

ηγέτες πολιτικούς οί όποιοι είναι ταυτοχρόνως καί οί πνευματικοί του ήγέτες.

Δέν ύπάρχει έναργέστερο παράδειγμα αὐτῆς τῆς αὐτόχρομα πνευματικῆς πολιτικῆς στάσεως, ἀπό ἓνα ἐξαίσιο καί ἐμπνευσμένο κείμενο — τόν ἐπικήδειο πού ἐξεφώνησε ὁ Κανελλόπουλος πρὸ τῆς σοροῦ τοῦ Γεωργίου Παπανδρέου, στίς 3 Νοεμβρίου τοῦ 1968. Θεωροῦμε ὅτι μία αὐτολεξεί παράθεση μέρους ἐκείνου τοῦ ἐξόχου δείγματος πολιτικοῦ ἥθους, ἀλλά καί ρητορικῆς, συνοψίζει κατὰ τὸν έναργέστερο τρόπο ὅσα θελήσαμε νὰ ἀναλύσουμε σὲ τοῦτο τὸ σημείωμα.

«... Γεώργιε Παπανδρέου ... θὰ ἦτο βαρὺ εἰς ἠθικάς συνεπείας, ἐὰν αἱ νεώτεραι γενεαὶ ἐσχημάτιζον τὴν ἐντύπωσιν ὅτι τὰ χάσματα μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τῶν παλαιότερων εἶναι ἀγεφύρωτα καί ὅτι τὰ γεφυρώνει μόνον ὁ τάφος. Ἐὰν ἦσαν ἀγεφύρωτα, δέν θὰ εἶχεν ἀπὸ ποῦ νὰ περάσει ἡ Ἑλλάς. Ἡ Ἑλλάς δέν εὐρίσκεται ὁλόκληρη —οὔτε εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ στηριχθεῖ— εἰς καμμίαν ἀπὸ τὰς δύο ἀμμόδεις καί συνεχῶς ἀλλοιουμένας ἀντιθέτους ὁχθας τοῦ ρεύματος τῆς ἱστορίας. Ἰσταται καί στηρίζεται ἐπὶ τῆς γεφύρας. Γνωρίζω, ἀπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς παλαιᾶς συνεργασίας μας, ὅτι πρὸς τὴν γέφυραν αὐτὴν ἦσαν ἐστραμμένα τὰ βλέμματά σου. Καί εἶμαι βέβαιος ὅτι πρὸς αὐτὴν κατηυθύνοντο οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὅταν ἔρριπτες τὴν τελευταίαν ματιὰ εἰς τὸν μάταιον τοῦτον κόσμον. Μόνον ιδέαι ὅπως εἶναι ἡ Ἑλλάς καί ἡ ἐλευθερία εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ συνδέουν κάπως τὴ ματαιότητα μὲ τὸ Αἰώνιον. Γεώργιε Παπανδρέου σὲ ἀποχαιρετῶ».

Ἴδου ὁ Κανελλόπουλος.

Κανελλόπουλος ὁ Ἀλκίφρων. Κανελλόπουλος ὁ Βαθύβουλος.

Ὁ Ἀξιοπρεπὴς καί Γενναῖος.

Παναγιώτης ΤΖΑΜΑΛΙΚΟΣ

THE 21<sup>ST</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF SOCIETIES OF FRENCH SPEAKING PHILOSOPHY: *L'Avenir. Actes du XXI<sup>e</sup> Congrès de l'Association des Sociétés de Philosophie de Langue Française*, publiés par E. Moutsopoulos (1986), Paris, Vrin, 1987 (Publication de la Fondation de Recherches et d'Éditions de Philosophie NH, Série «Recherches» n<sup>o</sup> 3), 437 pp.

The 21<sup>st</sup> International Congress of the A.S.P.L.F., which took place in Athens from July 21<sup>st</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1986, enjoyed the participation of a large





number of philosophers from Greece and abroad. All the participants shared interesting and original contributions concerning future. Every aspect of the issue was discussed and particular emphasis was given to its significance for mankind and its relationship with human consciousness. This new perspective of the problem was introduced by Prof. E. Moutsopoulos, President of the Congress. According to him future is usually envisaged as a dimension of time directed towards what-is-not-yet. The opposite concept of future as directed towards present in the sense of concrete realisation does not cease to belong still in the classical perspective of time which presupposes an objective «becoming» as well as an observer who, indifferent to this «becoming», merely focuses his attention on the description and explanation of the (observed) facts. What is mainly missing from this classical concept of time is the presence of human consciousness. It is necessary therefore that consciousness should conquer its rights in order to be able to interfere with the process of the universe in its ultimate aim to dominate this universe. Obviously consciousness, being now a dynamic rather than a static entity, must get rid of its observative role. It is in these terms that consciousness absorbs and reduces the present into its intentionality. This half-identification of consciousness with the reality of universal «becoming» allows it to assume the various meanings of present—which now disappears—and seek for the other two dimensions of time, i.e. past and future. The past, where consciousness intervenes, is the referential present according to Husserl. The future is a provisional present where consciousness also intervenes in order to assimilate it. Consequently, the three-dimensional time now appears two-dimensional, the dimension of *not-yet* and that of *never-more* being conceived of and conceivable by the very intentional dynamics of consciousness. The category of «kairos» is established by the encounter of the two above mentioned categories (time-dimensions). It is within this context and from viewpoint of kairicity (anteriorization and actualization) that future now reveals itself as a provisionally experienced reality anticipated by conscience. This anticipated future assumes a particular significance since it constitutes a reality reconstructed through consciousness. Consciousness, therefore, allows future to interfere with, interpret and affect reality and, last but not least, impose possible values.

Among the four main conferences that followed during plenary sessions only that of Prof. G. Vlachos was of political interest, whereas the other three thematically belonged to the same problem-area as the first foundational paper. Since Antiquity, Ontology and Teleology have been the two stones of Philosophy and even if, according to Prof. O. Gigon, their traits should change in the future, they will still remain one Ontology and one



Teleology all the same. Prof. A. Mercier (Future: what is «to come») rejected any attempt to conceptualize time from ancient times to our contemporary Newtonian - Einsteinian era and suggested a semantic analysis of future —what is «to come»— instead. Such a semantic analysis reveals that future is the authentic source of Time. Consequently the creation of the world should not be limited within the remote past; it should occur in the present that would immediately turn into a never-approached past. The conclusion is that it is only in the above defined context of time-future, though not space, that it is possible to search for *Deus absconditus*. Prof. G. Vlachos («The scientific Prophetism of K. Marx») maintained that some ideals of Marxism such as for instance the free and creative personality that has not been alienated by the industrial environment were based upon logical postulates and transformed into prophetic messages with reference to future. Marx was neither a mere utopist nor just a social reformer; his efforts were focused on establishing a science based on determinism. Yet, this very concept of science thus conceived of, proved incompatible with the anticipated prophecy introduced. More than one hundred important and significant papers by notorious French-speaking philosophers enriched these fundamental views through highly original theses. One has to underline the excellent organization of the Congress and the fact that such a Congress took place for the first time, successfully, in a non French-speaking country, thanks to the personal capacities of its organiser.

Anna ARAVANTINOU