

# Résumé

While we are standing shyly at the beginning of the third millennium, we feel to be a part of intellectual movement that has an essential meaning for humankind. The change of paradigms has not been completed yet; we are in the middle of a great change. It shows that numerous projects dreaming about a new land, which were made real by the modern era with such effort, are deficient and turn man's sight back to an entire basis of needs that gave birth to these projects.

It seems proper to ask whether this land will be a land of people. After all tragedies of 20<sup>th</sup> century this question is quite legitimate. We live in the world where man seems to be reduced to a number, size of which grows with the profit he brings. It's obvious that a definition of man depends on his social role. Here they are: a businessman, a manager, an employer and an employee. But where is the human being? Nowadays, more urgently than whenever else, Diogenes' lamp is searching for the human being. Shakespeare's dilemma *to be or not to be* is more than a rhetorical question. It's the historical and existential space and at the same time it's also *locus theologicus*.

Man nonstop collects his losses, suffers from various forms of violence and at the same time keeps projecting his hopes.

At the beginning of our work we analyzed the context of refusal of God that can be grasped from several various angles of sight. The secularized concepts of liberation and salvation look in the logic of this context a bit self-salving, historical and intranscendental. We tried to catch this very self-salving aspect of secular concepts of man's liberation in the second chapter of our work.

First and foremost we concentrated on three key streams of modern thought through which the multifaceted message of liberation is coming: science-technological hope, proletarian revolution and Freudian project of liberation. These projects aren't just methods of limited liberations this or that dimension of man, but they appear to be radical and global sights on man and his existence. This is the theme of the third chapter of our work.

New, modern ways of liberation that develop as alternatives of global message of historical religions have got always certain soteriological effort at the background. The moment of liberation is for science-technological conception included in *safety* and *security* from cosmic chaos and any functional limit. The Marxist concept declares liberation as a victory over lacerating historical chaos consisting in division of labour and social classes. Psychoanalytical conception stands on a boundary of liberation from cosmic chaos and historical chaos. It is based on intertwined individual and collective unconsciousness where all conflicts, complexes and lapses originate.

The triple pattern of secular humanisms' liberation is a part of only one effort for liberation of man from domination in such meaning of liberation as emancipation from natural determinisms, liberation as an act of overcoming socio-economical estrangement and liberation as getting rid of obligations of moral domination.

For a believer the essential moments of these conceptions can play a certain prophetic role. A purgatory function which is undertaken by them in the relationship to religions stimulate religions to emancipate themselves from magic conception, ideological stiffness, from superstitions, prejudices and religious toys.

However to suppose that they are totalizing conceptions which give complete answers for essential inevitable questions of man ( it's impossible to live without knowing why, where from and where to ) would stand man on shaky ground.

Science and technology will never satisfy spiritual needs of man the same way they realize themselves in various religions. Neither science and technology nor Marxist or psychoanalytical conception have suppressed religion totally and they don't seem to be successful in future.

The science-technological humanism, the Marxist and psychoanalytical humanism contain valuable elements which help to solve some aspects, they even influence the complex solution of problems of man and his deep questioning.

At the moment of their crossing over their own borders and becoming alternative religions, totalizing conceptions which try to solve the basic questions of being such as *why*, *where from* and *where to*, they come to failure. Their historical verification shows that original hopes set on them by man are disappointed, they even create more yet serious fears and anxieties than those which they intended people to liberate from.

Boris Pasternak wrote in one of his poems : “ *I have been daybreak but I’ve never been daytime.* ” These words could be well applied on the projects of liberation offered by secular humanisms.

In the fourth chapter we tried to have a look at inside criticism and supplements that became real within the framework of every single conception. Though these corrections and improvement made by H.Marcuse, E. Fromm and E. Bloch were admirable and bold in their endeavour, they appear at the final result incomplete or utopian and standing on not quite solid foundations. This very weakness which calls for more comprehensive and well-founded problem-solving of the issue of man is the object of the fifth chapter.

Man appears to be a being that is characterized by constitutional openness, transcendental dimension of his existence becomes evident in his concepts of thought that he had created during centuries. Man is defined by transcendental openness which is possible to call eschatological tendency of human existence. The need for liberation is in close contact and interrelates with the need of salvation.

Here ends the text of licentiate work which we would like to link up with the dissertation. Here, that means at the transcendental openness of human needs that define human existence, the dissertation sets the task to sketch anthropology aimed to salvation characterized by its basic dimensions : *fullness* in the meaning of wholeness of man, *universality* in the meaning of concerning every human being, *certainty* based on solid ground of history, *continuity* in the meaning of eternity.

In this sense we understand history as incompleteness that calls for being completed, as space of *nostalgia for something utterly different* (Horkheimer). The revelation of God of Bible enters this way of

comprehension history and man as an offer of a free gift of liberation of man. God asks man, struggles for man. History is a temple of God because man is God's passion, God longs for man. The world isn't given to man as something that is only of the natural quality but it's something that is also of the cultural quality. This cultural quality comes out from the reality which is set by human ability of choice.

In the last part of this work the theological reflection of phenomena included in the first part leads into declaration of Christian-Jewish belief in God who has been liberating since the beginning of history, the summit of his liberating effort is Christ – the happening of liberation, and who is at the same time the winner over any form of man's slavery.

Christ offers a gift of freedom – liberation that precedes accepting this gift by man even before man enters the experience of Christ's freedom paid by heavy price. This gift is experienced by man in his essential need for liberation. This way freedom that causes freedom (i.e. gives man the chance to be human) becomes freedom-gift and at the same time freedom-endeavour. Man finds in Christ his certainty that it is really possible to be a man fully.

We find ourselves in the middle of a paradox : we can notice that the more man multiplies his relations and relationships, the more he experiences loneliness; the longer he lives, the more he feels lack of sense and meaning of life; with the growing wealth the inside depression grows too; in spite of the widely spreading influence of technical rationality the man succumbs to still wider irrational thought which appears in various forms of violence, self-disintegration, suicide and magic.

E. Fromm diagnoses the spirit of our era as a necrophilic structure. John Paul II. spoke about culture of death. Both of them come up from the fact that modern man prefers the idea of possession to the idea of being. It is not only a question of two opposite words but above all of two completely opposite ways of existence and coexistence.

It is a question of anything but the fact that we measure the sense and value of our existence according to how much and what we produce. Your value depends on what you do. Your value depends on how much you have.

This myth of importance of productivity, the possessiveness by purpose stands at the root of confusion *to be* with *to have*, *how* with *why*. Here is the cause of loss of identity, stability and happiness of man. The results are various temptations, apathy on one side, violence on the other, escape into the past on one side, escape into utopian dreams on the other.

The spirit of possession asks hungrily not only for things but for the man too. I'm as great as much I possess. I'm as great as much I perform. I'm as great as much I can. Here is firmly rooted man's feeling of estrangement. Who is heavily depressed, feels estranged because he isn't able to cope with demands, claims and speed and who is in the lead of a race feels frustrated as well because man feels frustrated when he doesn't realize his being but only his possession. When he piles up and heap and doesn't aim to fullness.

In this serious cracks of modern conceptions, that are from many aspects admirable, display themselves. By accenting various forms of ownership they reduce the dimension of being and avoid the basic issues of existence: *where from*, *where to* and *which way*. These three questions relate to three Kantian questions: What can I learn? In what can I hope? What can I do? Radical *why* of existence can be heard in all these questions. Not replied, they give rise to the feeling of anxiety, boredom, sickness, hopelessness and unimportance, the feeling of both outer and inner violence.

Liberation from violating socio-economical structures by creating fairer order of more solidarity, science-technological progress serving more comfortable lifestyle, knowledge of inner dynamisms of man for decreasing inner personal conflicts have a great meaning for man. But it is necessary to say, that they aren't everything to man. We don't claim that these conceptions are inhuman, but they aren't humanized enough.

These liberating moments don't cover essential needs of man that come forward from experience of impossibility to share thoughts and feelings, loneliness, disappointment, losses, pain and strain and death fully. Death, in particular, which is characterized by its permanent presence, its invincible inevitability and complete irrevocability, reveals in man with great intensity some of his needs. Facing the fact of death of person no theory is able to solve concrete aspects of isolation, illness and death. It is necessary

for every humanistic theory, even for the best one, to count this inconsolable reality.

After the great projects of liberation of man didn't fulfill hopes they inserted in themselves we can state that their conception was one-sided. We learned this lesson from modern history and it would be short-sighted not to take advice from it. The Frankfurt school, Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse witness this reality by their work. Garaudy's statement is in this consequence emblematic: *"Radical transformation of man's consciousness is one from essential premises. For me, the key problem is, how to approach this radical change of a person's consciousness before we start transformation in social and political institutions."*