposed between the greatness (and richness) of their own future output and the range or grade of their self-instrumentalization. The **lower flexibility**, however, remains as a reflection and a linearly determinative residue of class subordination, primarily of persons

authorized to manual activities or simply to that administrative ones. The same line of persons authorized to perform troubleshooting – problems' analysis, synthesis and contextual design – remains suspended at a limbo level, which precedes the social division that has been treated in this short article. At this suspended plan are, in fact, invoked either the propensity to solve ideological problems themselves, and the real power of their effective resolution. Into this contradiction they get caught all the operators dedicated to the economic and social reproduction, from the simple technician of industrial plants – who apparently has no constraints, because they are internal to its own working organization – to the analyst of systems in general – with a much larger number of external constraints – to the teacher himself, who always remains aware – although, it is true, to a greater or lesser extent – of the essential needs of his own role and function. Especially of his own educational role and of his centrally systemic function.

So it is the teacher who occupies the central and more delicate hub, in the very heart of the contradictions of the system: it is not, in fact, a case that for its formation have been spending a lot of care and concern, until the establishment of specific schools for teaching qualification, in general, however, born for the real purpose of adaptation to structural, economic and political, context, when at the beginning of the '80s Western neoliberal governments – starting with U.S. and U.K. – had to make an appropriate selection of the ideology of future teachers. These goals were in fact masked by the superstructural integration to a fictional context, of operational goodness (but of not so democratic opening), that instead hid an ideological intent, already and yet active, of transformation and inversion of the process of gradual democratization, that was previously implemented (in the '60s and '70s).[\[36\]](#) So the fictitious intent towards the operational goodness of the teacher – as if the previous teachers were not generally skilled in their pedagogical intent – has been covering the dismantling of the previous democratization process, as regularly manifested in the progress of institutional transformations, which are incurred by the Italian school system (and typically by all European school systems, according to the prescriptions that are originated in the Lisbon Conference, in March 2000).[\[37\]](#)

In front of this disconnection between the real and structural plane and that superstructural and fictitious the teacher, the classes and the same set of parents are caught in a constant and nagging doubt: moving towards the preservation, maintenance and even increase the conditions of expression, those of creative and dialectical training – essentially democratic ones – or bend the head, the mind and heart towards the interest of the system? This choice is made more dramatic by the fact – pointed out and demonstrated in this short article – that all phenomena of violence against themselves and against others in the classes, as well as all the phenomena of cognitive and moral disaffection or disengagement are originated by the appearance and the essence of that disconnection and by the discrepancy that is between the rhetoric of a society and a school that are

active towards a democratic institution and the hidden reality of a general public institution whose aims are truly opposite to those advertised.

In front of this schizophrenic and schizogenetic outcome, that is really fatal to the psycho-social and political balance of the subjects that live in the educational institution, nothing different can make a democratic school, except **revolutionize from below** the whole of these relationships, marked by an heteronomous and heterooriented domain and control. This revolution must eliminate that disconnection, but certainly not in the sense of a full and complete adequacy of the structural level to that superstructural, as it tries to do instead institutionally (at the same European level). It must retake the possession firstly of its **autonomy of government and direction**, but certainly in an opposite direction to the current business-drift that rules Italian (and European) schools, where competitiveness is their cornerstone. Then it must transfer this possession to the general pedagogical objective of **regaining their future life by learners and students**, with their total mutual accountability (against the accountability – in its form, content and purpose – that is requested by and in the system). It must therefore transform – yes, here, in a real operational and constructive sense – the whole educational teaching, operating in the institution, according to criteria of organization and determination described earlier in this paper (see the points of the new *Manifesto*).

By opening a horizon of orientation, theoretical reflection and common practice, that can be able to establish a relationship of reciprocity and codetermination, where freedom remains inseparable from equality, and thus preserving the ideal and the real practice of diversities, that are at the same time creative and logical, Italian (and European) schools will lay the foundations for a democratic society very different from that present one: they will indeed operate a real divergence with respect to it, tracing the path of a revolution to a new possible world, in which the radical reality and the ideal of true peace and real justice can be never withered.



## Chapter 7. Notes

- [1] J.-F. Lyotard, *The post-modern Condition*. Les Éditions de Minuit (French ed.), University of Minnesota Press (English ed.), 1979 (Engl. 1984).
- [2] T.W. Adorno and M. Horkheimer, *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. 1947, (Engl. 1972).
- [3] M. Foucault, *Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie à l'âge Classique*. Libraire Plon, Paris 1961. G. Deleuze, *Différence et répétition*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1968. G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, *L'Anti-Œdipe – Capitalisme et schizophrénie*, Les éditions de Minuit, Paris 1972, 1980.
- [4] T. Adorno, *Negative Dialectics*, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966.
- [5] K. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Routledge, London, 1945.
- [6] F. L. Wright, *The Living City*. Horizon Press, New York, 1958.
- [7] M. P. Shelley, *Frankenstein, or the modern Prometheus*. London, Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor & Jones. 1818.
- [8] T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 1651.
- [9] H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem – A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Penguin Books, London, 1963.
- [10] See:  
[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/environment/sustainable\\_development/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/sustainable_development/index_en.htm)
- [11] John Bellamy Foster, *The Vulnerable Planet*. Monthly Review Press, 1991.
- He says: «**Four laws of capitalism**
- Viewed against the backdrop offered by these four informal laws, the dominant pattern of capitalist development is clearly counter-ecological. Indeed, much of what characterizes capitalism as an ecohistorical system can be reduced to the following counter-ecological tendencies of the system:
- 1) The only lasting connection between things is the cash nexus;
  - 2) It doesn't matter where something goes as long as it doesn't reenter the circuit of capital;
  - 3) The self-regulating market knows best; and
  - 4) Nature's bounty is a free gift to the property owner.»
- See: <http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/04/02/four-laws/>
- [12] J. Baudrillard, *La Société de consommation*, Gallimard, Paris 1970. ID., *Le Miroir de la production*, Casterman, Parigi 1973. ID., *L'Échange symbolique et la mort*, Gallimard, Paris 1976. ID., *Simulacres et simulation*, Galilée, Paris 1981. ID., *Les Stratégies fatales*, Grasset, Paris 1983. ID., *Le Crime parfait*, Galilée, Paris 1995. ID., *L'Échange impossible*, Galilée, Paris 1999. ID., *La violenza globale*, Raffaello Cortina, Milano 2003.
- [13] Plato, *Parmenides*. See the four hypotheses: if the One is the One; if the One is the Being; if the One is and not is; if the One is not.

See: <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/parmenides.html>

[14] J. Baudrillard, *The violence of the global*, 2003.

See: <http://www.ctheory.net/articles.aspx?id=385>

[15] J-J. Rousseau, *Émile ou De l'éducation*. La Haye, 1762.

[16] I. Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*. Riga, 1788.

[17] C. Fourier, *Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales* (Theory of the four movements and the general destinies), appeared anonymously in Lyon in 1808.

[18] M. Montessori, *Come educare il potenziale umano*. Milano, Garzanti, 1970 (*To educate the human potential*, 1947).

[19] W. Reich, *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf*. Sexpol-Verlag, 1936. ID. *Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1933.

[20] H. Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1941. ID. *Eros and Civilization*. Beacon Press, 1955. ID. *One-Dimensional Man*. Beacon Press, 1964.

[21] E. Morin, *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris, Ed. Du Seuil, 1990. ID. *L'Intelligence de la complexité*. Paris, L'Harmattan, 1999. ID. *Éduquer pour l'ère planétaire, la pensée complexe comme méthode d'apprentissage dans l'erreur et l'incertitude humaine*, Paris, Balland, 2003. ID. *Restricted Complexity, General Complexity*, 2008. See it at: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/cs/0610049v1.pdf>

[22] C. Castoriadis, *L'Institution imaginaire de la société*, Seuil, 1975. ID. *Capitalisme moderne et révolution*, 1979. ID. *Political and Social Writings*. Volumes 1, 2, 3. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1988-1993. ID. *The Crisis of Western Societies*. In: «TELOS» 53. New York, Telos Press, 1982. ID. *Figures of the Thinkable*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2007.

[23] L. Milani, *Letter to a Teacher*, 1967.

See it at: [http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/LTAT\\_Final.pdf](http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/LTAT_Final.pdf)

[24] U. Bronfenbrenner, *Ecology of Human Development*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard UP, 1979.

An Italian synthesis is available here:

[http://www.webalice.it/silvanocolugnati/Scienze%20Sociali\\_files/Ecologia%20dello%20sviluppo.pdf](http://www.webalice.it/silvanocolugnati/Scienze%20Sociali_files/Ecologia%20dello%20sviluppo.pdf)

A ppt-file of synthesis is, also, available here: <http://www.slideshare.net/aislado/bronfenbrenner-ecological-theory>

[25] See the way through which financial and economic crises for debts of nations such as Greece, Portugal, Spain, Italy and Cyprus are dealt with by the E.C.B., the European Commission and the I.M.F.

C. M. Reinhart, K. S. Rogoff, *IMF. From Financial Crash to Debt Crisis*. See it at: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15795>

The Centre for European Policy Studies. *The Sovereign Debt Crisis*. Link here: [www.ceps.eu/ceps/dld/6951/pdf](http://www.ceps.eu/ceps/dld/6951/pdf)

[26] For the italian I.N.Val.S.I. see: <http://www.invalsi.it/invalsi/index.php>

[27] D. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Bantam, New York, 1995. ID., *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Social Relationships*. Bantam, New York, 2006. M. Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001. S. I. Greenspan, A. Biavasco, V. Guani, *L'intelligenza del cuore. Le emozioni e lo sviluppo della mente*. Mondadori, Milano, 1998.

[28] See: <http://ecosocialisthorizons.com/>

[29] See the conception of *Degrowth* at: <http://www.degrowth.org/> It can be seen also the G. Bateson's conception of *Ecology of Mind*, at: <http://www.anecologyofmind.com/> Or the conception of *Buen Vivir*, at: <http://plan.senplades.gob.ec/>

[30] See Domenico De Simone's F.A.Z. (Financial Autonomous Zones) and Titan, at: [http://www.laleva.cc/economia/nuova\\_moneta.html](http://www.laleva.cc/economia/nuova_moneta.html) and <http://www.scribd.com/domenicodesimone>

[31] See the new phenomena of *Cold Fusion*, at: <http://www.infinite-energy.com/> or at: <http://www.youtube.com/user/NewEnergyFoundation> See also their applications in biological and medical sciences, at: [www.arcoiris.tv/modules.php?name=Unique&id=5417](http://www.arcoiris.tv/modules.php?name=Unique&id=5417). See also: <http://www.leconnessioniinattese.com/index.html>

[32] For an italian critic to *Patriot Act*, see: [http://www.academia.edu/2235881/Darjn\\_Costa\\_-\\_R.i.P\\_Civil\\_Rights\\_La\\_Legislazione\\_U.S.A.\\_Antiterrorismo\\_all\\_indomani\\_dell11\\_settembre](http://www.academia.edu/2235881/Darjn_Costa_-_R.i.P_Civil_Rights_La_Legislazione_U.S.A._Antiterrorismo_all_indomani_dell11_settembre)

[33] A beautiful video about String Theory and the Universe, played by Edward Witten at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tofbMx8ZTQ4>

See, also: <http://www.superstringtheory.com/>

To see the videos *The Elegant Universe*, you may go at:

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UV\\_X2B5OK1I](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UV_X2B5OK1I), (1);

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k9giLn5UiJw> (2);

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=36tGKrWY4QE>, (3).

A volume that expresses a critical point of view against modern scientific tradition is that written by A. Woods and T. Grant, *Reason in Revolt, Marxist Philosophy and Modern Science*; Wellred Publications 1995, (2007<sup>2</sup>) See it at: <http://www.marxist.com/rircontents.htm>

[34] See <http://www.jacques-benveniste.org/index.html> for the theory of memory of water and <http://www.sheldrake.org/homepage.html> for the theory of morphic fields and morphic resonance in life sciences. R. Sheldrake, *The Rebirth of Nature*, Bantam, New York, 1991. Or <http://www.telmopievani.com/> for italian studies on evolution.

[35] Halvorson, Hans and Kragh, Helge, *Cosmology and Theology*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming See: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmology-theology/> W. Bauman, *The Problem of a Transcendent God for the Well-Being of Continuous Creation*, in «Dialog: a Journal of Theology», 46 (2), Blackwell, London 2007. Pagg. 120-127.

[36] See «JP Morgan wants Europe to be rid of social rights, democracy, employee rights and the right to protest» at: <http://www.taxresearch.org.uk/Blog/2013/06/25/jp-morgan-wants-europe-to-be-rid-of-social-rights-democracy-employee-rights-and-the-right-to-protest/>

or at: <http://thevoluptuousmanifesto.blogspot.it/2013/06/the-bank-that-wants-your-democratic.html>

[37] See: *Main policy initiatives and outputs in education and training since the year 2000. Strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training* (“ET 2020”).

See it at : [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/policy-framework\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/policy-framework_en.htm)

## Chapter 8. Some bibliographical indications

- ADORNO, T. W. - HORKHEIMER M., *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. 1947, (English edition, 1972).
- ADORNO, T. W. *Negative Dialectics*, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966.
- 
- ALTHUSSER, L. - MATHERON, F. – CORPET, O., *Philosophy of the Encounter: Later Writings, 1978-87*. London, Verso, 2006.
- 
- ARENDT, H., *Eichmann in Jerusalem – A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Penguin Books, London, 1963.
- 
- BAUDRILLARD, J., *La Société de consommation*. Gallimard, Paris, 1970.
- ID., *Le Miroir de la production*. Casterman, Parigi, 1973.
- ID., *L'Échange symbolique et la mort*. Gallimard, Paris, 1976.
- ID., *Simulacres et simulation*. Galilée, Paris, 1981.
- ID., *Les Stratégies fatales*. Grasset, Paris, 1983.
- ID., *Le Crime parfait*. Galilée, Paris, 1995.
- ID., *L'Échange impossible*. Galilée, Paris, 1999.
- ID., *La violenza globale*. Raffaello Cortina, Milano, 2003.
- 
- BAUMAN, W., *The Problem of a Transcendent God for the Well-Being of Continuous Creation*, in «Dialog: a Journal of Theology», 46 (2), Blackwell, London 2007. Pagg. 120-127.
- 
- BELLAMY FOSTER, J., *The Vulnerable Planet*. Monthly Review Press, 1991.
- 
- BRONFENBRENNER, U., *Ecology of Human Development*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard UP, 1979.
- 
- CASTORIADIS, C., *L'Institution imaginaire de la société*, Seuil, 1975.
- ID. *Capitalisme moderne et révolution*, 1979.
- ID. *Political and Social Writings*. Volumes 1, 2, 3. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1988-1993.
- ID. *The Crisis of Western Societies*. In: «TELOS» 53. New York, Telos Press, 1982.
- ID. *Figures of the Thinkable*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2007.
- 
- DEBORD, G., *La Société du spectacle*. Paris, Buchet/Chastel, 1967.

-

DELEUZE, G., *Différence et répétition*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1968.

DELEUZE, G - GUATTARI, F., *L'Anti-Œdipe – Capitalisme et schizophrénie*. Les éditions de Minuit, Paris 1972, 1980.

-

FOUCAULT, M., *Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie à l'âge Classique*. Libraire Plon, Paris 1961.

-

FOURIER, Ch., *Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales* (Theory of the four movements and the general destinies), appeared anonymously in Lyon in 1808.

-

GOLEMAN, D., *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Bantam, New York, 1995.

ID., *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Social Relationships*. Bantam, New York, 2006.

-

GREENSPAN, S. I. - BIAVASCO, A. - GUANI, V., *L'intelligenza del cuore. Le emozioni e lo sviluppo della mente*. Mondadori, Milano, 1998.

-

HOBBS, T., *Leviathan*, 1651.

-

KANT, I., *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*. Riga, 1788.

-

LYOTARD, J.-F., *The post-modern Condition*. Les Éditions de Minuit (French ed.), University of Minnesota Press (English ed.), 1979 (Engl. 1984).

-

MARCUSE, H., *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1941.

ID., *Eros and Civilization*. Beacon Press, 1955.

ID., *One-Dimensional Man*. Beacon Press, 1964.

-

MILANI, L. *Lettera ad una professoressa*, 1967. Cinisello Balsamo, San Paolo Edizioni, 2007.

-

MONTESORI, M., *Come educare il potenziale umano*. Milano, Garzanti, 1970 (*To educate the human potential*, 1947).

-

MORIN, E., *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris, Ed. Du Seuil, 1990.

ID., *L'Intelligence de la complexité*. Paris, L'Harmattan, 1999.

MORIN, E. - MOTTA, R. - CIURANA, É-R., *Éduquer pour l'ère planétaire, la pensée complexe comme méthode d'apprentissage dans l'erreur et l'incertitude humaine*. Paris, Balland, 2003.

-

NUSSBAUM, M., *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

-

PLATO, *Parmenides*. Francis MacDonald Cornford Editor. Taylor & Francis Group, 2010.

-

POPPER, K., *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Routledge, London, 1945.

-

REICH, W., *Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1933.

ID. *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf*. Sexpol-Verlag, 1936.

-

ROUSSEAU, J-J., *Émile ou De l'éducation*. La Haye, 1762.

-

SHELDRAKE, R., *The Rebirth of Nature*. Bantam, New York, 1991.

-

SHELLEY, M., *Frankenstein, or the modern Prometheus*. London, Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor & Jones. 1818.

-

WOODS, A. - GRANT, T., *Reason in Revolt, Marxist Philosophy and Modern Science*; Wellred Publications 1995, (2007<sup>2</sup>)

-

WRIGHT, F. L., *The Living City*. Horizon Press, New York, 1958.

## Author's page

Stefano Ulliana obtained a degree in philosophy (1993) and the title of PhD in philosophy (2002) at the University of Padua with two successive thesis on the thought of Giordano Bruno. The first - entitled *La metalogicità dell'Ars memoriae bruniano* - translates and comments the *Ars memoriae*, which is an integral part of the text traditionally known under the title *De umbris idearum*, and the second - which is entitled *Il concetto creativo e dialettico dello Spirito nei Dialoghi Italiani di Giordano Bruno* - searches for innovation in the perspective of the brunian studies, presenting in a theological-political and natural key the revolutionary foundation of the speculation of the philosopher of Nola.

The author, currently a teacher in the secondary schools in the province of Udine (Italy, Friuli – Venezia Giulia), is the author of essays, articles and books on the thought of Giordano Bruno.

Ulliana Stefano

Via Latisana, 23

33033 Codroipo (Udine) - Italia.

Web-page: <http://independent.academia.edu/StefanoUlliana>

Mailto: [ulliana1@tin.it](mailto:ulliana1@tin.it); [ulliana@alice.it](mailto:ulliana@alice.it).

Skype: stefano.ulliana

Tel. 39(0)432-900829

Cell. 39-3333501509