

To Discuss

DECOHERENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN QUANTUM COMPUTATION

By contrast, classical theories, as understood here, consider their primary object of investigation as, at least in principle (it may not be possible in practice), available to conceptualization and, often, to direct or, at least sufficiently approximate, representation by means of such theories – in short, as knowable.

This is "the knowable" of my title. Classical thinking does not deny that there are things that are, in practice or even in principle, beyond theory or any knowledge. In contrast to non-classical theories, however, classical theories are not concerned with the irreducibly unknowable or its effects upon the knowable. The irreducibly unknowable, if allowed to be placed strictly outside their limits, rather than is seen, as it would be in non-classical theories, as a constitutive part of knowledge.

Thus, most classical physics, such as classical, Newtonian mechanics, can be – and customarily is seen as – classical theory in this sense, in contrast to quantum mechanics to Bohr's or other non-classical interpretations.
(from Arkady Plotnitsky's book *The Knowable and the Unknowable: Modern Non-Classical Thought and the "Two Cultures"*)

FREE FLOATING ATTENTION

Michael Klien: The word "Choreography" extends the possibility of understanding and posing questions about the nature of the creative act within living systems. These days choreography has become associated with ordering processes, however the philosophical inquiries into order from chaos theory to complexity theory and cybernetics invite us to rethink the very notion of order as something non-linear / unified and far beyond our ability to measure or control. Choreography is not to constrain movement into a set pattern, it is to provide a cradle for movement to find its own patterns... over and over again... to prevent a body... whether bound by skin or habits... from stagnation and enable lightness, primal energy and elemental possibility only to be found once relations start dancing.

Steve Valk: Out of a growing awareness of the ever-widening gap between "the way man thinks and the way nature works," choreography, traditionally understood as "the art of movement in time and space", has found itself being drawn away from "the ideal world" of the stage. At the same time it has been driven to undergo a re-examination of its conceptual language and explanatory systems. Choreography has moved beyond the architecture of its stationary historical universe and has emerged as an embodied act of a human consciousness no longer separate from, but embedded within, the irreducible, unfathomably complex ordering system of the biological world.

SUMMARY

There are several reasons why "Know yourself" has obscured "Take care of yourself". First, there has been a profound transformation in the moral principles of Western society. We find it difficult to base rigorous morality and austere principles on the precept that we should give ourselves more care than anything else in the world. We are more inclined to see taking care of ourselves as an immorality, as a means of escape from all possible rules. We inherit the tradition of Christian morality which makes self-renunciation the condition for salvation. To know oneself was paradoxically the way to self-renunciation. We also inherit a secular tradition which respects external law as the basis for morality. How then can respect for the self be the basis for morality? We are the inheritors of a social morality which seeks the rules for acceptable behavior in relations with others. Since the sixteenth century, criticism of established morality has been undertaken in the name of the importance of recognizing and knowing the self. Therefore, it is difficult to see concern with oneself as compatible with morality. "Know thyself" has obscured "Take care of yourself" because our morality, a morality of asceticism, insists that the self is that which one can reject. The second reason is that, in theoretical philosophy from Descartes to Husserl, knowledge of the self (the thinking subject) takes on an ever-increasing importance as the first step in the theory of knowledge. To summarize: There has been an inversion between the hierarchy of the two principles of antiquity, "Take care of yourself" and "Know thyself". In Greco-Roman culture knowledge of oneself appeared as the consequence of taking care of yourself. In the modern world, knowledge of oneself constitutes the fundamental principle.

To learn the art of listening, we have to read Plutarch's treatise on the art of listening to lectures (*Peri tou akouein*). At the beginning of this treatise, Plutarch says that, following schooling, we have to learn to listen to logos throughout our adult life. The art of listening is crucial so you can tell what is true and what is dissimulation, what is rhetorical truth and what is falsehood in the discourse of the rhetoricians. Listening is linked to the fact that you're not under the control of the masters but you must listen to logos. You keep silent at the lecture. You think about it afterward. This is the art of listening to the voice of the master and the voice of reason in yourself.

INDIGENOUS PSYCHOLOGIES OF THE SELF

Cultures that emphasize firm boundaries and high personal control tend to view the self as exclusionary or "self-contained". Fluid boundary, strong field-control cultures view the self as "enssembled", meaning that the self is inclusive of other individuals.
(reading from E. Martin Walley's essay *Experiences in Social Demeaning*, p.218)

MICHAEL KLIEN: What I would say about the Balinese dance ceremony is that "a psychic structure" would seem to be the prime mover of the piece and that the bodies themselves are not discreet units but they are "caught up in" another kind of structuring process. Of course these bodies correspond or overlap with what we would call "individual selves", but during the course of the ceremony, these "bodies" are drawn into a different organizing pattern or constellation. The unknowing participants become enmeshed in a wider communicational field or "psychic structure".

Dramaturgical process which emanates from this undecided state of consciousness produces a perceptual terrain, an interactive, unfolding field of thought where engagement itself becomes a dance of meaning creation.

STEVE VALK: The notion of the void, of nothing, "of the nakedness of concepts", smacking your body on the floor, etc., this sense of dance has been the underlying and defining current of my work and why I have repeatedly been drawn into the vicinity of this art form.

MICHAEL KLIEN: Maybe it is because dance is always pointing towards the possibility of change... towards the unknown, "silently rewriting your vision", as Badiou says.(1) It never lets you get comfortable.

STEVE VALK: Daghdha Dance Company has tried to cultivate something like a new ecology of the arts: to see a cultural institution, like a dance company, as the locus and initiator of living processes which begin within the company itself, its internal workings, its everyday life etc... and then extend into the relationships with its own immediate and not so immediate surroundings. The "vision of dance" we have been referring to in this discussion and the role that "dancing" and "the dance" play at Daghdha is one of a constituting principle. Dance within the ecology of Daghdha is an active power which generates an undercurrent of corporeal and environmental interconnectivity. It instills a rich and multi-leveled awareness which informs and challenges both the company's everyday affairs and its engagement with its own emerging frame.

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I am terribly sorry for my prolonged e/absence—I have been out of the country and find myself besieged by deadlines and political activities. I hope you are well and deeply apologize for the rude appearance of my silence: I am truly swamped.

Very warm greetings,

Avital Ronell

2. "Duh" is an evocation of the obvious and an instantiation of discourse's pause or failure, but not the pause or failure of thinking. "Duh" demonstrates the interval between the "constative" and "performative" aspects of language. To this extent, "duh" is a critical, performative figure within the space of theoretical inquiry. "Duh" is para/extra-grammatical, yet it provides meaning through a performance of the *not there* or the *not getting it*. More than a simple phenomenon of speech-act theory, "duh" draws language into deconstructive operations; or, as Paul de Man writes in *Allegories of Readings*, "[t]here can be no text without grammar: the logic of grammar generates texts only in the absence of referential meaning, but every text generates a referent that subverts the grammatical principle to which it owed its constitution." [4] He continues that "[w]hat remains hidden in the everyday use of language, the

fundamental incompatibility between grammar and meaning, becomes explicit when the linguistic structures are stated." [5] "Duh" becomes the "subversive duh" as it means *not there* or *not getting it* and performs the possibility of "something" *not there* or "something" *not gotten*. The "subversive duh" enacts and betrays its own stupidity by marking its own allegorical structure and necessary relationship to knowing and not knowing.

To Discuss

DECOHERENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN QUANTUM COMPUTATION

By contrast, classical theories, as understood here, consider their primary object of investigation as, at least in principle (it may not be possible in practice), available to conceptualization and, often, to direct or, at least sufficiently approximate, representation by means of such theories – in short, as knowable.

This is "the knowable" of my title. Classical thinking does not deny that there are things that are, in practice or even in principle, beyond theory or any knowledge. In contrast to non-classical theories, however, classical theories are not concerned with the irreducibly unknowable or its effects upon the knowable. The irreducibly unknowable, if allowed to be placed strictly outside their limits, rather than is seen, as it would be in non-classical theories, as a constitutive part of knowledge.

Thus, most classical physics, such as classical, Newtonian mechanics, can be and customarily is seen as classical theory in this sense, in contrast to quantum mechanics to Bohr's or other non-classical interpretations.
(from Arkady Plotnitsky's book *The Knowable and the Unknowable: Modern Non-Classical Thought and the "Two Cultures"*)

INDIGENOUS PSYCHOLOGIES OF THE SELF

Cultures that emphasize firm boundaries and high personal control tend to view the self as exclusionary or "self-contained". Fluid boundary, strong fluid-control cultures view the self as "ensemble", meaning that the self is inclusive of other individuals
(reading from E. Martin Walker's essay *Experiences in Social Disruption*, para 8)

MICHAEL KLIEB: What I would say about the Balinese dance ceremony is that "a psychic structure" would seem to be the prime mover of the piece and that the bodies themselves are not discreet units but they are "caught up in" another kind of structuring process. Of course these bodies correspond or overlap with what we would call "individual selves", but during the course of the ceremony, these "bodies" are drawn into a different organizing pattern or constellation. The unknowing participants become enmeshed in a wider communicational field or "psychic structure".

Dramaturgical process which emanates from this undecided state of consciousness produces a perceptual terrain, an interactive, unfolding field of thought where engagement itself becomes a dance of meaning creation.

STEVE VALK: The notion of the void, of nothing, "of the nakedness of concepts", smacking your body on the floor, etc., this sense of dance has been the underlying and defining current of my work and why I have repeatedly been drawn into the vicinity of this art form.

MICHAEL KLIEB: Maybe it is because dance is always pointing towards the possibility of change... towards the unknown, "silently rewriting your vision", as Badiou says (11) It never lets you get comfortable.

STEVE VALK: Daghdha Dance Company has tried to cultivate something like a new ecology of the arts: to see a cultural institution, like a dance company, as the locus and initiator of living processes which begin within the company itself, its internal workings, its everyday life etc., and then extend into the relationships with its own immediate and not so immediate surroundings. The "vision of dance" we have been referring to in this discussion and the role that "dancing" and "the dance" play at Daghdha is one of a constituting principle. Dance within the ecology of Daghdha is an active power which generates an undercurrent of corporeal and environmental interconnectivity. It instills a rich and multi-leveled awareness which informs and challenges both the company's everyday affairs and its engagement with its own emerging future.

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I am terribly sorry for my prolonged e/absence—I have been out of the country and find myself besieged by deadlines and political activities. I hope you are well and deeply apologize for the rude appearance of my silence: I am truly swamped.

Very warm greetings,

Avital Ronell

FREE FLOATING ATTENTION

Michael Klieb: The word "Choreography" extends the possibility of understanding and posing questions about the nature of the creative act within living systems. These days choreography has become associated with ordering processes, however the philosophical inquiries into order from chaos theory to complexity theory and cybernetics invite us to rethink the very notion of order as something non-linear / unfixed and far beyond our ability to measure or control. Choreography is not to constrain movement into a set pattern, it is to provide a cradle for movement to find its own patterns... over and over again... to prevent a body... whether bound by skin or habits... from stagnation and enable lightness, primal energy and elemental possibility only to be found once relations start dancing.

Steve Valk: Out of a growing awareness of the ever-widening gap between "the way man thinks and the way nature works," choreography, traditionally understood as "the art of movement in time and space", has found itself being drawn away from "the ideal world" of the stage. At the same time it has been driven to undergo a re-examination of its conceptual language and explanatory systems. Choreography has moved beyond the architecture of its stationary historical universe and has emerged as an embodied act of a human consciousness no longer separate from, but embedded within, the irreducible, unfathomably complex ordering system of the biological world.

SUMMARY

There are several reasons why "Know yourself" has obscured "Take care of yourself". First, there has been a profound transformation in the moral principles of Western society. We find it difficult to base rigorous morality and austere principles on the precept that we should give ourselves more care than anything else in the world. We are more inclined to see taking care of ourselves as an immorality, as a means of escape from all possible rules. We inherit the tradition of Christian morality which makes self-renunciation the condition for salvation. To know oneself was paradoxically the way to self-renunciation. We also inherit a secular tradition which respects external law as the basis for morality. How then can respect for the self be the basis for morality? We are the inheritors of a social morality which seeks the rules for acceptable behavior in relations with others. Since the sixteenth century, criticism of established morality has been undertaken in the name of the importance of recognizing and knowing the self. Therefore, it is difficult to see concern with oneself as compatible with morality. "Know thyself" has obscured "Take care of yourself" because our morality, a morality of asceticism, insists that the self is that which one can reject. The second reason is that, in theoretical philosophy from Descartes to Husserl, knowledge of the self (the thinking subject) takes on an ever-increasing importance as the first step in the theory of knowledge. To summarize: There has been an inversion between the hierarchy of the two principles of antiquity, "Take care of yourself" and "Know thyself". In Greco-Roman culture knowledge of oneself appeared as the consequence of taking care of yourself. In the modern world, knowledge of oneself constitutes the fundamental principle.

To learn the art of listening, we have to read Plutarch's treatise on the art of listening to lectures (*Peri tou akouein*). At the beginning of this treatise, Plutarch says that, following schooling, we have to learn to listen to logos throughout our adult life. The art of listening is crucial so you can tell what is true and what is dissimulation, what is rhetorical truth and what is falsehood in the discourse of the rhetoricians. Listening is linked to the fact that you're not under the control of the masters but you must listen to logos. You keep silent at the lecture. You think about it afterward. This is the art of listening to the voice of the master and the voice of reason in yourself.

2. "Duh" is an evocation of the obvious and an instantiation of discourse's pause or failure, but not the pause or failure of thinking. "Duh" demonstrates the interval between the "constative" and "performative" aspects of language. To this extent, "duh" is a critical, performative figure within the space of theoretical inquiry. "Duh" is para/extra-grammatical, yet it provides meaning through a performance of the *not there* or the *not getting it*. More than a simple phenomenon of speech-act theory, "duh" draws language into deconstructive operations; or, as Paul de Man writes in *Allegories of Readings*, "[t]here can be no text without grammar: the logic of grammar generates texts only in the absence of referential meaning, but every text generates a referent that subverts the grammatical principle to which it owed its constitution." [4] He continues that "[w]hat remains hidden in the everyday use of language, the

fundamental incompatibility between grammar and meaning, becomes explicit when the linguistic structures are stated." [5] "Duh" becomes the "subversive duh" as it means *not there* or *not getting it* and performs the possibility of "something" *not there* or "something" *not gotten*. The "subversive duh" enacts and betrays its own stupidity by marking its own allegorical structure and necessary relationship to knowing and not knowing.

and spatial form of thought, a perceptual framing device, a self-actuating template for an ecologically configured experiment in contemporary subjectivity. The cognitive scientist Francisco Varela has said, "The blind spot of contemporary science is experience." (1) Social Choreography has opened an arena of cultural interplay between artists and audience, a lived and interconnected world of relationships, patterns and dynamics, a region of new and subtle observational capacities in which a deeper level of interdependence, an imprecise order of mind and nature, has emerged as a model for a new and regenerative social reality.

Michael Klein: Is Social Choreography, "playing for real" with the social structures, applying aesthetic sensibilities and creating a space for subjective awareness in the shaping and organization of society (i.e., coupled to a sense of "utopian impulse"), or might it simply be aimed at deconstructing existing boundaries and existing ways of doing things?

THE TIME TO HOUSE OURSELVES... IS NOW!!

□□□ An infrastructure must be created which would provide opportunities and incentives for city dwellers and local institutions to suspend their habitual ways of seeing, to talk openly about complex problems, to take stock of their situations, to exchange ideas and find common ground. An interactive field in which to cultivate a new sense of civic consciousness, one that is more fluid and in dialogue with itself, where citizens can detach from their everyday functions and roles and cultivate a wider, panoramic, sense of knowing.

What is missing is a place and an infrastructure for motivated citizens and institutions to engage with each other, to immerse themselves collectively in the realities of the contemporary situation.

Yet the environment of trust needed to think about these problems is fragile. Only when people begin to see from within the forces that shape their reality and to see their part in how those forces might evolve, can a vision, a way out of the crisis, become manifest.

Steve Vail: One can go back to the Situationists... who wanted to abolish the notion of art as a separate, specialized activity. They saw the social realm as a realm of creativity, a utopian topography which harboured vital and socially transformative possibilities. Joseph Beuys is another figure of historical importance, although I don't feel I know enough about his work. It is interesting.

□□□ Conditions for large-scale transformative innovation in the arts, culture and society are desperate, bordering on hopeless. This is not due to lack of potential funding, talented individuals, institutional resources, project ideas, or of a genuinely concerned and engaged citizenry. What is lacking is an awareness, an expanded sensibility, which could inform, coordinate and bring about the conditions necessary to draw together and actualize capacities for profound, transformative innovation. This sensibility would need a locus, a point of orientation, a place where new domains of meaning can be cultivated.

A NEW SOURCE OF INTENTION

□□□ People are searching for ways to develop a new source of action, one that lies beyond preconceived plans or narrow self interest, beyond past experiences. For this to be possible it is necessary to provide opportunities to experience acting in the world, not on the world, to explore places and possibilities, strategies and prototypes for shifting from the past, to opening up to what might be emerging from the future. A place to do what needs to be done, for action as a spontaneous product of the whole.

CONCLUSION: On "Stuckness"

The old idea of a cell being like a sack full of proteins and all sorts of other good things has been supplanted by the contemporary view of the cell as having a complex inner structure that bears more resemblance to the structure of a city than to the structure of a sack of flour. But the point at which the true focus of this account starts to become clear is when we discover that it is precisely this freezing of the cell's chemical make-up which institutes a totally new kind of freedom, one which I call...semiotic freedom. Because even the single-celled organism knew a little trick which proved most effective in tempering the growth of predictability. It was able to describe itself - or at least key aspects of itself - in an abstract code embedded in the string DNA molecule bases. Fragments of this coded self-description could then be copied, sometimes wrongly, and traded with other members of the same species - or even on occasion, with members of another species. The never-ending sequence of "mistakes" and "misunderstandings" that put life-forms on earth into a constant state of flux, the sequence which we call... organic evolution, was set in motion, (reading from Jesper Hoffmeyer's book Signs of Meaning in the Universe, p. 29)

Choreography as an Aesthetics of Change. Who "choreographs" what in society? Who, if anyone, is constructing these perceptual frames and who is living by them. What unfolding rule-based choreography is at work in the DNA of emerging lifeforms? What composes or choreographs the symphonic complexity of human lovmaking?

Michael Klein: STATEMENT

Choreography has become a metaphor for dynamic constellations of any kind, consciously choreographed or not, self-organizing or artificially constructed. It has become a metaphor for order, intrinsically embodied by self-organizing systems as observed in the biological world or superimposed by a human creator. If the world is approached as a reality constructed of interrelations, relationships, constellations and proportionalities then choreography is seen as the aesthetic practice of setting those relations or setting the conditions for those relations to emerge. Choreographic knowledge gained in the field of dance or harvested from perceived patterns in nature should be transferable to other realms of life. The choreographer, at the center of his art, deals with patterns and structures within the context of an existing, larger, ongoing choreography of physical, mental and social structures, whereby he/she acts as a strategist negotiating intended change within his/her environment.

Michael Klein: When Derrida speaks about the political act being "the settings of artificial relations between people", how can the choreographer, who does exactly that for a living, retreat into a studio and practice his or her "politics" in front of a mirror. It doesn't make sense. I feel that there is a real lack of critical, and by that I mean "transformative" evaluation of the role of art outside its own historical context. This then leads to a closing of the information loop and the propagation of status quos, of conceptual "safety zones": theaters, orchestras, dance companies, galleries, festivals, exhibitions etc...

perhaps more rhetorically effective and obvious way. The degrees of stupidity are endless, since no one can ever completely miss something or completely get something. It is Flaubert, for Ronell, who sees not the essence of stupidity, but the force of stupidity - its trace: "Stupidity is something unshakeable. Nothing attacks it without breaking itself against it. It is of the nature of granite, hard and resistant."

Nowadays this

63. commitment in itself requires some separation from value-positing positions

To Discuss

46. unlike some other theory-heads, I am irrevocably trained on and by literature,
47. instructed by the poetic word, baffled by its audacities
- 48.
49. As for why I am relentless about pursuing difficult and dense locutions, texts,
50. descriptions, etc.: Believe it or not, I consider this relation to language to
51. be my political and ethical responsibility. Anything else would be, to my way
52. of thinking, slacking or dozing off, giving up and extinguishing the light. As
53. scholars and activists I feel we need to avert the tendency, very American,
54. to accommodate any version of thinking lite. My adherence to so-called
55. difficult works may be a way of resisting American simplicities which, as we
56. now see and know, have murderous consequences and are world-destructive.
57. Totalizing narratives are firing up war engines; simplistic pre-Nietzschean
58. notions of evil are spiking the death toll, the refusal to grapple with
59. Levinasian passivity beyond passivity or Derridian clashes with the
60. unforgivable or Judith Butler's gender mutations result, in my view, in
61. referential chaos, lazy losses, true aberrations and regressions. I am not
62. trying (anymore) to change the world; just to read it.

64. that have backed off the hard stuff. I am sure that everyone is doing her
65. best. So I do not grade or degrade the efforts of others. For all of us, the
66. work that we do involves renunciation, crashes, doubts, wall to wall rewrites.
67. Not to mention in my case thankless days of solitude, listening to texts that
68. are barely approachable or have been marked down as unfashionable, off base. I
69. feel responsible to these works; I have a sense of their fragility and
70. finitude. They need me to be there. The others have advocates and cheerleaders
71. and shelters. Or that's what I tell myself.

Thompson is Freud's "Rat Man" to eternity and this association with the scatological is not accidental, especially considering the range of constructions linking stupidity with "shit" or excess: *shit-for-brains, stupid shit*. The point, however, is that this contaminating act is an uncalled for response, an excess to what is expected or, perhaps, not expected. Stupidity

To Discuss

been its attribute: Thompson has effected a substantiation of the attribute, for there is no stupidity without monument. Flagg the ancient, he answered a call that was no put out. The naïve and insolent arrogance that consists in responding where no response is invited is an effect of monumental arrogance.[12]

stupidity as an anti-method of research. The point to be made here is that throughout *Stupidity* Ronell rewrites "stupidity" as a confrontation with a theory of "refusal"[27] either as a refusal of the "commanding neurosis" to see itself or the refusal to accept that which Franz Kafka describes in "The Refusal" as a *status quo* in which "[o]ur officials have always remained at their posts." [28] The desire for or displacement or refusal of the "right referent" is the space joining stupidity and theory. Stupidity seeks and finds a "right referent" and theory refuses it. Theory seeks the hiatus and stupidity refuses that with even greater force. Ronell's *Stupidity* gives us Kant's, Nietzsche's, Wordsworth's, Heine's, Kafka's, de Man's, Derrida's, Deleuze's, Musil's, Heidegger's, Paul's, Lacan's, Freud's . . . refusal and acquiescence of and to stupidity.

more and more sporadic and difficult to observe: "Acts of stupidity where no response is called for, whether by carving huge childlike letters into an Alexandrian column or, in the same neighborhood, answering the call of God as if you were the one being summoned (Kafka's Abraham)—these are reflexes of stupidity." [13] "Reflexes of stupidity," to continue the "bodily" discourse surrounding stupidity, respond "to a call that was not made." [14] Ronell asks, "but how, precisely, can we *know*?" This "knowing" is posed in the negative, in the study of the predicament one who responds as if the call were "meant for him." For Ronell, the perverse tourist Thompson finds some resonance with the "primal father," Abraham. The stupidity of Abraham, just as the stupidity of Thompson, appears as a call to be answered or a "cut." Thompson cuts his response to the call of eternity into the Pompey column as Abraham, first, cuts his response to God in himself (circumcision) and, secondly, into Isaac (uncut cut): "Abraham, primal father, turns into a kind of Thompson who has imposed his name in an act of monumental error." [15]

22. Now, therefore, I am known to ye by my name Nuit, and to him by a secret name which I will give him when at last he knoweth me. Since I am Infinite Space, and the Infinite Stars thereof, do ye also thus. Bind nothing! Let there be no difference made among you between any one thing & any other thing; for thereby there cometh hurt.

7. The difficulty with "stupidity" and *Stupidity* is that the subject of inquiry escapes explanation. Stupidity, inherently, occupies a non or pre-discursive space—a space not under the dictates of cognition. "That's just stupid" points beyond discourse to the nonsensical. In other instances, "that's just stupid" underscores the complete transparency of something. The two nodal points of "stupidity" create a vacuum in the center, an ongoing tension in which stupidity, more than knowing, determines the logic of a series of events or ideas. Stupidity has a brute force AND a philosophical trace that can be associated with the Oedipal Father and the law of mimesis: "Incapable of renewal or overcoming, the stupid subject has low Oedipal energy; he has held onto ideas, the relics and dogmas transmitted in his youth by his father." [16] Ronell, referring to the work of Jean Paul, examines the role of the "*dummkopf* reader," a mimetic reader, one "remain[ing] loyal to the text." [17] More troubling than "loyalty" is the "*dummkopf* reader's" "deadly repetition," a repetition leading to a mechanical reprocessing of the text within rigid cognitive boundaries: "The stupid are unable to make breaks or breakaways; they are hampered even on the rhetorical level, for they cannot run with grammatical leaps or metonymical discontinuities. They are incapable of referring allegorically or embracing deferral." [18] This blindness to texts is also a blindness to others and oneself. "The stupid cannot see themselves." [19] and this invisibility allows stupidity to pass imperceptibly across the world, "avoiding the screening systems of philosophy." [20] If stupidity travels unnoticed, then what can be done about it? Capitulating to stupidity betrays our Enlightenment impulse to "wage war" on error and superstition. Are we not historically obligated to fight stupidity, especially the gross stupidity that accompanies the petty dictates of everyday life?

answer." Deleuze's call is false, already unanswerable; it requests that which is impossible, making visible that which is invisible. However, in accepting the impossibility of the task Ronell resets the parameters, making the (im)possibility and inevitability of stupidity the hiatus to be confronted: "Never hitting home, unable to score, language is engaged in a permanent contest; it tests itself continually in a match that cannot even be said to be even or altogether futile because the fact remains that this match is ongoing, pausing occasionally only to count its losses." [24] This seems to

To Discuss

some should not exit. Rather than risk exposing the "structure" of stupidity, "disciplinary neurosis" rushes in at this precise moment to blind the reader to the dubious nature of the isomorphic relationship between language and world. This methodology, absent any specific data, is consistent with a widely available "mode" of literary and philosophical analysis that "cheats" the inquirer into thinking that no other possibilities exist. To a larger extent, this "mode" is the dogma of the humanities and the obstacle to theory in the past, present, and future. Stupidity obstructs theory with information; and, this gathering of information becomes research, an anti-theoretical endeavor to make the world clear and simple.[30]

notice tacked to her door. The lesson from these "ordeals" and others is that when stupidity refuses theory something complex occurs—stupidity acts contrary to its own stupid impulse. Theory forces stupidity to become "theoretical," to, contrary to what Ronell argues, see itself or part of itself. In other words, stupidity reveals its own stupidity by drawing a contiguous line of thought from rhetoric to world, either in an "eviction" notice, rejection of a theory manuscript ("the fad of theory is over"), or in a negative tenure ballot ("His/her courses are too theoretical for our students"). In these instances, stupidity seeks refuge in "simplicity," a simplicity that it unavoidably complicates by its own act of referral to a homogeneous reality that does not exist.

I have spoken of three Stoic techniques of the self: letters to friends and disclosure of self; examination of self and conscience, including a review of what was done, of what should have been done, and comparison of the two. Now I want to consider the third Stoic technique, askesis, not a disclosure of the secret self but a remembering.

The Greeks characterized the two poles of those exercises by the terms *melete* and *gymnasia*. *Melete* means "meditation", according to the Latin translation, *meditatio*. It has the same root as *epimelesthai*. It is a rather vague term, a technical term borrowed from rhetoric. *Melete* is the work one undertook in order to prepare a discourse or an improvisation by thinking over useful terms and arguments. You had to anticipate the real situation through dialogue in your thoughts. The philosophical meditation is this kind of meditation: It is composed of memorizing responses and reactivating those memories by placing oneself in a situation where one can imagine how one would react. One judges the reasoning one should use in an imaginary exercise ("Let us suppose...") in order to test an action or event (for example, "How would I react?"). Imagining the articulation of possible events to test how you would react - that's meditation.

At the opposite pole is *gymnasia* ("to train oneself"). While *meditatio* is an imaginary experience that trains thought, *gymnasia* is training in a real situation, even if it's been artificially induced. There is a long tradition behind this: sexual abstinence, physical privation, and other rituals of purification.

In addition to letters, examination, and askesis, we must now evoke a fourth technique in the examination of the self, the interpretation of dreams.

To prove suffering, to show shame, to make visible humility and exhibit modesty - these are the main features of punishment.

failure into the ongoing process of a dialectic. But a dialectic, segmented by repeated negations, can never dance'. We might say, reinvoking the improbable *pas de deux* of Nietzsche and Hegel, that a dance, as contestatory match, can never be a dialectic but, being engaged in a fundamental (mis)match, must, in a more Beckettian sense, go on and on, seeking referent and refuge. It is not so much that it casts about for the "right referent," as Paul de Man puts it, but that language as contest posits such a thing in order to fall short of it, to keep itself going.[25]

the dominant logic of the text-world. Why can't the stupid see themselves? Why does Deleuze "call" for making stupidity a transcendental problem? Why does Ronell answer the call? The answer: theory. The "stupid reader" is a reader without a sense of difference, a sense that the world and text open onto multiplicities, not just "interpretations" of historical, sociological, and biographical data, which are extensions of a primary "*Cogitatio*." To see oneself entails an awareness of espacement—an interval between sensation and cognition as the early phenomenologists through Merleau-Ponty have contended. More to the point, "theory" resists the neurotic, often times mindless, reproduction of the same as something different. This resistance, as Paul de Man has written, places reading against itself as both a resistance "to" a form of unity and a resistance "from" a form of unity: "There can be no text without grammar." There can be no stupidity without meaning, since meaning is grammar of stupidity.

this sense, it is Isaac who answers the call of theory, a call to refusal, but not a refusal of one's own. The refusal, the displacement was forced on him, leaving him with both the awareness and unawareness of stupidity. Isaac, at the end of Ronell's study, seems to be the future of theory as he stands in the middle of something in excess of his own place in God's universe. Is it a blessing or a curse? Are we to live by another law, a law of refusal, or a law of the ridiculous? How would we phrase it without sounding . . . stupid?

the 1978 World Series?" Information, retrieval, information, retrieval. The same instrumentalist or mechanical cognitive exercises appear across cognate fields in the humanities with a more direct antagonism to theory manifesting itself as a necessary "instrumentalism." In the service of institutional monotony and mediocrity instrumentalism rises on stupidity's tide, leaving theory on the shores of ruin. What would it mean to refuse this? To refuse not only the "facts" of stupidity but also its structure? A refusal would demand the creation of discourses needed to force stupidity to betray its own simplicity, its own place of refuge in thinking. Here one can just as easily refer to Deleuze as Ronell (to be a disloyal reader) for a first discourse that refuses stupidity:

The philosopher, the scientist, and the artist seem to return from the land of the dead. What the philosopher brings back from the chaos are *variations* that are still infinite but that have become inseparable on the absolute surfaces or in the absolute volumes that lay out a secant [*sécant*] plane of immanence: these are not associations of distinct ideas, but reconnections through a zone of indistinction in a concept. The scientist brings back from the chaos *variables* that have become independent by slowing down, that is to say, by the elimination of whatever other variabilities are liable to interfere, so that the variables that are retained enter into determinable relations in a function: they are no longer links of properties in things, but finite coordinates on a secant plane of reference that go from local probabilities to a global cosmology. The artist brings back from the chaos *varieties* that no longer constitute a reproduction of the sensory in the organ but set up a being of the sensory, a being of sensation, on an anorganic plane of composition that is able to restore the infinite.[31]

To Discuss

A. I don't feel that it is necessary to know exactly what I am. The main interest in life and work is to become someone else that you were not in the beginning. If you knew when you began a book what you would say at the end, do you think that you would have the courage to write it? What is true for writing and for a love relationship is true also for life. The game is worthwhile insofar as we don't know what will be the end. My field is the history of thought. Man is a thinking being. The way he thinks is related to society, politics, economics, and history and is also related to very general and universal categories and formal structures. But thought is something other than societal relations. The way people really think is not adequately analyzed by the universal categories of logic. Between social history and formal analyses of thought there is a path, a lane — maybe very narrow — which is the path of the historian of thought.

Q. In *The History of Sexuality*, you refer to the person who "upsets established laws and somehow anticipates the coming freedom." Do you see your own work in this light?

A. No. For rather a long period, people have asked me to tell them what will happen and to give them a program for the future. We know very well that, even with the best intentions, those programs become a tool, an instrument of oppression. Rousseau, a lover of freedom, was used in the French Revolution to build up a model of social oppression. Marx would be horrified by Stalinism and Leninism. My role — and that is too emphatic a word — is to show people that they are much freer than they feel, that people accept as truth, as evidence, some themes which have been built up at a certain moment during history, and that this so-called evidence can be criticized and destroyed. To change something in the minds of people — that's the role of an intellectual.

everyone would have answered yes. What I am afraid of about humanism is that it presents a certain form of our ethics as a universal model for any kind of freedom. I think that there are more secrets, more possible freedoms, and more inventions in our future than we can imagine in humanism as it is dogmatically represented on every side of the political rainbow: the Left, the Center, the Right.

To place openly 'Love sets Free' as the premisses for any order in society, means a shift from transforming the marginal and decadent (fluctuating, subject, instant) into the arena of what is considered the traditional values of pure love (consistent, object, static).

How to produce unsolvable subjectivities within an empirical framework?
Can empirical frameworks function when assimilating the production of unsolvable subjectivities?

Unsolvable subjectivity can here be described as an exigent practice of all the various complexities encountered in artistic processes, personal inspirations, random insights, unconscious drives, etc. The unsolvable within the production of subjectivity needs to be treated with the scientific method, to allow it to become problematic to any empirical discourse. The subjectivity needs also to be fully transparent in order to allow each of its qualities, all of its details, each of its possible interpretations, etc. to become relevant for scientific investigation.

The funny thing about refusing to do what I think I need to do is that: whenever not doing what planned results in other possibilities opening up, while a given possibility is still in a process of becoming identifiable in its immediate interpretation. This causes things to slow down and allows an experience of perceptions to navigate and entertain the mind with subjective interpretations. The process of identification easily mimics the immediate form through a representation of imitation. The practice of an experience of perceptions in its immediate interpretation relies on an affirmative and contradicted mentality in order to allow it to refrain itself beyond itself.

The trap in writing is that predefining and describing often leads to a closure of any potential action envisaged by it. The joy in writing is that it doesn't require more than a few words to describe any potential action happening in spite of it.

My challenge is not in having new ideas or formulating more possibilities. Instead...

The practice is to develop a performative work from what has been written during these last three months, while continuing to write whenever I feel like.

C U tomorrow
or Sunday
then! → 2/1