

### THIRD ESSAY TOPIC

Concerning the fact that, according to Marx, all philosophers that came before him, didn't change the world, one must ask oneself what changing the world means? I believe that poetical quality of this quotation must not be doubted, but a rational one? In poetry, word world would stand for the whole, for everything that exists and is everywhere around us, world, in poetry, would stand for a stage. But in a philosophical way would it stand for disputable objective reality that we are part of, or for our perception of it, or rather perhaps for our perception of things that in fact do not exist within our thoughts? The world that Marx is referring to when saying *the point is to change it* is, I frankly believe, the same world that is being carried on human thought like a sky upon the shoulders of Atlas the mighty.

Samuel Beckett said that the historians are prophets turned upside down and backwards so they see future that already happened, the whole alternative endings from which we started. On the other side, philosophers are obliged to define and explain **now**, the present, the intimidating and overwhelming continuation of time. Philosophers are obliged to be prophets of the present, to see present, unlike others who are just existing in it.

Marx didn't mention or blame workers, politicians, economists, scientists, writers or housewives; he blamed philosophers for not changing the world. That implicates that there is something philosophers can do, what others can't. Contemplating and writing philosophy is what philosophers do. So what in the name of Christ, did that old bearded fellow actually mean – that nobody (*sic*) before him wrote philosophy right? That we should give birth to new philosophy that will be entirely practical and will be ugly sister (philosophy is female, for no man can have such a beautiful dignity and not be haughty at such old age) to law, economy and revolution? Philosophy must not ever try to be revolution, because philosophy is not in fight with anything, philosophy is not on the opposite side, but upper side.

On the other side, philosophy does have its might, in the written word. If the man from the Plato's allegory of cave did not return to the cave but publish a 600 pages long book on how to percept and understand the Thruth, two things could have been avoided:

-the guy getting killed by bunch of pagans

-me not knowing how to percept and understand the Thruth

We are changing the world when we are making it more or less conscious of us and of self. The selfconscious world is the world without a conflict, at least the one that does not have schizophrenia. The world has attended its psychotherapy: held by Thomas Aquinas after the great medieval plague, by Adorno and Sartre after WWII, by Žižek and Horvat after September the 11th. I believe Marx made a mistake. Maybe he was a little bit too much well informed on

subject of economy to make a great observation on past philosophies. Or maybe I am little bit too much well informed on subject of art to make a great observation on Karl Marx. Marx, forbid my evil dreams come true.

Whatsoever, neither Marx or I found writing philosophy not able to change to world. As said in the movie *The Dreamers* (Bernardo Bertolucci, 2003, strongly recommended), *the poem is the petition, the petition is the poem.*