

ABOUT THE TECHNIQUE: THE POSSIBILITIES OF SERENITY IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER

SOBRE A TÉCNICA: AS POSSIBILIDADES DA SERENIDADE EM MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Adair Adams^I 

Fábio César Junges^{II} 

Morgana de Almeida Trintin^{III} 

Antonio Escandiel de Souza^{III} 

^IInstituto Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Vacaria, RS, Brasil. Doutor em Educação nas Ciências. E-mail: adair.adams@vacaria.ifrs.edu.br

^{II}Universidade Regional Integrada do Alto Uruguai e das Missões, Santo Ângelo, RS, Brasil; Universidade de Cruz Alta, Cruz Alta, RS, Brasil. Doutor em Teologia. E-mail: fabiocesarjunges@gmail.com

^{III}Instituto Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Vacaria, RS, Brasil. Estudante do Curso Técnico em Multimídia. E-mail: mogaalmm@gmail.com

^{IV}Universidade de Cruz Alta, Cruz Alta, RS, Brasil. Doutor em Letras. E-mail: asouza@unicruz.edu.br

Abstract: The text aims to think about our condition of being-with-the-earth, from texts written by Martin Heidegger. The hypothesis that moves the reflection is the possibility of creating a living without technological determinism and, likewise, the non-radical negation of technologies in the human world. The serenity is one of the bets, unfolded in a thought of deepness and in saying “yes” and “no” to the technique. One of the results is the institution of a human world as housing and not only construction. The housing here has the poetic perspective, inspired in Friederich Hölderlin, for whom the human dwells poetically the world. The argumentative path has as base the bibliographic research in the philosophy, centered on the author of “Being and Time”, Hans-George Gadamer, and Paul Ricoeur. The horizon is the repeated taking the meditative thought as a questioner of the calculating interpretation of the human being sense. We hope that the presented reflections can collaborate with the comprehension about the world we live in, increasingly guided in the mathematization and informatization of the human condition in their social relations, both of plurality and of diversity.

Keywords: Technique. Serenity. Meditative Thought.

Resumo: O texto objetiva pensar sobre a nossa condição de ser-com-a-técnica, a partir de textos de Martin Heidegger. A hipótese que move a reflexão é a possibilidade de constituição de um viver sem determinismo tecnológico e, outrossim, a negação radical das tecnologias no mundo humano. A serenidade é uma das apostas, desdobrada num pensar de profundidade e no dizer “sim” e “não” à técnica. Um dos resultados é a instituição de um mundo humano como casa e não apenas como construção. A casa nesta pesquisa segue a perspectiva de Friederich Hölderlin, para quem o ser humano habita o mundo poeticamente. O percurso argumentativo tem por base a pesquisa bibliográfica na área da filosofia, centrada no autor de “Ser e tempo”, Hans-Georg Gadamer e Paul Ricoeur. O horizonte é a reiterada retomada do pensamento meditativo como questionador da interpretação calculadora do sentido do ser humano. Nós esperamos que as presentes reflexões possam

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31512/vivencias.v20i40.995>

Submissão: 06-03-2023

Aceite: 24-04-2023



Esta obra está licenciada com uma Licença Creative Commons Atribuição-NãoComercial-SemDerivações 4.0 Internacional.

colaborar com a compreensão sobre o mundo em que vivemos, cada vez mais guiado pela matematização e pela informatização da condição humana em suas relações sociais, ambas de pluralidade e de diversidade.

Palavras-chave: Técnica. Serenidade. Pensamento meditativo.

Introduction

In the second decade of the 21st century, we experienced a deepening of technification of the human world, above all thinking and acting, moved by the structures of utilitarianism and productivity. Basic tasks, considered part of the routine, are no longer thought of without connection with technological means or with the utilization of innovations in this area. During the Covid-19 pandemic, these behaviors, that were already being recurring, established in the widest possible way, triggering ways of being that present the technologies of communication and information as the human essentiality. They became the radicalization of the escape of thinking, according to Heidegger (2006), and of own freedom, according to Gadamer reflections (1983).

It is essential that, along with the questions to be asked, we emphasize that Heidegger does not attribute the problem that involves those topics to the use of technologies, but to the way that they are associated to the human essence, as part of its nature. This association sometimes makes us leave the subject aside while human being, a look so necessary for us to be aware about the meaning of the actions we perform, be it in personal or professional aspects, and for directing and the political organization of our society, using the language, from the dialog, by performing a communication between the tradition, that makes part of our existence, and our sense of being one with others.

On this journey in search of what was created beyond the technical improvement or its realization, we are taken out of the presented convenience by revolutionary instruments and by the imposed meanings in its creation. It is necessary to take a certain reflexive distance from the actions and the objects that we think are known, to see how they act in our society. By this, we will become able to guide the best way to use them, without allowing a strengthening pattern to be established and capable of setting leveling structures of thinking and questioning. the following of this pattern does not only occur by lay people, when related to the search areas that encompass the study of the human beings from their mind and subjectivity, but also from scholars, and those are who that need more to take this thinking distance, due to its immersion in those areas and in their already established concepts.

The text seeks to reflect about the way we live by Martin Heidegger's proposal of meditative thinking as a way of confronting the technicality that levels us and, in large part, dehumanizes us. It is not about analyzing the influence of communication and information technologies that overlap with everyday life, but about what happens to us when we center the operation of the human being on devices. To think is, for the author, a way to say "no" to

this technological framework and also to say “yes”, being capable of understanding the relation between the proximity and distance of being-with-the-devices. The argumentation horizon is the possibility of finding ways to understand the human as a question, beyond the defining perspective of assembling it in concepts, structures and strategies.

Investigative path

The present text is vinculated with the Research Scholarship “Education and New Technologies: Reflections about the Instrumental Reason and its implications in the Common World” referred to the Notice nº 16/2022, associated to the developed research during the curriculum component named “Project of Training and Integration III”, part of the Multimedia Technical Course Integrated with High School, both developed at Vacaria Campus belonged to the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil - IFRS. The studies began in June of 2022 from the reading of the text “The Question of Technique” written by Martin Heidegger, followed by the reading of the same author text “Serenity”. Beyond those readings, classes taught between June and September of 2022 evidenced the most important concepts, contributing to the occurrence of an assimilation between theory and the occurrence in different spaces. The research object takes place from what was already developed in different areas of knowledge, since it is becoming from tradition and in concepts that require interpretation. This set of studies, along with the guidance of teachers, debates and exchange of ideas, enabled the writing and elaboration of these arguments.

The developed research is characterized as basic, with qualitative approach and descriptive and explanatory objectives. Its development is based on the reading, registrations and review of two main texts, originated from conferences given by Martin Heidegger and posteriorly published as books: “The Question of Technique” and “Serenity”, presenting two main phases of comprehension: the understanding of the concepts “technique”, “technology” and “technicality” and then, how are presented the “serenity” and “meditative thought”. The author constituted a starting point for the hermeneutic tradition and foundations of the language paradigm, in addition to being responsible for the first philosophical elaborations about the technique and the world situations that it involves.

The bibliographic research has as perspective the interpretations of the fixed senses by the writing of several authors and related with our human condition, which seeks to constitute itself as such in a pedagogical way, opening new paths. So, when we choose to follow this type of research, we also choose to open new paths from what has already been thought, discussed and written. The period of research was organized between reading, writing and presentation of the interpretations for scholars of the area and professors of the teaching networks, especially the ones that make part of the region named “Campos de Cima da Serra” where the Vacaria Campus - IFRS - is located. In the search of establishing an approximation with the real, science is required to constitute itself as an argumentative community, open to the confrontation with a dynamic of this real and, also, with the other areas of knowledge, having as base an interdisciplinary dimension.

According to Gil (2002), the qualitative researches do not have the concern with elements that express the totality of the students and the definition of a percentage to validate the results. The adoption of these modalities has as a finality to understand the way how humanity began to constitute itself through a non-thinking technicality. Thereby, identify and describe how this way of being implies in a society that compromises what is most dear to the human, to think the being, the sense and the truth of the being.

Argumentation

About the heideggerian concepts of technique and technology

Martin Heidegger presents the technique and the technologies in an essential way so that, in this context, we understand relevant questions before the world we are disposed of. The great problem pointed out by the author in relation to technification, is directly linked with a third concept that will relate with other two, which we call “technicality”. When we study the world, we will notice the suffix “ity” which concerns an intoxication related with the world’s prefix, in this case the technique. Soon, the meaning of technicality would be an intoxication by the technique, pointed by an exacerbated necessity, that would make all the others options dependent from it and imposing as an absolute and undoubted truth above all the others.

Regarding the technique, we start from *techne*, which refers to the ability to make, to become present in the world something, until then, nonexistent. “Knowledge that constitutes a determinate being capable-to-do, self-assured, in the context of a production” (Gadamer, 1983, translated by the author). Acts as a manifestation of the entity (something, someone), once there is an externalization of inconsistent questions from the action, causing there to be many roots to the same technique.

With regard to the technologies, they would be a way to improve the own technique, appearing from a nuisance, from a necessity of renovation or, even, as a version from other technology. This contextualization already proposes a thought about the attribution of essence to the technique or to the technologies, since both need there to be a manifestation of the subject, for it to happen, or for a certain object to become established in the world.

For Heidegger, the human being is a being that is always in the way, always in the direction of something. As it does not have a direction or a way preset, it can direct to multiple meanings and walk through multiple trails. The condition of having to create their paths and trails puts the human being in a risk situation, which is the one that leads or arrives to a no-way or de-tour and thus transit through paths that do not have a crisp and clean sense. Freedom constitutes its meaning of being, puts the human being in a structure of living and needs to think about the structure with a requirement to face the danger of going astray.

The reflection about the technique does not remain restricted to technological devices, but from a questioning of their meaning, when we understand that to the technique “belongs the production and the use of tools, appliances and machines, as to it belongs those products and utensils in themselves and the necessities they serve” (Heidegger, 2006, p.12, translated by

the author). To this dimension is possible to join the most upscale and complete techniques of the actual moment in all of the fields that are desired: biochemical, psychoanalytic, linguistic, microphysical, sociological, statistical, computational. Stein (2006) argues that this reflection does not just or mainly stick to technological artifacts - genesis, evolution, advantages, dangers - in an ontic perspective, but that manifests, among other things, a philosophical interpretation of the current time, the era from modern technique and the possibilities of thinking the human sense.

Heidegger (2006) sick to think with deepness the question of technique, more properly in an ontological perspective. And it's not possible to infer a way of epistemological and ethical thinking from it. However, a possible ethic in Heidegger (2008)¹ it does not must be understood just as an introduction to a set of regulations that say how the human being should live next to *a safe constancy of its plan and work in whole*. But, that yes, as reflection about our way of life, in the sense that refers to the origin of *ethos* in which we can understand ourselves in a way more wide and deep, considering what we are and how we are in the present time. According to Heidegger (2006) *ethos* means instance and place of dwelling. The word names an open scope in which the man dwells (*Wohnt*). That implies that meditation about the technique manifests our own way of dwelling corresponding to the technique, that is, leads us inexorably to a thought that seeks to understand the truth of the being as the most origin dimension of the human being, what would be an original ethics. The reflection about the technique leads to this original ethics as a thinking about the human way of dwelling above the earth.

To recognize the helplessness of reflection before the powers of the contemporary world is a deep comprehension of the situation that the “man behaves like *he* was the language creator, while *she* remains the mistress of the man” (Heidegger, 2006, p.126). According with the author, the same situation applies to the technique, on the condition that man can not aspire to the truth of the technical world and to seize her. The bottom line is in thinking a technical project whose development takes place in harmony with the human project, in their historical-existential² senses.

It is not necessary that the human being links itself with the entity reduced to the constancy and by giving as much of it as possible so that the technique transformation of the entity occurs what makes itself to convert in a commercial and of power sense. Without doubt, the entity can note give itself as object - to the scientific turn - or like something available to its explanation - for the technical look. Can also give itself and before everything as thing. And our most genuine relation with the entity occurs, precisely, when we assume it as thing. “For a long time, our thought has been accustomed to fix the essence of the things in an *extremely indigent* way. In the course of the western thought, the consequence from this habit was to represent the thing with a X, endowed with sensitive property” (HEIDEGGER, 2006, p. 133, translated by the author). Something achieves the characteristic of thing when it replaces the quadrant:

1 The basis of this argument is the Letter about Humanism (Heidegger, 2005). In this text Heidegger explains the motives of not writing an ethic in the manner of dealings that since Kant have been elaborated.

2 The decision of thinking possible ways of harmonization takes place in the field of politics, because the deliberation ethical-technical is something that can happen in the common meeting of human beings.

heaven, earth, mortal and divines, in which the mortals can dwell in the scope of the quadrant only and while they live there, where it stays: in the things. A bridge or a jar are things. “The bridge is a place. With this thing, the bridge establishes an espace in which admits earth and heaven, the divines and the mortal” (Heidegger, 2006, p. 134, translated by the author).

According to Heidegger (2006), the being manifests in the era of modern technique as will of power. By reflecting more closely about the technologizing character of our time, it can be said that the being take the figure of *Gestell*: the disposed, the im-posed; the device, and the shape of *Gestell* becomes preponderant about all the technique that the man creates as mediation of the world constitution. And “this is founded, however, in the own thing that here language comes to us” (Heidegger, 2006, p. 21, translated by the author).

The device is the name to designate the essential of the modern technique. Just like every modern technique, the im-posed, while a device has an ambiguous character. On one side, the dis-posed manifests by inducing or privating to the human being the un-hide of what exists in a pro-vocative manner. The provocative truth of the being raises the provocative truth of the entity, being the mediator man, so to speak, between one and the other. On the other hand, the inherent danger in the occurrence of the dis-posed emerges as the savior, that in danger or in the desert also lives de salvation (Hoelderlin, 2012). This reflection is elementary to not fall in a technological dualism of its uses, for bad or for good, that sends to a type of a dualist metaphysical argumentation of modernity.

Just as no fate can deviate or take away by sheer human will, the present tendency in the will of power, on the dis-posed, can not be modified according to our taste or convenience. However, even though the human being had welcomed this fate of being, can realize that the technique way to destine being to man is not the only one, and postpone this unique possibility would be fall in the mistake of do not see wealth of this horizon that keeps other possibilities, that ends up an unprecedented future, even not yet envisioned. So it does not run out the question of technique, in principle, by the non-limitation of the being, but moves through the technical word in a way that is not merely technical anymore.

Neither is in the human being's hands simply to accept or to decline this way of verifying the modern technique. The provocative reveal forms part of the history of the being and is a moment from its fate, beyond the will of want or do not to want has already been installed multiple times. This is one of the questions that leads to a reflexive desert in the human sciences, such as in education, ethics and politics, among others, for the fact that it seems that the humanity of the human being is consumed in processes of automation and that only remains the adequacy. So, the technique danger in its contemporary representations is in being an anchorage of sense in a world without sense (Stein, 2011).

In the era of modern technique it is imposed with more and more force, the instrumental conception of language, that is not incorrect, but is not fully true. In fact, “the consequence of precipitation and of inherent banality in the use of speech and writing, today predominates a relation with the language, but is more decisive. We think that the language [...] as all of the things we are in daily relationship is nothing more than an instrument, namely, an instrument

of communication (Verständigung) and of information” (Heidegger, 2013, translated by the author).

About the heideggerian serenity

So that we can take care of the serenity for Heidegger it is necessary for us to understand the concept of “meditative thought” and, in turn, to have a comprehension about its antonym, the “calculating thinking”. Where we consider and analyze that the actions in our society are historically evaluated and constructed, we are faced with the arisement of stipulations that lead us to an immobilization of thinking, making us conform with what is daily disposed and present in our habits and comprehensions about the world, since we are disposed in it. These structures make us return to the concept of *Gestell*, being like frames or armatures that keep the subject static without questioning or positioning about what they experience.

The armatures are part of the human condition. They can be an interpretation, of actions, of experiences, finally, of world crafting. To understand them is the task that manifests who is and how lives the human being. In some way, they are the reflection of the organization to which we are disposed of, effective in the presence of factors that, over time and with the establishment of certain convenience, apparently act in a simple and, sometimes, unnoticed way. This type of action ends up objectifying the human being, so as to lose the identity and comprehension about itself, starting to act as a determined model and to follow what is offered. Qualitative statistical data, as an example, make us have a limited vision only to presented numbers shown through graphics that vary in a consistent and inconsistent way. Without having a deeper understanding of the cases, we do not understand certain variations, lacunas and inconstancy, and we are not capable of seeing nothing but a collection, usually superficial, that fits the subject through algorithms.

The frenzy in the ways of living in the society, above all in the search of money and its luxuries, set aside an important dimension of thinking, and the capacity of admiring what was done. Thinking is not only a suspect interrogator about what is disposed of, but an attentive and contemplative turn to what has been achieved. “The calculating thinking runs from one state to the next, without ever stopping to meditate” (Heidegger, 1994, translated by the author). This kind of thought provides a reduction of the human and of the world only to what could be produced, just like a great reserve of energy in full readiness and in ideal state to be redirected to the industries and the markets. The calculating thinking, technifier, is a pleasant horizon before the interrogations and questions that require effort, dedication and existential problems, social and cultural, just one vaccine for a return to the normality. The central feature of this calculating thinking is an objectification that plans, organizes and controls, that has circumstances and defined results, without possibility of space and time to meditate and reflect about the sense that prevails in everything that is. Is precisely when analyzing the calculation thinking, that Heidegger presentes another type of thinking, which requires introspection and returns us beyond a single path, presenting others representations about what we think to know. Having the necessary understandment to identify the distinctions between calculating and meditative thinking, we

will notice that the last one requires us to tread a long path, but that we come closer to what we essentially are without limiting to what is presented to us.

By following only one representation, we are prone to believe that we fully know a certain object or occurrence, without us noticing that our understanding corresponds only to one type of representation. “Where there is desert grows what saves” (Höelderlin, 2012, translated by the author). We add to the meaning of technique, the discovery of things that acts as a revealing of the true *aletheia*, however adding to the technical criticism, because it represents an escape of thinking, according to Heidegger. When using the technique, while we reveal something, we are also hiding one possibility. So, the human realization, drives a frame of what we know, reinforcing a one-hand path presented with the frames.

The truth to Heidegger is the most original interpretation of *aletheia*. To be in the truth technically means to unveil what exists in a certain way, to know of a provocative way. The prevailing unhide in the modern technique is a way of *pro-voke* that puts all nature under the requirement of the production of energies that can be explored for the most diverse ways of life in society. So, the unhide of the modern technique manifests all nature as constant, with objects that are available, as a reserve and/or subsistence fund. Heidegger affirmed that the own objects become understood as something ready to be consumed. We could say that the idea of substance becomes understood by the idea of subsistence in the sense of reserve.

Despite this manifestation of the truth of the technique question that tends to rise with unique veracity, it does not exhaust the ways of *aletheia*. In front of it or beside it is possible, also, a welcoming and respectful unveiling that lets beings be what they are without impositions or requirement, without extreme use or exploitation. Manifests itself in *aletheia* a way of protective truth inherent in the genuine willing in which

to resguard is not only to do nothing with what is guarded. To resguard is, in own sense, something positive and happens when we let something surrounded in advance to its essence vigor, when we return, in own way, something to the shelter of your essence, following a correspondence with the word liberate: liberate to the peace of a shelter (HEIDEGGER, 2005, p.129, translated by the author).

The possibility “of liberate to the peace of a shelter” is supplanted by a technological direction that reduces the entity to the constancy of stocks and reserves to the provocative unhide of the modern technique. Heidegger refers to this mode that is imposed to the entity in our era. The energy and organization politics of the territories does not have any proper occupations with objects, but with a general planetarization that orders the space and the time exploration views that can happen. Thus, the entity enters into a utilities system in which everything is in a list of reserves and funds that can become utilities for a certain purpose.

According to Gadamer (1983), it is not necessary for the human being to bond with the entity reduced to constancy and in giving itself as much as it can for the technological transformation of the entity takes place which makes it convert into a commercial and of power sense. With no doubt, the entity can not give itself as object - to the scientific turn - or like something available for its explanation - to the technique look. Can also give itself and first of all as thing. And our most genuine relation with the entity occurs, precisely, when we assume

it as thing. “For a long time, our thinking has become accustomed to fixing the essence of the things in an extremely *indigent* way. In the course of the western thought, the consequence from this habit was to represent the thing as a X, endowed with sensitive properties” (Heidegger, 2006, p. 133, translated by the author). In the same argumentative line, Heidegger (2006, p. 22, translated by the author) affirms that the “unconcealment in itself, where it develops the disposition, never is, although, a man made, as is not the space, that the men should had already covered, to relate, as subject, with an object”.

The way of thinking supplanted by the computing acting is the meditative, the thinking that reflects about the sense that reigns in everything that is. According to Heidegger, both types of thinking are necessary. In a genuine dwelling both must be assumed in a serious war, wide and deep, each one in the measure and in the shape that corresponds to it.

Against the objection that the avid meditation is too high for the ordinary understandment, Heidegger answers that “anyone can follow it own manner and inside of it own limits the paths of meditations [...] it is enough to us delay in the next one and to meditate in the closest one: in what bind us, each one of us, here and now” (Heidegger, 1994, p.14, translated by the author). On the other hand, meditative thought requires us not to remain safe without just one representation in the meaning that we do not run along just one trail in the direction of a unique idea. To Heidegger the meditative thought leads us against the productive character of technique, manifesting our condition of dwelling in the earth. This would happen, as an example, when we use the technical objects and however, despite its convenient use, we keep ourselves so free of them as like to conserve in every moment the necessary distance.

If the contradiction of social reality can not be eliminated through thinking, neither can they be banished from the own thought. That’s why the “to name” or “to image” of any positivity means, at the same time, immediately, falsify it. The thinking, the meditative one. including, finds itself entangled in those contradictions, and it is not given to it the task of utter even a word of hope. Its possible look is the look of the determined negativity one. Is the preservation look of hope, despite that the hope that the things could finally be different from what they are is almost without hope.

The present of meditative thought, with claim of truth, is in to bring the false theories of reality to confess its falsifications. In this confession, they reveal, in the instant moment, their truth. Working with concepts against the own concepts it is necessary to do the “verb takes delirium” (Barros, 2015, translated by the author). Precisely in the “to play” and “to kid”, in the “to dance” and “to rave (scrutinizing)” constelative of the verb, from time to time may to jump a ratio of hope. The ratios manifest in the serenity with what can be presented as sincere friendship welcoming of the human, to death and to the simple of the being in the world, because this serenity keeps the enigma of the hidden in the non-appearance of what presents itself always the same.

Therefore, in a society that is each more technified, with an absolut market economy, with capitalism established as hegemonic, the meditative thinking that dilates the open fissures becomes more and more current. Even that, if not extinguished, at least put in the society margin

and including in the universities, or, even, induced to fill the constant gaps in the technified society with its comforting word, in the perspective defended here, and the meditative word can not convert itself in ideology again.

To Stein (2011) the complexity and even the danger of technique just like the founder way of the human being is in the concentration of language as an instrument simply of information. This instrumentalization driven by humanity in a production context of electronic brains, not only in computer terms, is specializing in producing machines that think and can make translations. Those machines are intended to regulate and calculate the manner of our possible use of language. For the modern technique those machines are - and always whole, come to be - way to dispose of the world of language. Lot of technological instruments by their usefulness demonstrate at first glance that it is the human being who keeps the domination above the machine. Nonetheless, could be in true them that put the language in action, producing ties to the constitution of meaning and of being proper from the human being.

According with Heidegger (2006) the modern technique converts the language in procedures of instruments that are in service of economy with politics backing, being that science, as the knowledge of those instruments, puts under its guardianship, as a globalizer power, everything that can be technified with a totalizing will. The language is the appropriate way of manifestation of being in its nearest dwelling place of the sense of human being. The man, but, is not only a living being, because beside others faculties, also has the language. On the other hand, the language is the home of the being; living in it, the man *ex-ists* while belonging to the true of the being protecting it (Heidegger, 2005, p. 38).

The language is the home of the being and the dwelling place of the human being. The language is not one more characteristic of the human being, otherwise what defines it as such, because in the within language it *cor-responds* to the call of being and belongs to its truth. The human being keeps that where it dwells, this is, where it *ex-ists*, namely, the truth of being (Heidegger, 2005).

Finally, the serenity before the technique is expressed as follows: “Would want to name this attitude that says simultaneously ‘yes’ and ‘no’ to the technique world with an old word: the Serenity regarding things” (Heidegger, 1994, translated by the author). Trying to answer this question, Heidegger presents the concept of serenity “to say yes to the inevitable use of the technical objects”. “to say ‘no’ to them removing, so, a within in which they request us in a so exclusive way that misrepresent”. In this case, the “misrepresent” concerns the Aristotelian concept of virtue: be good in what is and do. We find out in this balance, the phenomenological base, once is necessary “to let that these objects rest in themselves, as something that, in the most intimate and proper of ourselves, already do not concern to us”, because while we use them, we give a sense and a utilization to them, doing with they become seen practically as an almost extension of ourselves without us seeing them for themselves.

Considerations

Against the human condition under the armor of technique, comes the fateful question: what to do in light of this situation? We believe that it is not a task to a person or for one area of knowledge, but to a set of people, what gives a good indicative that the academy is a privileged space for that. We argue that it consists of thinking about some indicators of reflection, results of research, proper studies and interlocutions between teachers, scientists, administrators, economists etc. We present a perspective with the feet and the head in philosophy that needs to be in dialogue with other areas of knowledge so it can have some “efficiency”. We believe that psychology, sociology and pedagogy have distinct interpretations and, that’s why, must present their arguments in an interdisciplinary dialogue. We insist on the concept of reflection that needs to be recovered, reaffirmed and qualified in its importance, especially in all the educational institutions.

To reflect before and to propose any possibility of “to do” in relation to the technicist situation of the present. Therefore we do not invent anything, we just carefully hear to the concept of *techné*, while knowing what to do. To know what to do is not only to do or just to know. Heidegger expressed all the importance of this question by presenting the differentiation between a meditative thought and a calculating thinking. The university itself seems to be a slave of calculating thinking, including the areas that were always understood as humans and reflexives. Even without realizing itself, but by operative, administrative and financial necessities, end up adopting an engineer model. So we have engineers of education, engineers of psyche, engineers of social and of cultural, engineers of the *sophia* itself. It does not mean that this model is not important or central to our world, but that it is not the only or the fundamental one.

The concept of humanization emerges from the moment that we direct a prioritization of the things beyond what satisfies the concept of “utility”, relevanting the seek for a meaning and keeping us, an incessant and vigorous thinking. When we find the heideggerian serenity, we also go against an experience that does not despise the technologies, but use them in a balanced way. “If we say, although, simultaneously ‘yes’ and ‘no’ [...] Our relation with the technical world will become wonderfully simple and pleasant” (Heidegger, 1994, translated by the author).

To seek a new rooting that will enable us to flourish and bear fruit, no longer relying only in the technique that implies in the fading of our roots and, consequently, makes it impossible for us to leave a commodity almost permanent. Beyond to live a Kairologic time, a deep experience, without being worried about what we have to carry out soon after, enjoying the moment, the present event. In compensation, when we concentrate in living a chronological time, we are referring to the time organized in periods for the realization of determined tasks, watered by constant worries and lack of depth, usually required by the precepts of technicality.

When we look at the spaces we dwell, it is necessary to us to keep aware about the sense of our actions, without to limitate the apprenticeships, allocation of funds, properties maintenance and the direction of decisions only according with what could generate labor and strengthen financial markets, keeping the work system that imprisons without the balance suggest

by Heidegger in the serenity. When we left the humanization in second place, we consequently lose the sense about what we do and we plan the individuals as a way to put them over a same landing, which enables to them redirects from a ruled behavior triggered by the possibilities that are disposed without autonomy or, necessarily, some affinity. All these practices are dictated by the utility that they represent inside a systematic plan to which we submit through the static, influenced by the technicality and by the calculating thinking, without space for the germination of the meditative thought.

When we permanently fit in frames, we stop searching for sense in our actions, that is, we stay in the commodity in what would be more useful without, in fact, to explore and meet who we are and what gives us satisfaction in realize. As a consequence, we end up in an incessant search for a place of belonging that can never come. “Dwelling the world and creating space/time so that humanization can take effect” (Heidegger, 1994, translated by the author).

Finally, the meditative thought characteristic of dwelling does not have its own light. Its light comes from the perspective of redemption. Amid the hopelessness, a “dark light” breaks out. In the middle of the shadow, a spark of light, even if dark reveals a new instant, doing with the things amalgamate in its opposites. Metaphorically, finally the messianic light sparkles in the break of the “shrine curtain”, opening fissures, making it possible to spy at once the crucified and hidden in the history. This opening, an attentive listening to the *irresistibility of attacking* of the calculating thinking, is the *to the retention of what saves* (Heidegger) to what is simple and serene.

References

- GADAMER, Hans-Georg. **A razão na época da ciência**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1983.
- GIL, Antonio Carlos. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 4. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Serenidad**. Barcelona: Serbal, 1994.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Carta sobre o humanismo**. São Paulo: Centauro, 2005.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ensaio e conferências**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2006.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ser e tempo**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ontologia: hermenêutica da facticidade**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Hebel: el amigo de la casa**. Disponível em <http://www.heideggeriana.com.ar/textos/hebel.htm>. Acesso em junho de 2013.
- HÖLDERLIN, Friedrich. **Hipérion ou o Eremita na Grécia**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2012.
- STEIN, Ernildo. **Pensar e errar, um ajuste com Heidegger**. Ijuí: Editora UNIJUÍ, 2011.