

PHILOSOPHY: BETWEEN MEMORY AND VISION OF FUTURE

GUIDO TRAVERSA

Abstract

This philosophical contribute explores the dynamic relationship between potentiality and actuality, proposing finality as a key to understanding reality across time. Hope expresses ontological correlation of past, present, and future, basing on analogical unity. Human identity and freedom are rooted in the interplay of necessity and responsibility. Action, as both individual and collective, requires an epistemology tied to ethics and history. Memory can be interpreted as exercise of Hope itself. Also technological innovation and spiritual continuity are unified through a critique of understanding. Ultimately, by consequence, the common good emerges as a cosmopolitan goal rooted in responsible historical action.

Keywords: Hope, Memory, Work of memory, Historical responsibility, Ethic of memory

1. Metaphysics: power and act

Let's start with a metaphysical consideration: once power is translated into act, can it maintain itself as power? Maintain itself as power not only in relation to the new acts that can derive from it, but also in that very act that it has already determined? Can it maintain itself as power in itself, as "past", in the "present" of the act, and, in this same present act, exhibit itself as propensity, as "future"?

If the answers to these questions can be positive, by carefully and rigorously affirming "yes", then, in the being present of a determined act, its own power would be maintained as "propensity".

The dynamic category that, if well "used", can allow for an argumentative line capable of answering those questions with a yes is finality.

Conformity to an end, understood in a non-causal-mechanical way, leads thought to practice the art of grasping similarities and dissimilarities: to seek and invent real analogies. Analogies that do not show themselves, if the answer to those questions can be a “yes”, only by grasping them in the relations between different acts or entities, but ontologically even within the individual identity of a single act or a single entity. From this it follows that the intrinsic power of the identity of an individual remains power even in the present of this same singularity, in that, as power, it shows the finality, the analogies, that constitute that identity in itself.

Past, present and future thus show their ontological correlation and not only as exhibited by the linearity of time. In this way each of the three dimensions of time is removed from the “museum” hypostatization: of the past in a given present, as “representation”, of the future as a place of the indistinct and of the present as the here and now.

2. *Anthropology: Individual and Collective Action*

Agere sequitur esse: and if action is not erased in being, as if it were an implicit emanation of it, and if being is not formed from action, as its indistinct and presupposed accidentality, then it is right to answer “yes” to the metaphysical questions regarding the relationship between potentiality and act. Identity carries within itself the distinction: “it is” and at the same time it can become freely, following that modality of necessity that is not “an already given”, but can be cultivated as the soil of what follows from an existence without predetermining it. It is the real distinction that, constituting the ontological marrow of individual and collective identity, guarantees the possibility of freedom, of that free action that remembers the past, that recognizes the present, that awaits the fullness of the future.

But it is not enough to be able to answer “yes” to those questions from which we started: it is necessary to elaborate an epistemology of action, of ethics, of the human sciences in order to be able to correspond to a free purpose, endowed with meaning as a constantly active power. Answering “yes” must be able to be translated into the form of active responsibility towards oneself, towards the human race, as one’s own community of belonging, towards History and, perhaps even more, towards the future, not as a void to be filled ahead of time, but to which to tend with one’s own hi-

story: recounting the past, discovering it, as if it were itself a hope to which to give, once again, trust and concrete life.

The present can become a “sieve” to make the past and the future not confused but mutually analogous, which can meet, not infrequently, in the non-Euclidean time of the instant, grasped by individual identity and perhaps even more so by community identity, if only because daily life itself is a common, collective root, to which one belongs, in which one participates: the *participatio* is the ontological dimension of the *recta* analogia to be invent both between things and in each of them.

Necessity and responsibility, as ontological structures of human freedom, are the threads of the sieve frame, which makes memory and expectation intimate, despite appearances. Of course: we distinguish the past from the future at every moment, but if we do not arm them against each other, then the task is that of the translator of the already given into the “*da-bile*,” into an “as if” that even makes the ircocervus an object of zoological research, even if only to smile about it, politely, at conferences, and then, trained by the ircocervus, to give reason to a new class of belonging, that of the platypus, to give science of the “new” and of its being in the history of science and, consequently, in the history of humanity.

The task for the human being, for his action, is like the “task of the translator”: to exhibit the analogies, the propensities, the dispositions of human reality, of its History, to exhibit them in the “tending towards”, making History experienced not as a museum, but as an archaeological site, capable of impressing, in a non-Euclidean way, on the unity of place, action and time a twist aimed at discovering the not yet given in the already given: the permanence of power in being already act.

3. A “critique of understanding” as a “common root” of technological innovation and spiritual permanence: the place of memory

“The usefulness of history for life”, archaeology as a place to “remember the immemorial”, are not more or less successful metaphors, but experiences to which one can become familiar: a slow but constant *habitus* leads the eye and the ear to the permanent “excavation” in the history to which one belongs, to then discover stories belonging to all of humanity. The flow of time lives off all the multiple cultural differences, but, as a non-indifferent and indistinct temporal flow in human space, it also performs the

“task of the translator”: it sifts, harmoniously distinguishes the past from the present, assuming, as a unit of measurement, the virtuous beauty of the future, assuming that it can still be given to us as a sense of orientation and not only as a flow as such.

4. *Of the observer who, without any personal interest, shows, in a public way, an enthusiasm for a historical fact that shows the direction “towards the best for the human race”: the common good*

Whoever observes history, without haste, with the *habitus* of responsible understanding, digs into the present using given tools, and seeks new tools to find, precisely, the new. Technique is the twin of action. Human intelligence has always made use of artificiality, artificial intelligence, if *intelligere*, that is if it reads into something determined, does not damage the fabric of things, indeed it can support it, with delicacy, discovering as yet unknown similarities that were waiting for a proper name and a place in the yet to be given that is the future.

The protection of the territory, both in the physical sense, the land, and in the sense of belonging to a community, to its values, is a form of ethical and political responsibility understood as not a simple relationship based on reciprocity: one becomes responsible also towards those who may not be reciprocally responsible, the parent is responsible towards his children, the politician towards the citizens, humanity towards future generations. Thus, an empirical and at the same time formal dimension (of legal protections) opens up for the implementation of the “common good”, understood as collective property to be maintained and developed as the purpose of historical action and a formal-legal evaluation criterion of the present. The common good, from a horizon of meaning, can become a concrete “cosmopolitan point of view”.

The challenges of the new anthropologies, if they are truly anthropological, in the sense of the *logos* of *antropos*, are challenges without winners and losers: the history of challenges becomes a duel, without bloodshed, between memory and expectation, between new technologies, anthropology and archaeology. Archaeology is the public place from which the observer who feels the responsibility of understanding the past, as an active and living power, not a museum, of what has been that, even just because it is “excavated”, “invented”, becomes a life experience, a narrative that ex-

plains with rigor what the past, its memory, asks us to bring to completion.

The responsibility of the historian, the archaeologist, the scientist of new technologies, is the power that maintains in potential every act endowed with meaning and history for the human race and for its transcendent action, for the “human ethos of transcendence”.

The Euclidean geometry of the museum is not to be denied, but to be inscribed, as a particular case, in the non-Euclidean complexion of “place, time and action” that occurs in the intimate connection between technology and archaeology: a place reappears with the arts that translate it into the future.

And mankind, for a while, can take a breather outside the museum: “and they returned to see the stars again.”