

ISSN 2299-7806

Nr 32 (2021)

---

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/kw.2021.32.79-95>

# Dissolution and Changes for a New Model of Humanity

Emilio Sierra García

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8778-931X>

The axiological key to the world today is a result of a dissolution of the Nietzschean version of life and man, and of the Marxist perspective on the world, society, and history. In theory, the man of the twenty-first century would like to believe himself to be the heir to the spirit of the Enlightenment with its equality, fraternity, and freedom. In practice, the human being of our time is immersed in the tyranny of technology, the mastery of consumption and the investment of communication networks as anesthetizers of critical thinking. Drawing on Heidegger's analysis, Byung-Chul Han and Günther Anders will consider the utopia of social change and different approaches to it. Is change possible? Does it arise from society or from man? Does change necessarily entail progress? Millennials, new family models, media authority, fast food, romance websites speak of a transmutation in terms of the values of the human that deserve to be probed in depth to see what truth they expose about the human being, the world, and history.

Keywords: Nietzsche, Marx, human being, critical thinking

## Introduction

In the twentieth century, man was plunged into despair. Adopted son of the belle époque, times of illusions and vain optimism, he discovered himself

---

EMILIO SIERRA GARCÍA, PhD, Assistant Professor, CEU San Pablo University (Madrid) and School of Philosophy (Madrid); address for correspondence: Calle Asura, 8. 28043. Madrid, Spain; e-mail: [emilio.sierragarcia@colaborador.ceu.es](mailto:emilio.sierragarcia@colaborador.ceu.es)

the offspring of two terrible wars that placed on his table the extent of the cruelty that human beings were capable of. This was followed by the Geneva Treaty, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and a number of other measures that sought to guarantee respect for man and the freedom and peace of peoples. The model of humanity went through so many stereotypes such as that of the soldier, that of the self-made businessman, that of the liberated woman and that of the rebellious young man exalted by society that would later abandon him to his fate. Social change has been clear and possible. Not only have human relations between states been softened by dialogue and the supposed modern dogma of tolerance, but also the model of humanity has become a hybrid in which each one has to put into play what he wants to be either in his body or in his soul, generating millennials, depressive subjects, or mere consumers.

Certainly, throughout history the model of humanity has varied greatly, but when this model is subject to easy change there is no definition of man to which the concrete human being can aspire. Where do these changes that have occurred so virally and spontaneously in our world come from? What are the causes of the current dissolution of human identity that led Foucault to affirm, albeit in another sense, the death of man?

### **Research and results**

The direct sources of such changes explain the axiological keys of today's world as a result of a dissolution of the Nietzschean version of life and man, and of the Marxist perspective on the world, society, and history. In theory, the man of the twenty-first century would like to believe himself heir to the spirit of the Enlightenment with equality, fraternity, and freedom as his flag. In practice, the human being of our time is immersed in the tyranny of technology, the dominance of consumption and the investment of communications networks as anesthetizers of critical thinking. One could certainly argue to these those modern men are different and have a variety of problems. We look for what is general and universal. It is also normal that a Chinese person imagines the world in a Chinese way, an Indian in Indian, a Brazilian in Brazilian; and an Arab in Arabian ways; an African in an African way, and a Westerner in the Western way, but this does not justify such thinking in a scientific and philosophical cognition of the world.

This text could be charged of Eurocentrism or West-centrism in thinking about the world because there are many people outside the scope of thinking and development. It could be argued the illiterate population – which is estimated at 33% in Asia and 50% in Africa and other European countries – could declare themselves alien to the dialectic of the Enlightenment and the current technocracy (G. Anders). However, already M. McLuhan with the idea of the “global village” postulates that, in a world like ours, full of audio-visual information from technological media, feeling and thinking are unconsciously influenced and interconnected by the ideas that the media disseminate, many of them connected with the Enlightenment and its becoming: relativism, dependencies, ecology, equality, among others.

Certainly, this can be preached directly from the West, affected by capitalism and technocracy. But it can also expand its radius of action since, both in the Americans or the Africans, we are all the same men, although in different sensibilities and traditions. In the heart of deep Africa for instance, we can also find vestiges of the tyranny of Western ideas transmitted live from smartphones. It should be noted that the ideas of Nietzsche and Marx and the social, cultural, and intellectual consequences they brought are felt above all in the West and, from the West, in much of the world. This text deals with the current situation of the average Western man, his conception of himself, his interaction with technological media and the understanding that these foster in regard to the value of humanity and values.

How can we connect Nietzsche with a person who has barely read him? Is it possible that the Instagram teenager and the young worker who would not want to talk about commitment have been fertilized by the thoughts of the hammer philosopher?

Next, we will see Nietzsche’s anthropological approach to draw conclusions regarding social change and the conception of man today. Nietzsche says:

Man is something that must be overcome. [...] In times past you were apes, but now is man more ape than any ape! [...] The Superman is the sense of the earth [...] and never lend faith to those who speak to you of ultra-dark hopes! They are poison

distillers, conscious or unconscious. They are belittlers of the earth, dying and poisoned, and the earth is tiresome. That is why they wish to abandon it!<sup>1</sup>

There is in Nietzsche a conception of the human being, which exerts a great influence today. For him, man is not an individual, but part of an existential continuum. It is a product of forces other than himself, which he cannot control. What is the nature of the human being for Nietzsche? For Nietzsche, the human being is only and exclusively nature or sensitive body: living, thinking and violent in nature. Any other entity we add – soul, pure spirit – is a fictitious idea invented by us with no reference in reality.

The concept of culture occupies a central place in Nietzsche's philosophy. The illusion is the vital and what constitutes the subject, what is man in creation or in its appearance, and not in something that preextricates his activity? On the contrary, his essence is the effect of his activity, that is, culture.

And Zarathustra spoke thus to the people:

I teach you the superman. Man is something that must be overcome. What have you done to overcome it? All beings have so far created something above themselves: and do you want to be the ebb of that great flow and go back to the animal rather than surpass man?

What is the monkey for man? A laugh or a painful embarrassment. And that is just what man should be for the superman: a laugh or a painful shame.

You have walked the path that leads from the worm to man, and many things in you continue to be worms. Once you were monkeys, and now he is also the cutest man of any monkey. And the wisest of you is just a split being, hybrid of plant and ghost. But do I command you to become ghosts or plants?

Look, I teach you the superman! The superman is the sense of the earth. Say your will: let the superman be the sense of the earth!<sup>2</sup>

The idea of the superman today has been detached from all halos of heroism, tragedy and aesthetic or metaphysical eagerness. The suffering nihilism of Nietzsche that Dostoevsky expressed so well, and that in the existentialisms of the twentieth century found a response and frustration in the human being of the 21st century, soon became a comfortable option for a life without moral, political, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus spoke Zarathustra* (Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 2017), 45–46.

<sup>2</sup> Nietzsche, *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, 65–66.

existential authenticity. The superman becomes the consumer. The expression of nihilism in which man assumes and accepts “the death of God” should also assume his own life without subjecting it to the designs of any deity or false values. For Nietzsche the superman is the man who becomes aware of life as the only possibility and undertakes to live it in freedom. However, what person of our time lives life out in the open without any deity or false values? Is not the Internet, social media, the media, or the sex industry new gods that introduce dehumanizing values?

Another thing in common between Nietzsche’s man and today's postmodern man is that the human being is defined by a free, spontaneous, and creative will. This creation is also a game that undergoes change since reality is not fixed but is a constant. This constant, however, is such that in becoming where the instant sets the tone for the creation of new values – since in each instant, it is where the whole meaning of life is found – it is the instant where the Superman in use of an elementary vitalist instinct – of an unstoppable desire to live, that sets in motion his will to power to get what he needs in order to stay alive. Constant change would be justified by that will that recognizes what is best for itself according to its own interests.

How is common law possible? Where does compassion and humanitarian action fit? Where does justice? Glucksmann’s book, *Dostoevsky in Manhattan*, is well known, in which terrorism is raised as an epigon of nihilism, meaninglessness and the will to power.<sup>3</sup> In the twenty-first century there has been an animalization of man that we can call the “sophistication of barbarism.” What defines man among other things as reason, his capacity for critical thinking (Kant), his freedom outside the impulses of instinct (Plato), his ability to love as a surrender of life beyond himself (Ebner) and to be able to create as an expression of spirit and transcendence (Pareyson) and the recognition of the other as a reflection of the Other in ethical experience (Levinas). The twenty-first century man is not able to think, his intelligence has been hijacked by the flashes of the omnipresent screens, the excess of information and Big Data. Their freedom has been diminished by the desire for consumption and the pleasant life that banishes pain, as Byung-Chul Han affirms, and produces in the long run, depressive subjects. Just look at Jordan Peterson's studies on the subject. Love is understood as absence

---

<sup>3</sup> Anton Glucksmann, *Dostoevsky en Manhattan* (Madrid: Taurus, 2002).

and use, as Simone de Beauvoir once postulated, and art is nothing more than a meaningless transgression or a consumer product among others.

There is a veiled zoocentrism that has its roots in the Nietzschean approach. Nietzsche sees the world from the brains of animals, so he knows that the ant has a perception of time different from that of man, that for the worm a corpse is a good thought, that the mosquito feels the centre of the world, that if the horse read, it would be metaphysical and would affirm that: "humanity is a prejudice that we animals do not suffer at all."<sup>4</sup> For Nietzsche, the animal kingdom is better than man because it is not symbolically linked. Nietzsche is on the side of animals and against humans, his zoophilia is misanthropy. This is not foreign to us, in many countries of Europe today we fight for the rights of animals and forget that of the unborn. Peter Singer would be an extreme thinker in this regard, having come to affirm as sensible the practice of zoophilia.<sup>5</sup>

In the end, the conception of man that one has is that of the brute animal that has been desbestialized, deanimalized, domesticated, tamed and gregarious by Western history, Philosophy, Morality, Religion, The State, Culture, and the sure guidance of instincts has been replaced by its most miserable organ, consciousness. "Humanization' would oppose 'man's increase." The breed would be degenerate and "the improvement of the breed" is required how to straighten the instinct of the animal man?"<sup>6</sup> The answer is not to be found in metaphysics, but in animal physiology. We must turn men into animals.

Humanity has no meaning, as little, as the saurians had, but it has evolution, and it is required to activate the way back, dehumanization, moreover, dehumanization, rebestyalization, retroevolution to rich, violent, terrible, unconscious, brutal, savage, barbaric, inhuman nature. It is necessary to tear down the walls that mediate between nature and spirit, man, and animal, moral and physical, to return to the monkey, to the old animal self, to realize the "transformation of humanity" surpassing man, "returning to the animal," taking "animalization as a public good." "Let me howl, moan and squirm like an animal: I just believe in myself!"<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo* (London: Vintage, 1989), 107.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Singer, *Liberación animal* (Madrid: Akal, 1999).

<sup>6</sup> Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, 54.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, 87–88.

The passage from monkey to monster occurred in National Socialism and Communism. The passage from monster to shadow is a thing of our century. The claim to rebestialize, to monstruize man in a big way, is nothing more than an aspect of “the new creation of the Universe.”<sup>8</sup>

The process of returning to being a Nietzschean animal is to realize a moral theory from the zoological point of view that improves the breed through a selection, not natural but programmed with experiments, and institutionalized on a global scale. Hitler? The UN recognizing the right to abortion? School bullying? Racial hygiene and the eugenics of extermination must sift through the excess of degenerates, sick, tarred, fragile, forced mourners, the sacrifice of degenerate races by the advent of a stronger and more exceptional one. Animals do not need any morals. The new man of the twenty-first century does not want undesirables among them. This is not because of the improvement of the race, but because the “undesirable” cannot be part of the society of performance.

The last echo of the Nietzschean proposal that sounds very much today is that of: “Sensuality, drunkenness, total animality,” instincts, passions and appetites are the basic powers of the great man, “those magnificent beasts at his service,” which “awaken the sleeping animality” in civilized man. The will to power is unique physiological power, “there is only one kind of power,” which is exercised both in violence against the weak and in rampant sex drive. Once chastened by the denial of the sexual will of Pforta, Stirner and Schopenhauer, Nietzsche becomes a prophet of the sterile will to sexual power. Nietzsche upsets sexuality from fruitful to sterile, from relational (love) to oppressive, from hedonistic to sadistic-masochistic. In our world, the agony of eros is evident as Han has shown, man as a pornographic animal has forgotten the charm of eros that leads him to the discovery of the other as another and, therefore, to surrender.<sup>9</sup> The practice of exchanging partners or using sex toys for self-satisfaction, among other things, shows that the sexual instinct has returned to more sophisticated animality and has left behind the art of self-love not only of the body and the will to pleasure, but of people who, with intelligence and delicacy, are liken to a form of spiritual and personal expression through the flesh. This conception of sexuality is rooted in the contempt of matter because it is understood as raw data, not as a vehicle and carrier of meaning in dialogue and

---

<sup>8</sup> Dalmacio Negro Pavón, *El mito del hombre nuevo* (Madrid: Encuentro, 2009), 27–29.

<sup>9</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *La agonía del eros* (Barcelona: Herder, 2017), 76–77.

not as a relationship of domination with nature and the other. Later in the conclusions, I will expose the Nietzschean thought, and we will see how the echoes of Nietzsche resonate today with force.<sup>10</sup>

The other thinker to whom we owe the current conception of man, of his social relations and the understanding of history is to K. Marx. Simply because their doctrines have spread throughout the world, from Russia to Vietnam to small communities in the United States, and the meaning of its system, and its protest, has been projected to the development of gender theory from the Frankfurt School and some French thinkers of communist inspiration, especially Sartre.<sup>11</sup>

Marxist ontology and anthropology and their concept of man will be a novelty in philosophical positions; materialism and Marxist humanism will have a totally dynamic vision of man. The Marxist concept of man will be a concrete individual who is responsible, product of the historical circumstances that have created him, and a creator of circumstances. Man for Marx is the dynamic engine through his class determination (class struggle) and finds his reason as an historical being, transforming the world, a world that is hostile to him and exploits it.<sup>12</sup> In the twenty-first century the world is not hostile, but strange, the techniques of control and deterrence over the care of creation, the global idea of climate change is nothing more than an expression of the understanding of nature as useful to be cared for by the means it offers, not as a place of development of man.

Marxist anthropology and its entire philosophy are a violent response to the alienation of man, the loss of himself and the profound objectification of man

---

<sup>10</sup> I would like to point out how it has been argued that a Nietzsche renaissance is necessary for thought and has in fact been given. Nietzsche has made it possible for the Frankfurt School and W. Benjamin to have come into connection with Lyotard, that his critique of capital, connects, from post-Marxist and post-analytical positions, with the critique of the positivist metaphysics of history and the subject, the communicational pragmatics of Apel develop, or the new rhetoric and philosophy of praxis in the hermeneutics of Gadamer. By Heideggerian-Nietzschean thought, postmetaphysical and posthistoric hermeneutics are connected to each other with Riedel's metapolitics and pragmatics, Foucault's a priori epistemological, Ricoeur's dialogical hermeneutics, Derrida's deconstruction. This analysis has been highlighted in Gianni Vattimo, *Diálogo con Nietzsche. Ensayos 1961-2000* (Barcelona: Paidós, 2002).

<sup>11</sup> Milorad M. Drachkovitch, *De Marx a Mao Tsé-Toung: Un siècle d'Internationale marxiste* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1967).

<sup>12</sup> Georg Lukács, *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein: Studien über marxistische Dialektik* (Berlin: Luchterhand, 1970).



in capitalist society. There is a halo of truth in Marx who, in the face of the industrial revolution and the different types of exploitation of his time, seeks a fast track to liberate man. Marxism is a movement against the dehumanization and automation of man. Marx sees in man a concrete being who is prey to certain oppressions and historical conditions. Man owns those conditions that enslave him (alienation), he is the one who has created things that later dominates him (Feuerbach). The economic alienation and exploitation suffered by modern man is the living example of the exacerbated dehumanization that capitalist society imposes with its false “mass” democracy. In this sense, Marxism is a response to Hegelian idealism and to any anthropological conception that minimizes the role of consciousness and human dignity in shaping the cosmos.

In the wake of Marx, a thinker and honorary member of the Communist Party in France, Sartre argued that man is an abstract being prone to experiencing a metaphysical reality, but it is not possible to give way to the existential and abstract problematic without attending to the concrete problem.<sup>13</sup> Today’s postmodernism is consequently situated with a structuralist method before the concept of the evaporation of man (theoretical anti-humanism). Foucault will say that man is an invention of modernity, postmodernism that will be erected on the idea that the great meta-narratives of modernity have already collapsed and is directly to blame for the emergence of totalitarianism (fascist and Stalinist). Although his most coherent discourse is within aesthetics, it has been extrapolated to the field of political philosophy arguing an all-encompassing imprint, it is no longer the class struggle that is the engine of history, it is “knowledge” according to Lyotard, neoliberalism, and the end of history will be the only horizon to see arrive.<sup>14</sup>

These anthropological intellectual consequences have a common root with the approach of Marx and man as a productive being who, only in sociability, can develop all his historical potentialities. Man is the ontocreator of his own reality. At the same time when he moulds and reproduces reality, and the man-nature relationship, a question he resolves with the relations of production comes to the fore.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ana Boschetti, *Sartre et “Les Temps modernes”: Une entreprise intellectuelle* (Paris: Editions di Minuit, 1985), 67.

<sup>14</sup> José Guilherme Merquior, *Foucault ou le Nihilisme de la chaire* (Paris: PUF, 1986), 33–38.

History is the self-realization of man; it is the self-creation of his potentialities through work and his production. In that sense man as he reproduces reality, gives meaning to his existence, and finds his place in the cosmos. It should be noted that Marx's entire theoretical effort was not only to understand human nature, but to be able to give an alternative to capitalist society, that by Marx's time, capitalism had already become a savage and exploitative system. Man does not affirm himself, but refuses. He feels unhappy and unfortunate. From here we can note that Marx develops an ontology of the social as Lukács and Kosik would say in the twentieth century, an ontology that possibly Marx was not aware of having realized, but that in any concern to understand or try to apprehend (Popper) the radical ontic (Heidegger) of reality, in short, there is an ontology.<sup>15</sup> Ontology tries to understand the ultimate nature of reality, of entities, their conformation and constitution. But Marx turns ontology into an ontology of social being and work, that is, in the way in which man is inserted in a historically determined reality and he himself reproduces this reality through his labour and cognitive forces. For Marx, the emergence of socialism and the overcoming of capitalism consisted in providing certain conditions for initiating the real emancipation of man and the beginning of his true history. In both Marx and Nietzsche, we witness a prophetic philosophy that was correct in its forecasts as we will see later in the conclusions.

The criticisms of Marxism are accurate, especially of economic determinism, and theoretic inability of Marxism to understand the imaginary in the framework of man's relations with nature and his ability to think and construct the social-historical. In Marx, a closed self continues to prevail over itself. In practice, Marxism can only be overcome by itself, by its epistemic self-destruction, and overtaken by historical facts.

To conclude, we can affirm that Marx speaks of man as an individual in relation to work. Work is the activity through which the individual creates himself on the basis of which he defines himself. Certainly, Marx says that work is a specific activity of the individual where he can express his humanity, but at present, the postmodern prototype of twenty-first century society leads to the understanding of man as a worker defined by hours of work and rest, with no

---

<sup>15</sup> Márcio Antônio de Paiva, *A liberdade como horizonte da verdade segundo M. Heidegger* (Roma: Gregorian University Press, 1998) and Dario Antiseri, *Karl R. Popper: Epistemologia e società aperta* (Roma: Armando, 1972).

projection other than performance. This materialization of the “human being” through work comes to life in a product that is external to the individual. It is created by him and at the same time man himself undergoes modifications in his constitution. Capital and Marxist classes have been replaced by welfare, the media, and the self-formation of the subject without fixed criteria. The realization of the freedom of the individual could only occur in a social context where justice prevails, understood here as reciprocity in social relations. The classical concept of Aristotelian justice would have no place, not even in Rawls’ theory. It takes much more than a social transformation for the person to free himself. It takes a deep understanding of human identity, to create a relationship of justice, brick by brick. When man is not a man, he can be a wolf, an exploiter, a tyrant, a salesman, or a mere user. The conversion of “in itself” into “for itself” has not occurred only because of the introduction of consumerist liberalism, but because the structures of consumption in a welfare state can only guarantee the status of man as “in himself” satisfied. Man is stripped of his humanity no longer at the moment when he is not reunited with his own product, but at the moment when he can do nothing but consume products and express his opinion. The alienation is twofold. Not only is he deprived of living fully and exercising his freedom by being stripped of his production, but also by the reduction to spectator and buyer, he loses self-awareness. It is in this sense that it cannot be free.

The serious thing is that the consequence of this alienation is that it is not only individual, but that it makes possible the domination of a class that in the global village is the whole interconnected world.<sup>16</sup> The working class for the ruling class.<sup>17</sup>

This line of analysis seems to make particular sense when thinking about what happens in an advanced industrial society. Here the industrial revolution has already introduced the “machine” to the productive process, which undoubtedly aggravates the consequences on the worker in terms of dehumanization. The axis in this type of society is the work-technology relationship. In this regard, Marcuse in his work *The one-dimensional man* of 1969, characterizes the domination that

---

<sup>16</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *En el enjambre* (Barcelona: Herder, 2014).

<sup>17</sup> Svetozar Stojanovic, *Between ideals and reality: A critique of socialism and its future* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

technology exerts on the worker causing alienation.<sup>18</sup> The subject is “reified,” loses its human value, because it is trapped in a “scientific-technological rationality” that limits it in its condition.<sup>19</sup> In the Marxist world, the state, the church, the school, and the family are the consensus apparatuses that facilitate alienation. It is here that alienation effectively finds an appropriate place. In today's world where there is no family, (or the family has been subjected to changes that make it appear as never before), where there is no church (because of the growing discredit in the name of relativism and science), what remains is only the State which take over the school.

For Marx, the path of desalienation is overcoming and becoming aware. The recognition of the situation of domination – in which the man who is dehumanized finds himself – leads to the reappropriation of his work, that is, a rediscovering of his own being. Of course, this presupposes a model of society where social relations are established within a framework of reciprocity and social justice. In short, the proposal of a new man by his social relations and defined by the key to a liberating work.

## Conclusions

Thus, we can summarize the ideal of change for a new model of humanity is the postmodern subject that preys on emotions in a supposed search for the values of life, renounces all morality to create itself in relation to work and production. He is an individual and not a person, because he relates to himself in others and does not constitute himself in those relationships. It is an island. The justification of this absolute character of the subject is supported by the understanding of a liberal policy that must above all provide the individual with the necessary guarantees for total well-being, thus producing a palliative society, in Han's words, which entails a liquid individual fleeing the experiences that make

---

<sup>18</sup> Herbert Marcuse, *El hombre unidimensional: Ensayo sobre la ideología de la sociedad industrial avanzada* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1972).

<sup>19</sup> Carlos Gurméndez, *El secreto de la alienación y la desalienación humana* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1989) and Pierpaolo Donati, *Sociología relacional de lo humano* (Pamplona: Eunsa, 2019).

him go beyond himself. In flight of transcendence and, therefore, of morality, memory, art, and religion.<sup>20</sup>

To conclude we can affirm that the change of the new model of humanity is not so much a change, as a dissolution since there is no element that remains with respect to the defining coordinates of man: reason, will and freedom for good. The image of the present man is an image of the self-exploited man. The relations that constituted it in the Marxist era have passed from the owners of the means of production to itself, but the purpose has not changed at all. We work to perform, not to dignify ourselves. We exploit ourselves and think we are realizing ourselves, in Han's words. Today's man unthinkingly follows a social mandate: to do everything he can. Until a while ago, people did what they should, but no longer. Now the human being believes that he must achieve "success," even at the expense of himself, and is severely distressed if he does not succeed. There is no need for power to whip it. The superman has become a servant of himself. Everyone submits to this regime of work and consumption, on a totally voluntary basis.<sup>21</sup> This idea of the superman and man in the West – because of the Nietzschean and Marxist root it contains – becomes that man cannot serve any cause other than himself. Causes such as the Nation, the Church, Race, or Feminism are epigones of themselves that reflects something like a broken Narcissus: himself and his interest. The end of the transcendence that Kant had postulated in a world of phenomena is transferred to the whole reality. There is no other, it is no longer even a hell (Sartre), but there is only the individual prolongation in the Western superman dissolved upon himself. The man we speak of, situated in the West and spreading his message veiledly through technological means throughout the entire "global village" is dissolved in his psyche (Freud), in his existence and meaning (Heidegger), in his relationship with God (Nietzsche and the New Age) and in the relationship with others (Sartre).

We observe a man who, as far as communication is concerned, has apparently left *homo homini lupus* behind because he likes to relate. In reality, however, relationships have been replaced by connections. What is established today is a link between sources of information scattered around the world. There is no physical presence of the other, but exchange of information. All the senses

---

<sup>20</sup> Biagio Di lasio, *Luigi Pareyson: Fede e ricerca filosofica* (Manfredonia: Dianoia, 2017) and Byung-Chul Han, *La sociedad paliativa: El dolor hoy* (Barcelona: Herder, 2021).

<sup>21</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *La sociedad del cansancio* (Barcelona: Herder, 2017), 13.

except sight are falling into disuse. That is why, in part, communication has weakened markedly. In turn, people look only for their “equals,” those capable of liking their own. Where is the difference then? The superman is unable to comprehend anyone who is not himself. There is no other. In the new model of humanity, all otherness is repudiated. Marx had predicted it with his dialectic, Sartre made it a reality. The other is one of the concepts that is in crisis in today’s society. It seems that the only slogan is to equalize us. The “trends” and “the viral” are manifestations of this desire to belong to a collective that marches in unison. Han says that the more equal we are, the more production increases.<sup>22</sup> In his view, the difference is contrary to the goals of neoliberalism. If there were some who used smartphones and others who did not, the market would be harmed. Currently there is a radical conformism, an enormous passivity that reduces the human being to the condition of client or producer.<sup>23</sup>

All this also leads to the loss of the notion of time. The new model of humanity today is a timeless, timeless man. Time is another of those critical elements in today’s world. What prevails now is acceleration and the passing. Do everything fast and let it go as soon as you arrived. It is an attack on permanence. We would have to recover personal time, that is, the time in which we dedicate ourselves. We would have to own time outside the productive system. We would have to recover the moments of leisure and the moments for the party. We would have to set aside time for the unproductive, not for the “pause” that makes work more efficient.<sup>24</sup>

Man is a chained Prometheus. It is not Sisyphus, as Camus said. Nor the superman free from all bondage. Han has reinterpreted the myth of Prometheus to speak of the man of today. It is a scene of the psychic apparatus of the subject of contemporary performance, who is violent with himself and who is at war with himself. In reality, the subject of performance, who believes himself in freedom, is as chained as Prometheus. The eagle that devours his constantly growing liver is his alter ego, with which he is at war. Thus seen, the relationship of Prometheus and the eagle is a relationship with himself,

---

<sup>22</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *La expulsión de lo distinto: Percepción y comunicación en la sociedad actual* (Barcelona: Herder, 2018), 19–20.

<sup>23</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *El aroma del tiempo: Un ensayo filosófico sobre el arte de demorarse* (Barcelona: Herder, 2015), 37–40.

<sup>24</sup> Joseph Pieper, *Una teoría de la fiesta* (Madrid: Rialp, 2006).

a relationship of self-exploitation. Liver pain, which in itself is painless, is tiredness. In this way, Prometheus, as a subject of self-exploitation, becomes prey to infinite weariness.<sup>25</sup> He is the original figure of the new humanity, typical of the society of fatigue. A disarmament of this self is necessary for the emergence of a new self, of a new image. To count on man from a non-reductionist conception of matter from his intelligence; to probe the relationship between mind and brain; to explore the essence of freedom as a relation to truth; to seek the question of conscience and the meaning of life are all fundamental to building a man who can aspire to a full happiness not manufactured by others. This is possible through an exercise of interiority from the phenomenology of action and self-awareness and limited situations. Painkillers are never enough in the face of the mystery of evil that can clarify the mystery of man.

Obviously, change is possible. The philosophical, artistic, and social vicissitudes of the last two centuries attest to this. The conception of man, social relations, their expression in art has crossed the borders of the global, and of the masses, to convert to the solipsism of the self that buys and satisfies itself without meaning or end. Change is possible, the question would be. Is it not a dissolution? Does it not lead to radical dehumanization? Does scientific and social progress not mean the decay of an entire civilization? Is there hope to rebuild man on solid foundations? No doubt there would be many topics to talk about and think about, but they are no longer the object of the subject that has occupied us.

## Bibliography

- Antiseri, Dario. *Karl R. Popper: Epistemologia e società aperta*. Roma: Armando, 1972.
- Anders, Günther. *La obsolescencia del hombre: Sobre el alma en la época de la segunda revolución industrial*. Madrid: Pre-Textos, 2011.
- Boschetti, Ana. *Sartre et "Les Temps modernes": Une entreprise intellectuelle Boschetti*. Paris: Editions di Minuit, 1985.
- de Paiva, Márcio Antônio. *A liberdade como horizonte da verdade segundo M. Heidegger*. Roma: Gregorian University Press, 1998.

---

<sup>25</sup> Byung-Chul Han, *La sociedad del cansancio* (Barcelona: Herder, 2017), 10.

- Drachkovitch, Mirolard M. *De Marx a Mao Tsé-Toung : Un siècle d'Internationale marxiste*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1967.
- Donati, Pierpaolo. *Sociología relacional de lo humano*. Pamplona: Eunsa, 2019.
- Di Lasio, Biagio. *Luigi Pareyson. Fede e ricerca filosofica*. Manfredonia: Dianoia, 2017.
- Glucksmann, Anton. *Dostoievsky en Manhattan*. Madrid: Taurus, 2002.
- Gurméndez, Carlos. *El secreto de la alienación y la desalienación humana*. Barcelona: Anthropos, 1989.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *El aroma del tiempo: Un ensayo filosófico sobre el arte de demorarse*. Barcelona: Herder, 2015.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *En el enjambre*. Barcelona: Herder, 2014.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *La sociedad del cansancio*. Barcelona: Herder, 2017.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *La expulsión de lo distinto: Percepción y comunicación en la sociedad actual*. Barcelona: Herder, 2018.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *La sociedad paliativa: El dolor hoy*. Barcelona: Herder, 2021.
- Lukács, Geörgy. *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein: Studien über marxistische Dialektik*. Berlin: Luchterhand, 1970.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *El hombre unidimensional: Ensayo sobre la ideología de la sociedad industrial avanzada*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1972.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University Toronto Press, 1962.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1964.
- Merquior, José Guilherme. *Foucault ou le Nihilisme de la chaire*. Paris: PUF, 1986.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus spoke Zarathustra*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*. London: Vintage, 1989.
- Pavón, Dalmacio Negro. *El mito del hombre Nuevo*. Madrid: Encuentro, 2009.
- Pieper, Joseph. *Una teoría de la fiesta*. Madrid: Rialp, 2006.
- Singer, Peter. *Liberación animal*. Madrid: Akal, 1999.
- Stojanovic, Svetozar. *Between ideals and reality: A critique of socialism and its future*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Vattimo, Gianni. *Diálogo con Nietzsche. Ensayos 1961-2000*. Barcelona: Paidós, 2002.

## Streszczenie

### **Rozpad i przemiany zmierzające do nowego modelu ludzkości**

Aksjologiczny klucz do dzisiejszego świata tworzą konsekwencje rozpadu Nietzscheańskiej wersji życia i człowieka oraz Marksowskiego ujęcia świata, społeczeństwa i historii. Teoretycznie człowiek XXI wieku chciałby uważać się za spadkobiercę ducha Oświecenia, z jego równością, braterstwem i wolności. W praktyce człowiek naszych czasów jest uwięziony w tyranii technologii, panowaniu konsumpcji i sieci komunikacyjnej, które



znieczulają na krytyczne myślenie. Na podstawie analizy Heideggera, Byung-Chul Han i Günther Anders zastanawiają się nad utopią zmiany społecznej i różnymi podejściami do niej. Czy zmiana jest możliwa? Czy powstaje ona w społeczeństwie, czy w indywidualum? Czy zmiana musi oznaczać postęp? Milenialsi, nowe modele rodziny, autorytet mediów, fast foody, strony internetowe poświęcone romansom mówią o transformacji wartości ludzkich, które wymagają dogłębnego zbadania, by dowiedzieć się, jaką prawdę odsłaniają o człowieku, świecie i historii.

Słowa kluczowe: Nietzsche, Marks, człowiek, myślenie krytyczne

## Zusammenfassung

### **Zerfall und Wandlungen in Richtung auf ein neues Modell der Menschlichkeit**

Der axiologische Schlüssel zur heutigen Welt sind die Folgen des Zerfalls der Nietzscheanischen Version von Leben und Mensch sowie Marx' Sicht auf die Welt, Gesellschaft und Geschichte. Theoretisch möchte sich der Mensch des einundzwanzigsten Jahrhunderts als Erbe des Geistes der Aufklärung mit ihrer Gleichheit, Brüderlichkeit und Freiheit betrachten. In der Praxis ist der Mensch unserer Zeit gefangen in der Tyrannei der Technologie, der Herrschaft des Konsums und des Kommunikationsnetzwerks, die ein kritisches Denken abstumpfen. Auf der Grundlage der Analyse von Heidegger reflektieren Byung-Chul Han und Günther Anders die Utopie des gesellschaftlichen Wandels und unterschiedliche Herangehensweisen daran. Ist Veränderung möglich? Entsteht sie in der Gesellschaft oder im Individuum? Muss Veränderung Fortschritt bedeuten? Millennials, neue Modelle der Familie, die Autorität der Medien, Fast Food, die den Liebesaffären gewidmeten Websites zeugen von der Transformation menschlicher Werte, die ein eingehendes Studium erfordern, um herauszufinden, welche Wahrheit sie über den Menschen, die Welt und die Geschichte offenbaren.

Schlüsselworte: Nietzsche, Marx, Mensch, kritisches Denken

Informacje o autorze:

EMILIO SIERRA GARCÍA, dr, adiunkt, Uniwersytet CEU San Pablo w Madrycie i School of Philosophy; adres do korespondencji: Calle Asura, 8. 28043. Madryt, Hiszpania; e-mail: [emilio.sierragarcia@colaborador.ceu.es](mailto:emilio.sierragarcia@colaborador.ceu.es)

