

***Heraclitean Thinking For a Philosophy of Education in the 21st Century:  
Towards an Ontology of a New Mode of Change***

Agnes Papadopoulou, Ministry of Education and Religion Affairs, Greece

The European Conference on Education 2014

**Abstract**

Heraclitus does not rivet Being, does not separate Being from Becoming. Being simultaneously changes and identifies with itself. The inherent multiplicity and variability of Being, namely the multiple facets of the self, this Being and Becoming, is the idiosyncratic nature of the world and us all, lasting time and energy, change and decay. Therefore, according to Heraclitus, the apparent conflicting states, tendencies, forces are connected in a coherent relationship of harmony. The simultaneous and eternal cosmic shift and identity is the cause of Being.

Heraclitus regarded critically the spectacular changes and developments of his transitional era and his philosophy is not an arbitrary and subjective construction, but there exists one eternal universal relation, the Logos, which is the eternal and catholic relationship; it involves both the natural and the human microcosm.

Today at a transitional era of constant shifts, at an age of erudition but not essential knowledge, Heraclitus is more contemporary than ever, as he insisted on the link between the constant shift with fixed parameters and the interlacing of “alterity”, “difference”, with “identity” and “unity”. This link with real-life parameters is considered more necessary than ever, since students immerse themselves into a virtual reality and a constant alternation of identities. This entails the fear that there does not exist a unifying principle or that they insist on conflicts without the presence of interactions that will create new balances.

Keywords: Heraclitus, education, knowledge, identity, unity, time, change.

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum

[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

The object of the present research is the utilization of Heraclitean intellect in a planning process which is directed, but whose outcomes are not predetermined. The interest is focused on the actual process and methodology, which will monitor the final outcome. Heraclitus maintains that every thing is examined in its natural structure and not integrated in systems for its defence with descriptions and analyses.

In the current conditions of flux, with no criteria of differentiation between opposites, with fine balances, ready to be overturned yet again in the face of the new data, a requirement presents itself for the development of cognitive tools, particularly during the educational process, preparing students for an unpredictable future. There exists an imperative for the development of mechanisms that will accept the concepts of randomness, complexity, unpredictability, as a challenge for the synthetic process, without however necessarily leading to one and only solution of the problem, but describing the problem and comprehending the separation of elements that change and those which remain stable at the shift.

The Heraclitean dialectic comes up against the contemporary common code which is ingestible, where people do not talk in concepts but codes and action is received without “language”. The accessibility of information to all is also a regression of the more stable forms of knowledge and culture. What is suggested is a superficial relationship with things, which are presented as obvious and evident, while Heraclitus speaks of the *μή δύνόν ποτέ* (that which never sets).

### **Heraclitus faces:**

#### 1) The issue of the dual existence of the world

In order to highlight the issue of the world as world-one and as world-always Heraclitus uses the horizon of secularity of Being. The dominant pattern of the Milesians on the fixation and permanence of the cosmos is overturned<sup>1</sup>. Becoming is a huge game. The Becoming of the World has a rhythm, this rhythm does not obey what we call laws. The world is one and universal; it is a structure. The kykeon is used as an example of the blend of individual elements and stillness as the cause of the separated. Fragment 125 is an indirect metaphorical Heraclitean statement on shift as the cause of the unity<sup>2</sup>. The world-kykeon remains in unity as world one-always, the shift becomes the cause of the unity of the world. In fragment 72 it is stated that the sum total of beings and phenomena of the world (always the becoming ones) must be integrated and interpreted within the frames of universal catholicity and not be treated individually and fragmentarily. All seemingly stable states of matter are in essence transitory, their permanence existing solely in the human mind, which is unable to capture the deeper essence of things.

The true nature of things (cf. apparent contradictions, fragment 16) lies behind the phenomena (cf. fragment 106), but cannot be hidden from the mind-logos, which lies

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, George, *Studies in Ancient Greek Society, Vol.II, The First Philosophers*, Moscow, 1959.

<sup>2</sup> Diels H., Kranz W., *The Presocratics*, Volume A'. Athens: Papadima, 2005.  
<http://www.mikrosapoplous.gr/heracletus/heracletus0.html>

over and above these. Its mission is to solve and illuminate them, leading to their full understanding. From the principle of constant transmutation arises the basic Heraclitean tenet, that of the perpetual struggle and simultaneously unity of opposites. The metaphysical terror of the philosopher in the face of the endless flow of the river waters essentially reflects his own unstable and constantly modifying “identity”. The safe, stable world of everyday life collapses and in its place remains a quantum bundle of probabilities, where everything is identified, and everything is equally insignificant and non-existent. All that is possible is the mode of existence as a dynamic field of relations of continuity, interpenetration and internalization.

## 2) The issue of the understanding of the Logos

The world forms a criterion for differentiation between people. In fragments 33, 34 it is stated that the opinion of one is wiser than the opinion of many. This is a standing Heraclitean position. The “many” (the “hoi polloi”) think and behave as if they are asleep, that is, they live in the secluded, illusory world of their subjective, biased and fragmentary contemplations, unable to grasp the world in its wholeness and the potential of Becoming. In this sense, the only “awake” is the philosopher (fragment 89).

Heraclitus goes beyond politics without going against it, since philosophical thinking subsumes political thinking (fragment 114). However, “private thinking” is an anti-dialectical manner of thinking<sup>3</sup>, while the normal way of thinking is the common, catholic one and the logos (ratio, reason) is catholic. Fragment 112 states that thought, world and action are interrelated and must be determined and governed by the knowledge of universal truth. The Word<sup>4</sup> takes up the importance of measure, the relationship between the dimensions of Being<sup>5</sup>. The expression of *λόγου ακούειν* (*hears not me, but the Word*) (fragment 50) shows that it concerns the verbal-communicative form of the Word. This does not concern an abstract cosmic principle but the reason that exposes and explains how the world works. The common word is the universal law. It is a description which emphasises empirical observation. The philosopher analyses, categorises and attempts to integrate them in a broader hermeneutical form, and this is the difference of the philosophical from the common

---

<sup>3</sup> Ийенков, Evald, *Dialectical Logic*.

[http://aworldtowin.net/documents/Ilyenkov\\_Dialectical\\_Logic.pdf](http://aworldtowin.net/documents/Ilyenkov_Dialectical_Logic.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Burnet John writes characteristically: “The λόγος is simply the discourse of Herakleitos himself; though, as he is a prophet, we may call it “the Word”. It can neither discourse addressed to Herakleitos nor yet “reason”....A difficulty has been raised about the words εόντος αἰεί. How could Herakleitos say that his discourse had always existed? The answer is that in Ionic εών means “true” when coupled with words like λόγος.” See, Burnet, John, *Early Greek Philosophy*, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1908, p.146. Access via <https://ia600300.us.archive.org/5/items/burnetgreek00burnrich/burnetgreek00burnrich.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Cherniss, H., *Aristotle’s criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, Baltimore, 1935.

word<sup>6</sup>. The thought and language of Heraclitus are concise: those who can be brief are dialectical, and those who cannot are not dialectical (Plato, *Republic*, VII, 537C).

### 3) The issue of the discovery of truth

Becoming is headed towards the infinite. It is based on ratio (logos) which is simultaneously thought and language and the truth is discovered. We must persevere in order to comprehend that which transcends us, not vilify that which is great (fragment 47). The human eye cannot distinguish the perpetual flow of things; it creates, therefore, according to Heraclitus, the illusion of individuality, stagnation, permanence, as in the case of the river (fragment 12). Fantasies, illusions, judgments and opinions that are a product of an accumulated experience and knowledge constitute one's particular identity.

Heraclitus approaches specific phenomena and his thought is directed towards abstract thought. He does not establish a contrast between the senses and reason. Learning comes from direct experience (perception through the senses) and then the process of knowledge is per se. Learning passes effortlessly from the perceptive to the cognitive level, through a process that accepts as valid solely the data of the senses (in contrast to speculation). They are submitted however to the critical analysis of the philosophical mind, with the ultimate aim of finding the truth about the world and its expression through speech (fragment 55). It is extremely interesting that we cannot see the truth neither in our dreams nor when we are awake and the true nature of beings, of phenomena, is perceived only through the mind, which actually takes as its base the data of the senses, yet processes them and interprets them in such a way as to understand the truth hidden behind them and is the perpetual flux and change through the unity of opposites. In fragment 65 Heraclitus uses human experience universally applied globally.

### 4) The issue of order as self-regulation

The universe is constantly transforming, everlasting movement, but the transmutation occurs not randomly but proportionately<sup>7</sup>. The world is the order of disorder<sup>8</sup>. The equilibrium of the world is a dynamic equilibrium, which results from the constant competition (war, strife) of the opposite forces (day-night, cold-hot), which however simultaneously are also complementary, since nothing can be perceived without its opposite. They are essentially two seemingly opposite aspects of the same basic principle, the cosmic fire, whose different forms are due to its perpetual

---

<sup>6</sup> Vlastos, G., "On Heraclitus," in *American Journal of Philology*, 76 (1955), 337–368.

<sup>7</sup> Burnet John states that: "It is important to notice that μέτρα is internal accusative with ἀπτόμενον, 'with its measures kindling and its measures going out'". See Burnet John, *op.cit.*, p.148.

<sup>8</sup> Tambakis, Nikos, *Heraclitus and modern world: Continuity of Dialogue*, Athens: Govostis Publications, 2006.

transmutation. Struggles and discords are not absent<sup>9</sup>. However, there is a necessity, that which is necessary to Becoming for it *to be* Becoming. In Heraclitus, freedom and necessity are not opposed, but form two sides of the same coin.

Opinion, that is the principle which governs him, does not lie outside him, but regulates the individual phenomena through their internal relations, based on the unity of opposites and the perpetual change and transmutation. This transmutation however does not take place uncontrollably, but according to his measures. Heraclitus paved the way for the Stoic world by comparing “the common” to the laws of the city<sup>10</sup>.

### **The issue of attunement**

Unity in Heraclitus results from multiplicity and the various parts acquire meaning through their common function in the context of a whole. Corporeality and disposition are not two spaces. Body, soul and thought are inseparable entities. Anyone can animate everything and overcome everything<sup>11</sup>. The universal soul cannot be wise except to the degree in which it communicates closer with the fire of the cosmic soul. A condition of absolute simplicity is essential, where everything becomes one. The separation of opposites in absolutely conflicting situations and forces, independent from each other, is due to the weakness of the “many” to overcome their fragmented viewpoints and capture the phenomena of the world within the “hidden harmony” that constitutes their unity. Contradictions are part of its dynamic unity<sup>12</sup> (fragments 37, 48). Opposites come together but are not identical to each other (as God, the Logos, the World and Fire are joined without being identified). The concepts of general and vague are two concepts which refer to the world as a unity. Attunement is sometimes visible and sometimes invisible. The “strife of opposites” is really an “attunement”.

### **The issue of continuity and consistency**

Repetition is a Becoming. What has been revealed is rediscovered, darkness reclaims the lost ground from light and what had been offered is withdrawn. It is expressed anthropomorphically for the universe and the last sentence in fragment 10 is explained with the movement of entities from uniqueness to plurality and vice versa. The Heraclitean unity of the world is not static and atemporal. It is a constant Becoming without beginning and end, a principle of self-regulatory periodicity in the form of a closed circle (fragment 30). The circular structure of time is manifested especially in the interior of the great whole which is the universal container. The beginning is the end. Time is the first cause of the destructive and recreative Becoming, it is the productive negativity. Contradictions are kept incessantly dynamic and never reach the point of neutralization.

---

<sup>9</sup> Vlastos, G., *Equality and justice in early Greek cosmologies*, Classical Philology, 42, 1947.

<sup>10</sup> Burnet, John, *op.cit.*, p.191.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Cornford, F.M., *Before and after Socrates*, Cambridge, 1932.

<sup>12</sup> Guthrie, W.K..C., *A History of Greek Philosophy*, I (Cambridge, 1962), 403-492.

## The issue of time

According to Heraclitus one cannot step into the same rivers twice because different waters flow. With the word waters he meant the conditions which are never the same, but always change. He also meant time. Time moves us from one station to the next, ages us and kills us<sup>13</sup>.

Being in time, since time is an expression of Being in Heraclitus, and tiredness, as two causes of shift, and in this way Being remains stable and unchanging, by changing eternally its peculiar in becoming nature<sup>14</sup>. We move between proximity and distance, between action and inactivity. Redemption from fire comes through fire according to Heraclitus and all these realising that there is an intersection of the temporal with the atemporal.

Heraclitus does not discriminate between now or yesterday. The shift between contradictory states is simultaneous and not sequential. The bonds that bind the visible and the invisible have never been severed. Becoming unfolds within time, i.e. good is identified with the truth (they speak the truth, they do good deeds) and evil with lies and self-delusions. Temporal dimensions need to be reconciled with selflessness, love for life and desire for creation.

Time (αἰών) is a child playing draughts, the kingly power is a child<sup>15</sup>. Play causes in the child's life a need for renewal. It is in the same way that artistic creation entertains and pleases the artist's soul. A lack of creativity will lead to an indifference or adherence to various groups in order to avoid the awareness of error, so as to diffuse wrath and the pain of failure.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century:

Heraclitus and education: A new orientation of the thinking process

Revisiting Heraclitus' views, this is an age where the young are characterised by a lack of appetite for views. This attitude is especially interesting, as long as it does not become a lack of generosity and lack of appetite for life. The young are characterised by an unwillingness of completion, where one can find both positives and negatives, as well as severe symptoms of lack of concentration, where problems are created and paths of communication are closed. The objective is to remove them from breathtaking ugliness, from false correlations and the fight for knowledge.

1) The issue of the dual substance of the world according to Heraclitus faced with the absence of any relationship between virtual reality and actual reality

---

<sup>13</sup> Axelos, Kostas, *Heraclitus and Philosophy*, translated by Dimitris Dimitriadis, Athens: Exandas Publications, 1986, p.255.

<sup>14</sup> Theodorakopoulos, John, *Introduction to Philosophy*, Athens: Estia Publications, 1974.

<sup>15</sup> Kahn, Charles, *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

In Heraclitus fire is not merely the generative “material” principle of the world, but rather a logical, organisational principle which governs it according to defined laws. The cosmic fire does not exist in a static state, but is successively transmuted to water (sea), and this in turn transmuted to atmospheric fire and earth, and the same again, in an interminable circular process that is the essence of the constantly changing universe. This transmutation does not take place randomly, but in measures, i.e. in an order which has not been defined “from the outside”, from a God-Creator, but operates within the frames of an internal self-regulation<sup>16</sup>.

Any loss of the contact between us and the outside world means we will not have a consciousness of our identity either (Heraclitus made references to dreams saying that they are the loss of consciousness of our contact to the external world and the subsequent withdrawal of the sleeper in a space entirely subjective (fragment 89) and this means no consciousness of identity as well.) While today lurks the danger of a universal predominance of a virtual world. We are immersed in unrealistic worlds, not in our own dreams, immersed in dream worlds of others. We come in contact with images which are not experienced moments and yet end up being observation spaces, and that means they are excluded from experience.

Heraclitean intellect should serve as a barrier for the habit of surrender to a spurious reality. If we get used to this spurious reality, we will be transformed into weak people, who will have a false conscience and will be unable to sense its falsity. There is a vicious circle of information increase, there is an inability to increase knowledge, with messages that do not reduce uncertainty. There is constantly an increase of possible probabilities, we face the very potentiality of information and become incorporated in a network of doubts that can spread and enclose us.

Thought is not equated with “estimation of consequences” and experience should not be lost. We must ask ourselves who is the active agent that transforms situations and since people have lost the battle with the reality of the image, we cannot ignore the consequences of the fact that they adopt and cooperate with it, and this is the basis for the use of the very technology of the three-dimensional, moving image. However the consequences will be disastrous if the non-mediated reality retreats to the fantasy world, where only the media are established as primary agents of experience creation<sup>17</sup>.

The issue of understanding the Word in contrast to the lack of a contemporary deep-thinking: empty word in a constant a-poria.

While criticizing, Heraclitus mentions that some are unreliable; those that know not how to listen (properly), also do not know how to speak. It is both a cognitive and a mental inability, an inability to distinguish between the words arriving daily in their ears and the true Word, that which the real philosopher uses to express the universal

---

<sup>16</sup> Marcovich, M., *Heraclitus: Greek Text With a Short Commentary*, Pp. xxix + 665. Merida, Venezuela: Los Andes University Press (Oxford: Parker), 1967.

<sup>17</sup> Habermas, Jurgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, translated by L.Anagnostou, Nissos Publishing: Athens, 1997, pp. 26, 68-82, 325-341.

truth, as he understands it through the “mind”. Here recurs the issue of the ignorance of erudition (Heraclitean allusion to Pythagoras; a complication and not true wisdom). The difference between learning and knowledge is an important parameter of Heraclitean thought. Its primary foundation is of course empirical, as Heraclitus points out with the verb *εγκυρέειν*, which means: meet, occur. Three verbs describe the basic learning stages: *φρονεῖν*, *γινώσκειν*, *δοκεῖν*. The first verb describes the mental process and thorough examination, the second verb the acquisition of true knowledge, the third verb the acquisition of subjective belief.

The process of constant interrogation is exacerbated by the overload of information, knowledge, and material goods in our days. In contrast, the set Heraclitean tenet is that quantity in evaluative terms does not correlate with quality (fragments 40, 57), nor the many followers (fragment 49) are a criterion of true life (reminding the many ‘likes’ or ‘followers’ of our digital age). Heraclitus claimed that true wisdom is one thing: knowing the principle that governs everything with the help of everything (fragment 41). Intellect is an expression of the objective, its therefore valid knowledge.

3) The issue of the discovery of the truth in relation to the current danger of the creation of a control web

A participatory internet web means networking, interactive communication, freedom of expressions, of independent information, with the possibility of embedding other means, which in essence means the creation of a convergence of media. High speeds, communication via optic fibers, user-friendly software, where the involvement of a growing number of people, therefore the exploitation of the collective intelligence is facilitated. An alternative public sphere of a potential reality is created, clearly, though, with an effect on actual reality. But in the turn of the century, an attempt took place to control information, surveillance and containment. However, the identification of the use is easy, reliable, autonomous and invisible (info split commercially motivated initially, geotracking). Digital traces are not erased, therefore a super-Panopticon is created.

Absolute knowledge of the dissemination of every parcel of information, a structural principle of publicity according to Habermas, precedence to surveillance and not freedom. The digital turn is realised within a new context of society, politics, economy, where the emergence of information to an absolute market value of modern societies crush privacy and freedom of expression. The commercial market has primacy. The collection of information regarding users is intended to increase the commercial market through the Internet. The same goes with secret services, since security is placed as a higher value than freedom of expression and privacy. Unfortunately, the powerful side remains surveillance. Heraclitus said (fragment 113): the limitations in thought are posed by the habits, prejudices and interests of individual committees and groups.



Today, the media acquire power<sup>18</sup>, do not merely support power and the consumer/viewer maintains a passive role as to the media achievements, but also at the level of formulating culture, which is grounded from the 1950's onwards on the entertainment industry. In front of a screen, inactive and slothful, stagnant, tired, with no energy.

The Heraclitean issue of inner self-regulation and the issue of peregrination today: inherent in the human being is the intensity for the search of meaning

The search for meaning is linked with creation, experience and the attitude towards effort, difficulties, obstacles. Heraclitus mentions that many neither contemplate nor finally acquire knowledge; instead, they form subjective beliefs. One needs to distance oneself, and the key is self-transcendence. This is impeded by the fact that today there is a strong effort for one not to be identified topologically, but to be "misinterpreted" tropologically. This independence from the limitation of time and space can lead to an inability of adaptability. What is everywhere cannot be anywhere. Heraclitus spoke of the realm of experience and the image of space. The key is that man is self-defined. They have the freedom to change at any moment. This freedom is supported by the Heraclitean intellect and can function as a formative agent within the troubled contemporary framework of speed, fragmentation, where it imposes a shift that eliminates pre-existing differences.

Today a shift is imposed which parallels our image only to the developments in science and suggests the production of knowledge and opinion based on the amount of information produced, which flood the human senses. Knowledge does not mean information. According to Heraclitus everything is examined in its natural structure and not by constructing logocentric systems. In all people there is the ability to know themselves and make themselves wise (fragment 116). This means enlightenment through experience and thought, knowledge and acknowledgment of the possibilities within an actual framework, that anticipates what can happen in a given situation. The understanding of truth lies in the perpetual transmutation and the dynamic unity of opposites, a prime example of which is the antithetical and yet bipolar relationship of the living with the dead (fragment 63). The philosophical mind comprehends their essential independence and its watchful gaze embraces the living and the dead as to opposite, but also mutually determined poles of a unique, dynamic and perpetually flowing reality (fragment 15)<sup>19</sup>.

5) The issue of harmony in Heraclitus is transformed and emerges as the issue of complexity and heterogeneity

According to Heraclitus, wisdom is not knowledge of many things, but the perception of the underlying unity of the warring opposites<sup>20</sup>. While today we observe that complexity and heterogeneity, the often non-rational treatment of space and irrational

---

<sup>18</sup> Bignell, Jonathan, *Postmodern Media Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.

<sup>19</sup> Thomson, George, *op.cit.*, p.269.

<sup>20</sup> Burnet, John, *op.cit.*, p. 158.

thought provide everyone with the right to perform mental leaps, however in substance what is achieved is the projection of a situation, which denies the existence of elements that determine the function of space. The acceptance of predetermined hierarchies and homogenized organizations or their utter avoidance, causing heterogeneity -a position clearly maintained by the postmodern- has as its aim to counter-propose a looseness, whose dominating rule is the lack of predetermined general rules. Additionally, it conforms to the acceptance of the complex reality, but through conflicts, disorder, ambiguous and not so much the comprehension of diversity and the acceptance of human nature. The supposedly “endless” multiplicity downgrades the fact that the effort is focused on the mutation of the community to a pulp of hybrid constructs and from the notion of community to the existence of personalized groups and supporters, without emphasis on function, but supposedly to a common aesthetic, which homogenizes and joins. Simply, visual representations are produced, with a superficial fusion of images, without any prior understanding of the structure of each element and the manner of the production of elements becomes mechanic, an external reference of the things that are repeated. Those who do not love anger, do not know what enthusiasm is and do ecstasize in the face of great beauty need not concern themselves with Heraclitus<sup>21</sup>.

6) The issue of continuity, cohesion in Heraclitus against the imperative adaptation of aesthetic proportions of humans to the new conditions of new technology

Technology has managed to penetrate the consciousness of people<sup>22</sup> and the aesthetic proportions of people have now adapted to the new realities of the new technology. The goal is to motivate students to spotlight situations in the light of an evaluation, in a hierarchy of values that will be founded on a biological a priori. We will ponder with our students whether the move is not upward, what exactly a struggle between young and old means. The dominant parallel objective is for students to learn to read<sup>23</sup> and interpret events. Movement is spiral, it is repetition, however deterministic and not arbitrary of the same phenomena. Therefore, the existence of leaps, abrupt qualitative changes in nature and society is unknown.

In Heraclitus, the illusions created by the singularity, arbitrary imagination, the lack of understanding, the random coincidences, fictionalized knowledge, sleepwalking (somnambulism)<sup>24</sup> are viciously condemned. Today that the incomprehensible is so reasonable (The Axion Esti (Genesis), Odysseas Elytis), where the organized resistance since the 1960's and onwards disappears, the alternative culture is far from being a solid and conscious group. Students wish to belong to groups, which move between power and withdrawal at the margin. Action is an activity of founding a body politic, memory and history. Educators should focus on the fact that the problem lies in the students' main goal being limited to the identification of their peers and not their active service or a claim to a portion of power.

---

<sup>21</sup> Falkos, T., Arvantitakis, *Heraclitus*, Thessaloniki: Zitros Publications, 1999.

<sup>22</sup> McLuhan, Marshall, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of the Typographic Man*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008, (first edition, 1962), pp.22-23.

<sup>23</sup> Bloom, Harold, *How to Read and Why*, London: 4th Estate, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Axelos, Kostas, *op.cit.*, p. 76.

## 7) The issue of time in Heraclitus and the dissolution of identity in time today

The “all-subduing” time for Heraclitus forms a type of temporality that allows in its territory the unfolding of both the subjective experience as well as the objective reckoning. Flashbacks lead to a search for points where concepts were in close relationship with the life they are called to describe. Clearly there are overlaps which have settled on the authentic existence. However research cannot take place in the gap of an instantaneous present, but some importance should be added, some knowledge added. The accumulation of technique has lost its horizon for any purpose, meaning and special content. Unless there is a ground for dialogue, it will be hard for truth to be revealed. No initiatives are undertaken, there is no dynamic relationship of disclosure and overlap in all fields (art, philosophy, technique...).

We have not being redeemed from the utilitarian dimension of time, but we are experiencing a destruction of the sense of continuity, tradition, identity. The act of remembering is seemingly useless in economic terms and homelessness means that it is always out of place; therefore sorrow is caused by constant destruction and most importantly by the perpetual evolution of destruction. We have to rid ourselves of the sense of time which is rooted in the present and as such dislikes any form of permanence. The consequences according to Stelios Ramfos are the lack of thought for the consequences. Time according to Heraclitus is expressed as a psychic element that is intertwined with the shifts of things. This excludes any recourse to metaphysical expectations, in order to better understand our behaviour. The awareness that the fundamental feature of human existence is constant movement and caring for one’s self can function as a counterweight to the inadequate definition of reality. However it cannot be allowed that there exist an uneven development, which magnifies that oblivion and thoughtlessness dominates. The Heraclitean world is a world is a world of change, therefore a world of the senses.

We realise that the danger is the unsafe patterns of either individual or collective perception, the danger to err due habitual patterns for the comprehension of reality. There arises an issue of variance between the impression of perception and the “construction” of comprehension. We must all possess an internal intelligence to see things in their binary shape (duality does not necessarily mean rivalry, it can also be complementarity) between the version of the passages and the desire of the whole. The objective is for us to realise things without either negating the opposites nor reconciling them or fighting them, to hold the role of narrator, namely the role of the third factor.

We should teach students, who begin with a background of ignorance, to perceive things in their place of installation. It is necessary to cultivate fantasy, but also their swing between memory and imagination. The dialectic of Heraclitus with the concept of the prominence of the universal participation and the role of contradictions in reality itself will open way for changes or corrections in the social, political level. The recourse to the diametrically opposite, to games of solidity and spatiality, to the contiguity of distance and proximity, to the meandering of thought is required for a deepening approach to things. Thought does not fall in contradictions and prejudices. In addition, the discharge from a metaphysical or transcendental attitude sets at the focal point dialectical thinking, the adoption of a dialectical mode of response, a

dialogue between habit and wit, a dialogue with “nothing-always” not for a rationality, but for the emergence of things and meanings.

## References

Anagnostou, L., Nissos Publishing: Athens, 1997, pp. 26, 68-82, 325-341.

Axelos, K., *Heraclitus and Philosophy*, translated by Dimitris Dimitriadis, Athens: Exandas Publications, 1986.

Bignell, J., *Postmodern Media Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.  
Bloom, H., *How to Read and Why*, London: 4th Estate, 2001.

Burnet, J., *Early Greek Philosophy*, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1908, p.146.  
Access via  
<https://ia600300.us.archive.org/5/items/burnetgreek00burnrich/burnetgreek00burnrich.pdf>.

Cherniss, H., *Aristotle's criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, Baltimore, 1935.

Diels H., Kranz W., *The Presocratics*, Volume A'. Athens: Papadima, 2005.  
<http://www.mikrosapoplous.gr/heracletus/heracletus0.html>

Falkos, T., Arvantitakis, *Heraclitus*, Thessaloniki: Zitros Publications, 1999.

Habermas, J., *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, translated by

Ilyenkov, E., *Dialectical Logic*.  
[http://aworldtowin.net/documents/Ilyenkov\\_Dialectical\\_Logic.pdf](http://aworldtowin.net/documents/Ilyenkov_Dialectical_Logic.pdf)

Kahn, C., *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Marcovich, M., *Heraclitus: Greek Text With a Short Commentary*, Pp. xxix + 665.  
Merida, Venezuela: Los Andes University Press (Oxford: Parker), 1967.

McLuhan, M., *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of the Typographic Man*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008,(first edition, 1962).

Tambakis, N., *Heraclitus and modern world: Continuity of Dialogue*, Athens: Govostis Publications, 2006.

Theodorakopoulos, J., *Introduction to Philosophy*, Athens:Estia Publications, 1974.

Thomson, G., *Studies in Ancient Greek Society, Vol.II, The First Philosophers*, Moscow, 1959.

Vlastos, G., "On Heraclitus," in *American Journal of Philology*, 76 (1955), 337–368.

**Contact email:** kapitanny@gmail.com