Everyday life and postmodernism: the ethics of social life in Ágnes Heller

Cotidiano e pós-modernismo: a ética da vida social em Ágnes Heller

Eduardo Portanova Barros
Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (UNIOESTE-PR); Pós-doutorando PPGSCF/ UNIOESTE-PR
Email:
eduardoportanova@hotmail.com

Antônio César Santos Fonseca
Universidade Feevale-RS; Doutorando em Processos e Manifestações Culturais
Email:
eduardoportanova@hotmail.com

Abstract
This article is inspired by the reflections of the Hungarian philosopher Ágnes Heller (representative of the so-called Budapest School), especially in two of her works: "Políticas de la postmodernidad" (1989), co-authored with Ferenc Féher, and "The Daily Life and History", originally written in 1970. We are not interested here in his debt to Marxist thought, from which his work, a disciple that he was of George Lukács, originates, but rather the circumstances of complex human relations as a dialectic between life and everyday life. It is concluded that the heterogeneous aspect of which Heller speaks to us, without any universal hierarchy (in her words), is an affirmation (without labeling or absolutisms) of the postmodern theories of "decentralization of the subject" (Hall), "weak thinking" (Vattimo) or "elective affinities" (Maffesoli), among other theorists of this hermeneutic-phenomenological approach.
Keywords: Ágnes Heller; Budapest School; Post-modernism; Sociology of Culture.

Resumo
Este artigo é inspirado nas reflexões da filósofa húngara Ágnes Heller (representante da chamada Escola de Budapeste), sobretudo em dois de seus trabalhos: "Políticas de la postmodernidad" (1989), em coautoria com Ferenc Féher, e "O cotidiano e a história", escrito, originalmente, em 1970. Interessa-nos aqui menos sua dívida com o pensamento marxista, do qual se origina sua obra, discípula que era de George Lukács, mas antes as circunstâncias das complexas relações humanas como uma dialética entre a vida e o cotidiano. Conclui-se que o aspecto

heterogêneo de que nos fala Heller, sem nenhuma hierarquia universal (nas palavras dela), é uma afirmação (sem rotulações ou absolutismos) das teorias pós-modernas de "descentramento do sujeito" (Hall), "pensamento débil" (Vattimo) ou "afinidades eletivas" (Maffesoli), entre outros teóricos dessa abordagem hermenêutico-fenomenológica.
Palavras-chaves: Ágnes Heller; Escola de Budapeste; Pós-modernismo; Sociologia da Cultura.

Introduction

By reflecting on politics in postmodernity, Ágnes Heller (1989) speaks to us, *a priori*, of a human condition. The approach of this Hungarian philosopher, therefore, necessarily crosses the idea of hybridity that characterizes social and cultural relations in contemporary times (also considered, but far from unanimous, postmodern). We take the term "post", therefore, with some liberties. Sometimes it can be synonymous with contemporary, sometimes with a Postmodern Era, let's say, in the same way that a Middle Ages or a Project of Modernity was characterized.

It may even be an exaggeration to consider our current time in that way (a Postmodern Era). However, it would not be entirely inappropriate, we think, to reflect on some aspects of the present day compared to the profile of culture in the thought of Ágnes Heller (1929-1919). Her pioneering spirit in her analysis of everyday themes, as in "The Future of Relations Between the Sexes", an essay published in Brazil in the early 1970s, for example, seems unquestionable. That is why the work of the neo-Marxist philosopher is important[1].

Heller (1989) begins his reflections by reporting that the West, because it feels superior in relation to other cultures - these, therefore, considered inferior within an ethnocentric view - has coined some expressions, such as "culture" and "civilization". For Heller (1989), they are plural terms. When the author recalls this plurality, she refers to the fact that this theme is umbilically, even if the term was not used at that time (or not in the way it is today), linked to the issue of the

---

[1]The prefix "neo", at least as we understand it here, seeks to contemplate the Hellerian perspective within an open Marxist theory, especially with regard to the materialist and ideological views of history in Marx and Engels, which, in our view, do not correspond, *ipsis litteris*, to Heller's thought.

postmodern and, therefore, indicates discontinuities perceived in a world that has been undergoing transformations processed daily. It is fearful to work on the concepts of culture and civilization from an ethnocentric perspective.

It is very likely that the minimum exemption would not be obtained. Furthermore, we highlight the fact that the transformations we talk about and which the subject has been going through, in fact, fragment him and, consequently, move away from the worldview that understands the subject as unified. This is because the transition from modernity to a later period (if we take history as a linear event, of course), called post-modern, articulates concepts such as identity, culture, civilization and others, in a somewhat erratic way (Lyotard, at the end of the 1970s, I would call this situation the "postmodern condition"). This means that the idea (and why not say ideology?) of a certain concept today, based on a re-interpretation of some Marxist paradigms, above all, including historical materialism and its use and exchange values they can be updated for better and worse, in the light of postmodernism.

Now, Marx's Dialectic Method, for example, according to which, in general terms, depends on a historical reality and a daily life that is rather materialistic than contemplative, not to say complex, as in Morin, or post-modern, as in Hall, Vattimo or Maffesoli, among several others before them (Nietzsche, for example), today it may need at least some updating, even if only to confirm it. We could follow this line of reasoning, revisiting Marxist concepts about dialectics (called Hegelian-Marxist), utopian socialism - a utopia that he, Marx, did not believe in - or about political economy. But it's not the case.

Therefore, what we mentioned above about "concepts" (it would be better, today, to consider them "notions", so as not to adopt a peremptory and irreducible tone), these of (1) identity (no longer "one" or unique, that is , I am what I am in the time of my existence, and I will die like this, *but* rather *identifications*, our different facets, which can vary even depending on our mood), of (2) culture (today affective or ambiguous, which occurs from an interpretation of meanings - no less tragic - marked by different manifestations of the same phenomenon) and, finally, of (3) civilization (no longer with a capital "C", through an attempted imposition,

even in this case, ideological of A against B, or vice versa, but rather a collective imaginary, and collective would be a redundancy), this is the postmodern.

And why is all this, in the postmodern, a bit erratic? Because the postmodern is not intended (indeed, nor is it intended to be anything) merely justifiable, as in the Modernity Project, from an ideological, positivist point of view, that is, considering, for example, the scope of Truth solely and exclusively through Reason, according to the "Discourse on the positive spirit" (1848), by Auguste Comte (1798-1857), or Cartesian (the Method as an instrument of Truth). "What was in vogue during the centuries that have just ended was what I would call moral-politics: a salvation for later, future perfection" (Maffesoli, 2012, p. 112). The communist ideal today, revisiting Marx, is different. And we don't want to continue with that for now.

1   Between the Modern and the Postmodern

Returning to the theme presented by Heller, we highlight the following: cultures follow one another and there is no way to return to the starting point, as if it were a nostalgic trip to the past. According to Heller (1989), an observation exercise is necessary so that we can understand aspects of change. It is important to highlight that this transformation, already mentioned here, is the result of the transition - not radical and more experienced than theoretically speaking - from Modernity to another period, the post-modern. But not yet as a historical consensus.

The basic characteristic of this transition is a social reordering based on public policies that are no longer - or only - progressive in character (in the sense of a rosy future dependent on modes of production), but hybrid, mixing with a complex institutional framework. Culture, therefore, becomes the key term for understanding this transition between the modern and the post-modern. New approaches left behind concepts such as action and structure, taken in isolation, and began to deal with designations with the radical "post": Post-feminism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, post-human.

Lyotard leveraged the discussion about the epistemological nature of knowledge and imagination in what he called, as we have already seen, a "postmodern condition". Let's look at the following. Just the fact that Lyotard uses a broad term such as "condition", a term that designates something temporary (so much so that it has become a bit of a fad, nowadays, for someone to refer to themselves as "being" in the position X or Y, and not, for example, "I am" president of a company or even, as we have already heard, of football clubs), justifies the importance of the cultural fact. Culture understood here as that which characterizes a totalizing way of life, as Teixeira Coelho (2004, p. 103) reminds us.

Lyotard's so-called "meta-reports" are a kind of "meta-discourses" or what is said about something to justify it, but which will never be that something in itself. It is "meta" because it occurs "beyond" its "concept". This "fold" in history, so to speak, is seen as that of a postmodern profile, too. Another author who changed the scenario of analysis within the cultural sphere, in the sense of validating it, even without the agreement, sometimes, of his peers, was Michel Foucault. In order not to extend too much, especially because Foucault is not our field of work, here we stick with his "Microphysics of power" (1979). It is a molecular interpretation of culture, which denotes an epistemological deconstruction of the unshakable truth. For Foucault, knowledge is provisional. "What is at issue is what *governs* the statements and the way in which they *govern* each other to constitute a set of acceptable propositions" (Foucault, 1979, p. 4).

Following this line of reasoning, culture began to mean more than a set of customs and thus began to assume a broader meaning (almost anthropological, we would say). Therefore, narratives and symbolic representations, not only based on the political scenario, *re*-orient individuals. Heller is aware of this. Culture - which is related to húmus, that which is earthly and also unstable, unlike "habitus", that which "perseveres in being" (Coelho, 2008, p. 31) - is the driving force. Force or driving power because it is what drives us, what moves us. The "habit", in contrast, would be deadly, because, as we saw above, with Teixeira Coelho, "it perseveres in being", that is, it remains somewhat stagnant. In Heller, what plays the role of driving power is everyday life. Everyday life, in Heller, is, by analogy, "húmus",

organic matter rich in nutrients. "Húmus" also serves as a metaphor for Hellerian daily life.

When realizing, according to Teixeira Coelho (2008), that the majority of the world's population today lives in the city, would it not be the time to question, together with Heller's reflections on everyday life, which culture we refer to and which motricity do we talk about on this path, according to Durand (1987), between our subjective drives and the objective coercions of the social environment ("anthropological path")? What Durand understands by "anthropological trajectory" is "the incessant exchange that exists at the level of the imaginary between the subjective and assimilating drives and the objective intimations that emanate from the cosmic and social environment" (1997, p. 35).

A little later, in this same passage, Durand will say that "[...] there is a reciprocal genesis that oscillates from the instinctual gesture to the material and social environment and vice versa" (1997, p. 41). The French anthropologist, it is worth highlighting, never thinks of polarities as dichotomous forms. If he highlights them in terms of polarities, it is to bring them together later. It was around Durand, it is worth remembering, that the so-called School of Grenoble (University of Grenoble III) was created. For Durand, the imaginary is the "foundation" of human actions.

Durand, following with him, assumes his choice of the imaginary as a path with a scientific content, but not Cartesian (which postulated evidence as a universal method). That is, not according to the laws of a hard science. In the age of the image, another French philosopher, Jean Baudrillard, states, "everything liquefies" (1991, p. 9). According to Baudrillard, we no longer have the signs of reality. This is one of the features of the postmodern, which Durand does not focus on, but which is worth observing, as in this article, also in Heller. For her, the real, that which Baudrillard mentions, can be translated, however, in one word: "Life". We therefore observe a transition here, no longer a logic of "should be".

It is this heterogeneous slippage, a common term in Heller's work, that addresses the complex thought of this author of Hungarian origin, based in the United States. The paroxysmal moment of simulation, which is when, according to Baudrillard (1991), there is no longer "the mirror of being" and appearances, is not

the scenario that arises for Heller. The expression of life, both for Heller and for postmodern theories, is marked by the qualitative. If the characteristics of the so-called Modernity Project were to codify, classify and order, in Heller, even with a Marxist basis, it is not possible to think only of dialectical materialism.

The value of being, for her, is not material. "Everyday life is, to a large extent, heterogeneous, and this in several aspects, especially with regard to the content and significance or importance of our types of activities" (HELLER, s/d, p. 18). Heller goes on to state that both spontaneity can characterize particular motivations and "the human-generic activities that take place in it [everyday life]" (s/d, p. 18). She expressed a clear interest in everyday matters, and accentuated the ambivalent character of social structures. Alongside her, Weber, who proposed a polytheism of values, criticizes the rationalization of existence in his famous expression "disenchantment of the world". The relationships are ambivalent, which Maffesoli considers "social eroticism" (2012). In a way, Heller motivates us to rethink the topic that motivated Plato: The *polis*. For Plato, it was important to discuss forms and structures of relationships and government of citizens, proposing the perfect solution aimed at an ideal policy.

2   Hall and the Information Push

Another author we refer to here and who dialogues with Heller is Stuart Hall (2014). He engaged in the discussion about hegemony, which is not unrelated to the politics of the postmodern in Heller, the backbone of this article. Hall paid special attention to issues relating to globalization, which is considered as a boost in information from the mass media, as well as the fluidity of meanings and symbols. The author shows us that it is necessary to understand the demands for recognition, starting from the different processes that constitute representations and identities.

When focusing on the Caribbean experience, Hall does not identify a single, true tradition, much less an attempt to reconstruct a distant past. The author understands identity as one of the different ways we have to position ourselves in relation to the narratives of the past and, thus, positioned by them. Identities are

thought of as constructions that impose an imaginary coherence on an experience of dispersion and fragmentation. They come from a place, they have a history, although these stories are always in constant transformation.

Heller's thought (1989), in turn, reminds us that cultures were previously considered closed universes and that, when they opened, they lost their characteristic features and, thus, became vulnerable to insubordination on the part of the younger culture. The author also remembers that this vision of "alienated foreign" cultures coincides with the beginning of capitalism and structure, and cultural division. In Hall (2014), in this case, the process of identification that produces the postmodern subject, conceptualized as not having a fixed, essential or permanent identity, made cultural identity more provisional, variable and problematic (Hall, 2014, p. 11).

Given this assertion, it is important to remember that, just as identity will be influenced by the social relationships that are established, the subject and culture are also affected by the postmodern condition. Heller highlights that, historically, there were, in addition to a mechanical "construct", formations of aristocratic groups and titles of nobility (mainly from England) together with the so-called bourgeoisie. For this segment of society, it is important that concepts such as superiority and inferiority are exercised and remain "in vogue", as this would be the way to perpetuate their power and guarantee the maintenance of their *status quo*, although currently the situation has undergone transformations.

But the intention is to guarantee the permanence of such concepts and legitimize the current social condition. It is noted that the groups mentioned, those who claim such an aspiration, are part of an elite that needs to perpetuate its power and, to this end, this is one of the strategies used in an attempt to convince, while strata of social layers at the base of pyramid, aspire to a certain equity that guarantees them a condition of equality before the society in which they are inserted.

However, Heller (1989) highlights that only after the Second World War did the erosion of the network of class cultures become visible and cultural relativism gained momentum. Before, cultural habits were linked exclusively to one class and now they were available to everyone. From now on, "other cultures" borrow

patterns of behavior and habits. The transition of the Modernity Project and its values from the 18th and 19th centuries, values of linear economic and social progress, currently offer the possibility of investigating, today, our cultural daily life under the Hellerian bias of a political imaginary beyond a binary ideology.

3   Multicausal explanations

Let us also look at this contradictory aspect (mass-individuals) with Heller. She will talk about a "multicausal explanation". Heller mentions the birth of the division of labor, which she points to as one of the factors of sociocultural development. She also highlights the birth of mass production, the breadth of means of communication, decolonization and the reduction of working hours in Western Europe. In her opinion, more than causes, there are three waves in which new imaginary meanings of a way of life have been created and which are, naturally, parts of everyday life, with more or less consensus, post-modern. Since the French Revolution, according to Heller, each new generation that succeeds not only maintains the aspirations of the previous generation, but also brings new aspirations and demands.

The author recalls that these movements had a political character, that of an exchange of elites. In this context, young people would be of fundamental importance, as they would, in the future, be academics, social workers, self-employed workers, etc. Heller remembers that the tendency towards the power of social absorption of social movements is very clear in the cultural trend of that time and cites punk-rock as an example. Before, to be part of a culture, you needed to have a clear identity, "bourgeois" or "worker" - there was an institutionalized role, but today that no longer makes sense. And this is precisely the contradictory point between the Modernity Project and the postmodern affect. The absence of a welfare state - even more so a radical state.

If we take this issue of a State that is now weakened, let's say, from the Maffesolian perspective[2], there is a change of perspective in postmodern society.

---

[2]Referring to the French sociologist Michel Maffesoli (1944-), according to which the knowledge (or scientific) society is a tributary of the vitalist daily life in actions, today, less arising from a purely ideological or individualistic bias than collectively affective or tribal.

Individualism gives rise to the need to identify with a certain group, as a kind of "tribalism", aggregation, identification. According to Maffesoli, culture is not a consequence of society, but simply one of its aspects, since it is, through it, that individuals position themselves socially. For him, contrary to popular belief, there is a "passionate imitation" (1997, p. 140). Remembering Simmel, Maffesoli (2012) says that this is a most instructive sociological phenomenon. Remembering Heller, from our perspective, we could call this impasse between the individual and the mass as that which concerns "life", simply put.

Thus, for Maffesoli, culture (in general and particularly in "post-modern tribalism") is seen between modernity and the expression "post", which seeks, in its trajectory, dissonance with issues related to the idea of a linear history by the march of the oppressed. Not that they cease to exist. However, the term "oppression" took on another place, other than just the ideological one of the left or right. Oppression is now of a different nature, because humanism is discredited. The dream of an egalitarian society collapsed with the fall of the Wall in 1989, which does not mean, on the other hand, that differences do not cease to exist. And these differences, from a cultural point of view, are no less significant, however, than those that existed before.

Heller (1989) points, for his part, to the possibility of a generational conflict due to the conflict between the cultures of parents and that of children, the result of a transition between traditional class cultures and post-modern culture. For Heller (1989), three generations that have appeared since the Second World War can be related: 1st - Existentialist generation; 2nd - Generation of alienation or separation; 3rd - Postmodernist generation. Regarding Existentialism, the author states that this theoretical approach emerges as a rebellion against subjectivity and the ossification of bourgeois forms of life and against deep-rooted ceremonial norms and limitations.

Sociology's call for the Modernity Project had the desire to break with everything that came before, bringing an idea of freedom and innovation, different from postmodern - a more or less consensual term - which has a different perception of changes, as it does not presents the total rupture, but rather "alternativism", a new-old, as a way of interpreting the three temporal vectors:

past, present and future. In this way, the so-called postmodern society would not have values to follow, and this results in the fluidity of identities and, for projects to improve the quality of life for the "marginalized".

4   Vattimo and the ideal of transparency

In 1968, the year of the May Revolution in France, by young people who demanded access to public universities and greater freedom of expression, it coincided with an "economic boom" and a post-war period with its consequent expansion of social possibilities. He was not alienated in the Marxist sense, without a clear political position. The search for freedom, from 1968 onwards, in France, above all, and Woodstock, an open-air music festival in the United States, was the common goal. The postmodern emerges, for some theorists, but this is quite variable, as a theory from 1968 onwards, with one of the milestones being that student revolt in France in May 1968, which took a stand against the closure of places in public universities, disillusioned with her own perception of the world. Heller also highlights that postmodernism is full of questions.

For the postmodern, there is no longer a fixed structure, as in the positivist logic of a Comtean sociology ("Order and progress"). In this sense, Gianni Vattimo portrays that an ideal of transparency, therefore, does not come true. Society has an ideal of transparency, but in reality it is not clear. To no one. Vattimo remembers that if the media is not transparent, on the other hand it dissolves the centrality of points of view. For Vattimo, media is a postmodern issue. Vattimo states that "the essence of the modern only becomes truly visible from the moment the mechanism of modernity distances itself from us" (1996, p. 102). He adds that the sign of this distancing is the emptying of the concept of progress (as we have seen). If we agree with Vattimo, the emptying of the concept of progress also results in the emptying of the concept of politics, following the example of Heller, in this postmodern perspective.

Politics, therefore, would no longer exist as a specific phenomenon, in the same way that genuine art existed in the Renaissance, representative of authorial genius and an auratic nature. As a cultural movement, postmodernism has a

simple message: "Anything goes", allowing all types of rebellion, integrated or collective, in an unlimited pluralism. Heller highlights that postmodernism is neither conservative, nor revolutionary, nor progressive, it is a cultural movement that understands that everyone can be part of this movement. For her, we can see postmodernism as cultural relativism against the rigidity of class culture; against the ethnocentric celebration of only what is correct and true.

For Hellerian postmodernism, all types of social and cultural movements are valid and possible, not delimiting limits and respecting all trends and opinions. Returning to Hall (2014), there is a decentering of the subject, as mentioned by Hall (2014). Note the following: For those people who understand that there was only a fragmentation of identity, the theorist argues that, in fact, what happened in the conception of the modern subject, in late modernity, was not simply its disintegration, but its displacement. He interprets this shift as the product of a series of ruptures in the discourses of modern knowledge (HALL, 2014, p. 22). Hall (2014) will remind us that the first decentering refers to the traditions of Marxist thought.

According to Hall (2014), the second decentering in Western thought occurs with the discovery of the unconscious by Freud. Freud's theory that our identity, our sexuality and the structure of our desires are formed based on psychic and symbolic processes of the unconscious, which function according to a "logic" very different from that of Reason, destroys the concept of the knowing subject (who is aware of his condition) and rational, provided with a fixed and unified identity.

We can infer that in the postmodern period, identity, as well as all the elements that were inserted in this environment, is marked by the fragmentation that originated in this multiplicity of references. "Life", even though this term seems somewhat abstract, deals with its history and its past, but, in the postmodern, it is replaced by an anxiety to live in the present and by an identification with "us" (a "community we" or "tribalism", according to Maffesoli). In this way, Hall (2014) reminds us that identity is something formed, throughout processes and not something innate, existing in ideological consciousness.

In this context, identity is always in a process of change, receiving information and characteristics that the outside world "makes available",

gradually filling itself and providing elements that are added to the identity. Hall (2014) highlights that the third decentering is associated with the work of linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, who argues that "speaking a language does not just mean expressing our most interior and original thoughts; it also means activating the immense range of meanings that are already embedded in our language and our cultural systems" (Hall, 2014, p. 25). However, when such meanings take on a political dimension, with concrete demands, we are faced with a series of oppositions of all kinds, especially culturally and politically speaking.

The fourth decentering is inserted in the work of Michel Foucault, in which the philosopher and historian developed a kind of "genealogy of the modern subject", in which he highlights a new type of power that he calls "disciplinary power". Disciplinary power is concerned with regulation, whereas surveillance is the government of the human species or entire populations and, later, of individuals and the body. The places chosen to carry out this surveillance would be those institutions where, in the 19th century, large-scale internment was used, and where people who were admitted to these establishments were policed and disciplined.

So, in this context, we will have this control in barracks, schools, prisons, hospitals, clinics and others (Foucault). And control by the State (or what remains of it), even if invisible, over social groups, including the example of Bubas. It is important to remember that Stuart Hall's decentered subject is the death of the subject in Foucault. The objective is to keep people's lives under control and discipline, including controlling the individual's state of unhappiness and pleasures, as well as their mental, physical and moral health, sexual practices, family life, in short, everything under strict control and surveillance.

The fifth decentering is the impact caused by feminism, which emerged as part of that group of "new social movements" in the first decade of the 1960s, during the period in which late modernity reached its peak. It is important to remember that this fifth decentering is linked to the fact that the subject is no longer the center of actions or the sole object of study. Decentering is the result of the fragmentation that this subject suffered, given the volatility and inconstancy of the transformations through which social relations are permeated. Therefore,

just as for Hall (2014), the postmodern subject does not have a fixed, essential or permanent identity, being formed and transformed. Heller (1989) will also verify that the same traits will be found in the study he carried out regarding the "Policies of postmodernity". These concepts coined in the West, during modernity, were intended to reaffirm the hegemony of dominant groups.

We talked here about the coincidence between the beginning of capitalism and the vision of "alienated foreign" cultures and the structure of the division of culture, but the coincidence does not lie only in this aspect, because with capitalism we will also have the emergence of globalization, which plays a preponderant role in this new stage that is emerging. Postmodernity and globalization are linked by the set of factors that make the two phenomena studied when analyzing these processes, which gave a new reading to these concepts.

"Local" identities and communities resist or surrender to globalization. It depends. From the moment they try to explain a phenomenon by seeking to identify characteristics that are similar to their actions, they face resistance. However, it is impossible to deny that people who live in distant places, such as small villages and poor Third World countries, receive information from the most diverse parts of the world through various means of communication, staying connected to the planet and having information of everything that happens in the world, being in this aspect a reality.

The absence of borders and free movement between countries and cities allows people to move freely from one place to another. The "dialogical" principle, one of the characteristics we observe in Heller, therefore, recognizes singular, original and historical traits of certain phenomena as opposed to a homogenizing and simplifying view. "The dialogical way and through macro concepts connects possibly antagonistic notions in a complementary way", according to Morin (2001, p. 334). Contrary to this, according to him, we would have the technicalist (operationality and applicability of the theory in a mechanical way), doctrinal (closed to the outside world) and degrading (vulgarization as a shock formula) views.

The French thinker speaks to us, therefore, of a "paradigm of complexity", on which we base our current work, and which can be defined as a set of principles,

linked to each other, whose characteristics dialogue with each other. This convergence, which does not exclude possible contradictions, is what Morin will call "dialogy" and which, in Heller's thinking, we could characterize as one of the features of his thesis about everyday life, which is both plural and heterogeneous.

Dialogy "applied" to sociological studies allows respecting the very status of this field, which is to value encounter, reunion to the detriment of dispersion and divergence. This, in short, is what we call the dynamic dimension of Heller's philosophy and everyday life as its heuristic principle. The presence of these postmodern tribes in everyday life is a reality and we cannot ignore them. This takes us back to the basis of sociological study, namely: that the set of beliefs and feelings common to the average member of a society forms a determined system with its own life and that this is what is called "collective consciousness" or "common".

It is also worth highlighting that, in "The Postmodern Condition", Lyotard, already mentioned before, opines that postmodern knowledge "refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to bear the incommensurable" (1989, p. 13). For Vattimo, finally, "there is no experience of truth except as an interpretative act" (1995, p. 41). This is because, according to him, postmodern man is characterized by a generic feeling: "Truth occurs outside the boundaries of the purely scientific method" (Vattimo, 1995, p. 41). At this point, concluding with Heller, everyday life, following the example of Vattimo's open interpretation of the postmodern, applies to a heterogeneity typical of a pulsating pluralism of *carpe diem* (Latin expression of affirmation of the Self and taking advantage of its moment, of your day).

Final considerations

What we pointed out in this article was, with Heller, a characteristic of her that - contrary to the Marxist thesis from which, paradoxically, the author herself is inspired - Marx's dialectical historical materialism, which postulates all types of explanations under the bias of evolution alone in economic relations through a historical process, but Heller and Ferenc, when they introduce the term

postmodernism into the debate - and she speaks of "postmodernism, and not postmodern, as we prefer, in this article, we move away from that hypothesis of pure ideological bias. Currently, according to Heller, it is no longer a matter of material data, but rather of human life, of man, of everyday life, of plurality. Now, the influence of a dominant ideology or market fetishism denounced by Lukács himself (Heller's mentor) or by the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School does not come into discussion here. Marx, moreover, imagined the abolition of classes and the State, which would become an instrument of struggle for the "oppressed" social classes themselves. The end of the State, as Marx thought, is not relevant to Heller in these two works highlighted here.

The hypothesis, in short, with which we work is that the postmodern, society, no longer sees itself only ideologically, as Marx wanted. And Heller, a "Marxist" philosopher, ends up reinforcing a picture that is justified rather as an interpretative character of existence, in the same way as Vattimo, when he states that the death of God, in Nietzsche, does not mean that God has died, and rather "which is no longer necessary" (1995, p. 44). Wouldn't it be possible, therefore, to make an analogy between Vattimo's idea and Heller and "his" Marxism? This is because, according to Vattimo (and wouldn't Heller fit here?), in the world without the threat of nature, God - and Marx, we could add - seem like an extreme hypothesis.

Bibliography

BAUDRILLARD, Jean. *Simulacros e simulação*. Lisboa: Relógio D´Água, 1991.

COELHO, Teixeira. *A cultura e seu contrário*. Cultura, arte e política pós-2001. São Paulo: Iluminuras: Itaú Cultural, 2008.

COELHO, Teixeira. *Dicionário crítico de Política Cultural*. Cultura e imaginário. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2004.

DURAND, Gilbert. *As estruturas antropológicas do imaginário*. Introdução à Arquetipologia Geral. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1987.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Microfísica do poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 7ª. ed., 1979.

HALL, Stuart. *A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2014.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Ser e tempo*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2015.

HELLER, Ágnes; FEHÉR, Ferenc. *Políticas de la postmodernidad*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península, 1989.

HELLER, Ágnes. *O cotidiano e a história*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, s/d.

LYOTARD, Jean-François. *A condição pós-moderna*. Lisboa: Gradiva, 1989.

MAFFESOLI, Michel. *Homo eroticus*. Des communions émotionnelles. Paris: CNRS, 2012.

MAFFESOLI, Michel. *O tempo das tribos*. O declínio do individualismo nas sociedades de massa. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1997.

MAFFESOLI, Michel. *O tempo retorna*: formas elementares da pós-modernidade. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2012.

MORIN, Edgar. *Ciência com consciência*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2001.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. *A origem da tragédia*. Lisboa. Guimarães Editores, 2002.

VATTIMO, Gianni. *O fim da modernidade*. Niilismo e hermenêutica na cultura pós-moderna. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1996.

VATTIMO, Gianni. *A sociedade transparente*. Lisboa: Relógio D´Água, 1992.

VATTIMO, Gianni. *Mas allá de la interpretación*. Barcelona: Paidós, 1995.

COMO REFERENCIAR

BARROS, Eduardo Portanova; FONSECA, Everyday life and postmodernism: the ethics of social life in Ágnes Heller. *Latitude*, Maceió, v. 18, n. 1, p. 1-17, 2023.