

Варини Е.

**ВОЗВРАЩЕНИЕ СИЛЫ: ТЕОРИЯ КОСМИЧЕСКОГО МОСТА
К ДИАЛЕКТИЧЕСКИ-СВЕРХЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКОМУ**

Варини Ермес – университет Тренто, Ph. D., научный сотрудник, Италия.
E-mail: ufficio.stampa@unitn.it

Varini H.

**RETURN OF POWER: THEORY OF A COSMIC BRIDGE
TO THE DIALECTICAL OVERHUMAN**

Varini Hermes – University of Trento, Ph. D., researcher, Italy.

Abstract. Propounded in relation to a peculiar mode in the view of an oscillating or cyclic universe, the concept of Return of Power, or of ontic recurrence as further increase in ontic Power signifies the determination of the existing entity according to its own selective recurrence as dialectically exceeding a previous status. Based thus upon the assumption that the actual ontological existence of the entity lies in its own potentiated recurrence (for it is maintained that only what is able to return to itself as potentiated signifies actual ontological existence) and that an ontic eternal return can only occur in terms of further Power, this notion embodies the culminating phase within change as an ultimate overcoming of a previous ontic status or situation respecting the category Power as a primary criterion within a constantly increasing Real (as Power, precisely). An ontic selective ultimate event respecting becoming as a general increment of the Real, this concept exceeds both the ontic dispersion in nothingness of the linear time and the identical ontic repeatability of the Eternal Return of the Same, the latter insofar as asserting the perennial return of man's own status of powerlessness, and as rendering accordingly impossible any actual (dialectical) transition to a well-defined superior ontic phase.

Being able to exist is power.
Spinoza, Ethics.

In setting forth the term and category *Return of Power* [12], I endeavored to define the determination of the existing entity according to its own natural and selective recurrence as dialectically exceeding a previous status. Based thus upon the assumption that the actual (ontological) existence of the entity lies in its own *potentiated recurrence* (for only what is able to return to itself as *potentiated* signifies actual ontic existence) and that the ontic return can only occur under this peculiar form, this notion establishes a substantive overcoming of a previous ontic status, phase, or situation in the distinct terms of *Power* as primary determination of the constantly increasing Real (*as Power*, precisely).

The continual increase of the latter, and hence of *Power* as contained within it, implies the Return in the very terms of *Power* as its own

culminating point respecting the Real as being *only potentially infinite*,¹ and as accordingly implying an intrinsic *return to itself* as its own self-determination, the opposite *actual infinite*, the relevant *creatio ex nihilo*, and linear view of time involving instead an eventual self-dispersion, and thus self-negation, of the entity in an ultimate nothingness. An ontic selective potentiating process and return, *ontic selective*, in contradistinction to the *identical ontic return* of the Eternal Return of the Same, an increase of Power intrinsic to Return, and a culminating point in becoming as a general increment of the Real (and hence *of Power*), the recurrence in terms of further increase in ontic Power exceeds accordingly both the ontic dispersion in nothingness of the linear succession of events (the latter as denying the ontic return as a final determination of the entity), and the identical ontic repeatability intrinsic to the Eternal Return of the Same, which, when looked upon in relation to Nietzsche's own notion of *Übermensch*,² and as asserting instead the return of man's eternal impotence, makes *de facto* impossible any transition (dialectical) to a necessarily superior *ontic phase*, hence to the actual (ontological) overhuman as antithetical to ontological human impotence in the first place. For, as the actual overcoming of the present status of the world is to be dialectical, and under this form *ontologically comprehensive*, if the entity (i.e. the human-entity) returns the same, no actual transition to the overhuman can possibly occur. In this light, the notion of Return of Power involves a constantly self-overcoming cyclicity (dialectical) that differs from the aforementioned case in defining the selective passage of status of the entity to that of over-entity, hence of the human to that of over-human in a peculiar non-Nietzschean sense, or, as anticipated, in a manner involving a *most radical opposition*³ to man's intrinsic status of ontic powerlessness. As confirmed by empirical evidence, the difference lies intrinsic within becoming, or change, as its own peculiar definition, this leading at length to a *recurrence of the difference*, which, in the fundamental terms *of Power*, and in accord with a Hegelian turn of mind, results in a *potentiated or enhanced difference* as a determination (and ultimate destination) of the entity, and in respect to identity (impotent), reaching its status of *Over-identity* or *Identity of Power* [12]. Becoming signifies accordingly a constant increment of the Real itself, until the ontic return shall occur as an ultimate result of this same increase by exceeding itself in the leading terms *of Power*, thus ensuring, *selectively*

¹ This notion is notably Aristotelian, and consistent with Greek wisdom in general.

² As is known, this concept is introduced in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

³ As set forth in my own *Condition of Power*, this opposition can be chiefly seen in terms of Power/Powerlessness.

(for otherwise the recurrence would *still be* in the general terms of ontic impotence), a potentiated and renewed situation of the (human) entity to be the case. The *ontic potentiating process* entails the ontic recurrence consistent with the difference in a peculiar potentiated fashion, and is regarded as being one with the *ontic return*, since they both lead to an antithetical status of the entity, which, in a situation as our own, is a status of intrinsic limitations. The Return of Power entails perforce a selection in respect to the (human) entity as whether or not the latter proves to be endowed with enough ontological ability, and indeed strength, *to return to itself*, which is the same effort under the form of potential adequation *to Power* [12] as required within this recurrence (for it is maintained that only what is able to return exists ontologically, in affirming, over and over, its continual status of existence). As regard what I attempted at defining as dialectic Power-Stasis-Power, to be further examined, within the impotent world of man this notion embodies the culminating phase as exemplified in the very passage from *Stasis to Power*, whereas in a situation of intrinsic (already existing) human Power that from *Power to Power* [12], in both cases establishing an ontic potentiating process and direction towards Power alone, whether under the form of the overcoming of human impotence (dialectical overhuman), as in the former, or in terms of reflective *overabundance* (of Power, precisely), as in the latter, in conformity with the use of this term in the Neoplatonic tradition. Again, whereas Power inheres in the Real (and in Being) as its own determination, it *also ontologically exceeds it* on account of being its own peculiar substantiality (Greek ὑποκείμενον) and Source [12]. As nothing can exceed the ontologically incomparable character of Power, be it terminological or conceptual, the latter can be overcome *only by itself*, this occurring in full compliance with the omnipresent Becoming (as increase of Power) as leading inevitably (since dialectically outlined) to the Return of Power as an unparalleled self-assertion. Under this garb alone, by asserting a self-overcome (human) entity, and thus the same actual overhuman in a non-Nietzschean mode, together with its own final determination, the necessary return of the Real occurs and exceeds itself in a *potentiated Real*. For the latter alone as precisely potentiated, that is, as an *over-Real* in the very terms of Power, is able to overcome the Real (former, as signifying substantial impotence) in a most comprehensive manner. Hence the criterion of Return of Power embodies by definition the very dialectical (and physico-cosmological, to be now suggested) transition *from Powerlessness to Power* as the most crucial and comprehensive process for human nature to accomplish, and the sole able to define a final determination of the existing entity, that is, of the entity endowed with a non-contingent or non-temporary character (for,

again, what actually exists returns, and does so under a potentiated form). It also signifies the crowning phase within what can be perceived, in visual terms, as a *closed spiral of events*, which is the same phenomenology as most dynamically (and very often conflictually) expressed in Becoming as increase of Power, the spiral closing on itself when at length the necessarily selective ontic return does take place [12]. This has been thus far a subject of remark in a logico-dialectical standpoint alone. Yet since the theme at issue proves to be no doubt attributable to cosmological matters, insofar as inevitably dealing with *the physical* (as a physical-entity proper), it is now high time for suggesting further connections in this direction.

Let us accordingly dwell upon the oscillating or cyclic model of the universe, as first propounded by Aleksandr Aleksandrovič Fridman (1888–1925),¹ and upon the relevant concept of gravitational singularity as defined in the Penrose-Hawking singularity theorems [3]. As is known, according to this most dynamic and self-referential view of the cosmos, the force of gravitation eventually succeeds in transforming the expansion, as originated by the Big Bang, into an ultimate contraction as occurring in the Big-Crunch, which latter in turn leading to a new expansion to again collapse on itself in a most distant future, the process being continual, hence affording, physically, an ideal notion we may possess of *Eternity*, with no dispersion of the entity in nothingness to possibly occur (as instead is the case in the rival notions of flat and open universe) [9]. If we are accordingly firm in our statement that change, by its very definition, does not, and cannot, arrest its increase of the Real (and thus of Power, respecting the perennial increment of the whole of its dynamic determinations), the obvious conclusion we reach is that it does not, and cannot, arrest such an increase *under no circumstances*. And in saying “circumstance” I now focus on the aforementioned criterion of *gravitational singularity*. Whereas in the latter, as consistent with the hideous furnace of the Big Crunch, a potentially infinite gravity (and heat) results in an utter breakdown of physical laws, the continual increase of the dynamic determinations of Becoming, and of Being, insofar as an *inseparable metaphysical counterpart* of the former,² cannot but *go further*, and respecting the very category and term *Power* as an ontological constant and primacy in both [12, chapter 1]. Accordingly,

¹ This view first appeared in *Über die Möglichkeit einer Welt mit konstanter negativer Krümmung des Raumes*, *Zeitschrift für Physik* Vol. 21, pp. 326–332, 1922. English version in A. Friedman, *On the curvature of space*, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 31 (12): 1991–2000.

² This has been again extensively illustrated in my own *Condition of Power-Ontology and Anthropology beyond Nietzsche*, Amazon Kindle Direct Publishing, 2015.

let us further consider the eventuality that, within the proximity of the so called Big Crunch, the growth of entropy defining the non-relative verse of the arrow of time may result to be at length so diluted as to account for the passage to the subsequent expanding phase of the universe (as in turn commencing with the Big Bang) in an *almost thermodynamically reversible manner, with an overall substantial enhancement of the physical entity as associated to a lower level of either intrinsic physical disorder or metaphysical chaos, of the thus ensuing matter and energy as one*, and in full accord with the celebrated Einsteinian formula:¹

$$E=mc^2$$

This assumption comes chiefly held according to the following statement: “As the black hole formed by the collapse of a rotating star settles down, it absorbs part of the gravitational radiation emitted during the last moments of collapse. This radiation, strongly blue-shifted near the inner horizon, enormously increases the mass of the black hole’s core. External observers cannot detect this mass, but it manifests itself dramatically when the black holes in a collapsing universe merge, a few minutes before the “big crunch.” The mass of a rebounding universe is enormously inflated, and its specific entropy correspondingly reduced. This allows the expansion to begin from a state of relatively low disorder.”² Nothing prevents us from interpreting the utterance “relatively low disorder” as an *ideal setting for an enhancement of the physical entity, hence of the human*, which, in reference to the substantiveness of Power as an ontological constant, would accordingly result as *potentiated in chief reference to a lower level of ontic disorder or chaos precisely*: a physical over-entity, as altogether foreign to the three *points of impotence* as I attempted at defining in relation to the present limitative status of the human.³ In a standpoint now by all means favoring an ontological superiority of the *Metaphysical* over the *Physical*, the Capability of Power⁴ of both Becoming and Being is to exceed such a breakdown, as the very category *Power* (both metaphysical and physical) is accordingly to prevail in any case. As a consequence, the physical Real turns out to be potentiated (with a constant reference to the Latin utterance *Potentia*), and hence the *entity itself*, to which it comes to be inevitably connected.

¹ As for this conception in my own Condition of Power, see: [1].

² See: [8] (Abstract).

³ See the relative concept as contained in the glossary in my own [12].

⁴ This notion indicates the actual amount of ontological Power to be found and expressed in a given circumstance, either human or extra-human. See the relevant utterance as contained in the glossary in my own [12].

Hereupon, the conclusion we reach is the following passage to be developed in relation to the force of change as still an unrestrainable ontological and physical agent, the symbol “→” being employed as broadly indicating a well-defined ontological (and physical) passage of status:

Entity→Over/Beyond Entity (as hitherto known and considered)

The entity may therefore result in being enhanced (as to an intrinsic want of chaos within it, as already suggested), and respecting a previous situation, and owing to this cosmological process to occur as recurrent (for, in causing one another, the Big Bang and the Big Crunch prove to be conceptually one). In the light of this event, which implies the entity to wear an accomplished aspect of *over-entity*, the whole hitherto known world would be, still in the supreme terms of Power, *diminished from whatever thinkable standpoint*. To suggest a few instances, our sun would shine like a supernova, a mere inlet of sea would be an unfathomable ocean, a banality the most comprehensive metaphysical system ever thought out, and the altar under which Alexander the Great in his route to Persia honored, lying alone in the middle of the night, the spirit of the fallen heroes of Troy, of so greater a magnitude as to overshadow the whole of our own historical memory. As all this is still to be regarded in the very terms of want of physical chaos, again in relation to the aforementioned dialectic Power-Stasis-Power as focusing on the ontic passage from *Stasis* to *Power*, (which, in symbolic terms, signifies the same transition from the ontological inconsistency of the *Shadow*, to the realized overhuman nature of the *Body* through the very mediation of the *Lightning*),¹ this determines the same selective stage for the entity to occur as a matter of course in its physic-ontological passage of status. Moreover, since the laws of dialectic imply by definition an intrinsic flow and guaranteed arrival, the contradiction of man’s impotence is to be now overcome respecting the overcoming as intrinsic in contradiction (Hegel) [see: 10; 4], this ensuring the passage from actual human Powerlessness to actual human Power to be now the case. Accordingly, the supreme phase of the dialectical overhuman is to be in any case achieved, sooner or later, and the passage from the *Thesis* (man, Powerlessness) to the *Potentiated Antithesis* (over-man, Power) altogether determined in leading the former to the latter as a well-defined direction, reference and goal (under the peculiar form of Identity of Power, Over-Identity).² And again this attainment proves to be the same culminating stage within change, a very phase which is again ontic-selective, for, if otherwise, no general improvement touching the entity in the leading terms of Power can possibly occur. And again this suggests an ontological

¹ See the notion of Ontological Triad as set forth in the glossary in my own [12].

² See the relevant terms in the glossary in my own [12].

inconsistency of Nietzsche's own statements regarding the advent of his own *Übermensch* in relation to his revived notion of Eternal Return of the Same (a notion previously held, as is known, by Empedocles, Zeno, Plato himself, and, more especially, by Stoic wisdom). For again, an eternally identical recurrence prevents the entity, hence the human, to achieve its superior status of actual ontological Power, as now looked upon in terms of substantial want of ontic disorder. A dialectic based upon the ontological primacy of the term and category Power, and of its necessary self-negation is to accordingly define the dynamic structure of Being as Power, of Becoming as increase in Power as its own agent, and of the human as defined in relation to the two antithetical phases of Power and Powerlessness, with the former alone as substantive, on account of its being altogether akin to the very character expressed within the unfathomable dynamic vastness and energy of Being as Power precisely (to with the notion of potential infinite is herein associated). Be it applied to the human or to the extra-human (as Being and Becoming), it determines at length the crucial advent of the actual Overman *as a human being superior in whatever respect since by very definition antithetical to the whole of the limitations of the current human status.*

In order to reach the level of abstraction the theme at issue now requires, let us focus our attention upon the intangible force of the Metaphysical in the first place, and maintain an underlying subtle connection with the Physical, as previously illustrated, in the second. As already implied, since dialectic always entails an *alterity* under the form of *opposition*, we may endeavor to suggest the very character of change as being consistent with three key moments. These stand for the same stages in the unrestrainable phenomenology of the Real as being now consistent with the following simple scheme:

$$A \rightarrow B \rightarrow (\text{Return to})A$$

The first stage (A) coincides with the third (again A), which is the *identity*, the same identical (Greek τὸ αὐτὸ, Latin *idem*, German *das Selbe*, as related to the English *self*) to be achieved by means of the crucial point of conversion, or return, via the mediation of the second (B), which latter, in order to afford dynamism to the process, to be perceived under the form of *alterity* and *opposition*. Accordingly, the aforementioned triadic relation may be further posited thus:

$$\text{Identity} \rightarrow \text{Alterity} \rightarrow (\text{Return to})\text{Identity}$$

The phenomenology, which, very often, if not essentially, either individually or at a general level, prove to be a dramatic and conflictual one, of Becoming as an increment of Power (as a determination of the Real) implies therefore a middle time (B) as opposite to the previous (A) and to the next (again A),

which are one, and the sole substantive and prevailing (as one are beginning and end in a self-referential progression, and, in a cyclical cosmic perspective, the same Big Bang and Big Crunch in causing one another). Within this self-referential and all-encompassing flux now in question, the presence of an *alterity* or *opposition* proves to be essential respecting the intrinsic change that feeds it as a necessary antithesis. This would further proceed according to a reconciliation of opposites as leading to harmony in a Heraclitean sense,¹ and to a self-recurring unity as referred to *Permanence* (μονή), *Procession* (πρόοδος) and *Return* (ἐπιστροφή), as exemplified in the quintessential Neoplatonic turn of mind of Proclus.² Hereupon the continual increase of Power as intrinsic to Becoming would focus upon the following stages:

Power→Stasis→(Return to)Power

Whereas Power embodies the two prevailing stages of identity, which sum up our relation within *unity*, or more precisely, within a self-recurring unity as a determination of the physical Real in conformity with a particular view of the cyclical universe, a necessary median phase still inheres under the form of alterity or opposition. This latter lies essential in establishing the dialectical dynamism required in change in general. Insofar as consistent with *difference*, and as antithetical in character to the ontological supremacy of the dialectical overhuman as personified Power,³ we may term it as a phase of *Stasis*, the same we see exemplified in the countless limitations of the present human status. Accordingly, although the achievement of Power from within human Powerlessness proves to be extremely distant in terms of Space and Time, yet, dialectically, it signifies a certainty, and a most selective one in relation to the suggestions set forth hitherto.⁴ To sum up, besides asserting a perennial transience with no beginning nor end (in the Heraclitean form of Πάντα ῥεῖ), the notion of Return of Power embodies the ultimate phase in the continual increase of the Real as resulting in an equally continual increase of *Power*, the latter always as a primary determination of the former. Owing to the Real being *only potentially infinite* (in the Aristotelian sense), and to the primacy of the term and category Power to inhere within it as its own substantiality (Greek ὑποκείμενον), and in stark opposition to whatever ontic dispersion and self-negation (as instead it occurs in the *actual infinite*), change is to lead at length to a selective ontic recurrence in the peculiar

¹ For a comprehensive introduction to Heraclitus, [see: 5].

² Such a Neoplatonic structure can be found in Proclus [7, Book III].

³ This concept is widely illustrated in my own [12].

⁴ In a state of affairs of already intrinsic human Power, the Return of Power occurs according to an ontic overabundance of Power. See the notion Triad of Power in my own [12].

terms of Power. Therewith the necessarily selective passage of status of the entity takes place, resulting in man's own selective transition (insofar as a human-entity) to an exceeding dialectical phase as altogether antithetical to the very notion we may possess of ontic impotence. In opposing the linear temporal progression of Biblical and Augustinian origin, and the relative *Creatio ex nihilo* (as both consistent with an ultimate ontic dispersion and self-negation *in nothingness*), it also substantially differs from the eternal ontic repeatability as intrinsic to the Eternal Return of the Same, and as otherwise admitting no actual (dialectical) passage to the overhuman. All this lies consistent with an ontic potentiating process to be selectively accomplished, at an ontic/human level, within the crucial phase of Return of Power precisely, and hence, with the assumption that the ontic recurrence, if is to exist at all, *can only occur in the terms of further Power*, and in full accord with a cosmological ontic self-referentiality within both Power and Unity.

Whereas the limited context of man, together with the whole of its aspects, save the overhuman myths,¹ proves to be ontologically insubstantial when regarded in the very terms of Power, the temporary, and indeed spatio-temporally infinitesimal character of the latter shall be overcome, sooner or later, by the one to be dialectically embodied by its own counterpart *of Power*, the process naturally inhering within the very course of things, both ontologically and cosmologically, as thus far attempted at suggesting. The ultimate advent of the actual overhuman (actual in contraposition to the ontic-limitative notion of *Übermensch* as a mere superior man), is rendered necessary, also, in the light of the very nature of Being as requiring this very presence under the form of personified Power with which to share a commonality of nature (for the extra-human entails the human, and the converse). As the very Real, including, with this very term, the whole of its determinations reaches thus its own naturally consequential status of over-Real, an exceeding human essence² holds now its dominion, an unparalleled position the present human cannot embody, being chained as it is, like the rebel Prometheus in the Caucasus, to the irremovable rock of its existential limitations.

References:

1. A. Einstein, *The Principle of Relativity: a Collection of Original Memoirs on the Special and General Theory of Relativity*, Dover Publications, 1952.

¹ The overhuman myths as chiefly consistent with polytheism, have been suggested as an unconscious reminiscence of the dialectical overhuman within our limited world. See: [11].

² See the notion of essence in its own overcoming in my own [12].

2. A. Friedman, *Über die Möglichkeit einer Welt mit konstanter negativer Krümmung des Raumes*, Zeitschrift für Physik Vol. 21, 1922.
3. S. W. Hawking, R. Penrose, *The Singularities of Gravitational Collapse and Cosmology*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Vol. 314, Issue 1519, 1970.
4. G. W. F. Hegel, *Science of Logic*, tr. W. H. Johnston and L. G. Struthers, 1929.
5. Heraclitus, *Fragments: The Collected Wisdom of Heraclitus*. Viking Press, 2001.
6. F. W. Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Penguin, 1961.
7. Proclus, *The Platonic Theology*, Selene Books, 1986.
8. A. E. Sikkema, W. Israel, *Black-hole mergers and mass inflation in a bouncing universe*, Nature 349, 1991.
9. J. Steinhardt, N. Turok, *A Cyclic Model of the Universe*, Science, 296, 2001.
10. K. Rosenkranz, *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegels Leben*, Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, Darmstadt 1998.
11. H. Varini, *Beyond Nietzsche: The Overhuman as a Dialectical Reality and its Evidence in the Myth* // *Философия и гуманитарные науки в информационном обществе*. – 2018. – № 2. – С. 12 – 24. – [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://fikio.ru/?p=3219> (дата обращения 01.09.2018).
12. H. Varini, *Condition of Power-Ontology and Anthropology beyond Nietzsche*, Amazon Kindle Direct Publishing, 2015.

Гончаров Н. В.

ПРОБЛЕМАТИКА ДЕФИНИЦИИ ПОНЯТИЯ «ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКИЙ КАПИТАЛ»

Гончаров Николай Владимирович – кандидат философских наук, преподаватель, кафедра философии науки и социологии, Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Оренбургский государственный университет», Оренбург, Россия.

E-mail: nik567485@mail.ru

Аннотация. В работе рассматриваются и анализируются различные варианты понимания понятия «человеческий капитал». Делается вывод о тесной связи трудовой деятельности и знаний, умений и навыков человека, в результате чего становится видно, что человеческий капитал способен определять способ производства и структуру общественной формации, совершенствуя социально-экономическую систему.

Goncharov N. V.

DEFINITION PROBLEM OF THE CONCEPT OF “HUMAN CAPITAL”

Goncharov Nikolay Vladimirovich – Ph. D. (Philosophy), Lecturer, Department of Philosophy of Science and Sociology, Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education “Orenburg State University”, Orenburg, Russia.