

Transcript

Great so welcome everybody to the third session to third meeting of this year's Post Kantian European Philosophy Seminar and we are delighted to welcome to the Naomi Waltham-Smith who is associate professor at the Center for Interdisciplinary Methodologies at Warwick. She works at the intersection of Sound Studies, a modern European philosophy and literary theory, especially deconstruction and more specifically, she's interested. In our orality is implicated in some of the most significant political issues in contemporary neoliberalism, including the impact of digital political economies on listening practices and the transforming conditions of vocality. Amid the current crisis of political representation, she's the author of *Music and Belonging: Between Revolution and Restoration* for Oxford in 2017. And also of *Shattering Bio Politics, Militant Listening and the Sound of Life*, which is forthcoming. I think next year right in 2021 with Fordham University Press, a book in which now she develops or interest in the role of sound and listening in the philosophical tradition from Plato to contemporary French thoughts and also in addition to all of these theoretical perspectives, she also works. Her work also involves field recording and creative practices, so we are really happy to have you here today just to remind everybody that there's a handout with some quotations that you can download from the section files of this team. Naomi, this virtual floor is yours.

Thanks so much. You so much January for such a generous and warm welcome. And thank you for the very kind invitation to speak your Department in the real world is of course right next door to mine, but right now we all feel so far apart. But it's a real pleasure to see, knew and familiar faces. So thank you everyone. So I've gotta talk. It's about 45 minutes. I won't read all of the lengthier quotations in full, so you will find it useful to have that handout to hand. But I will get started. It was supposed to put an end to the crisis by asserting the triumph of democracy over its enemies. It was meant in one resounding strike to be a decisive repudiation of Trumpism and a return to moderation. The result of the 2020 US presidential election, however much it came as a relief, shows on the country that the resurgence of the far right is no historical aberration. No accident even, and that the crisis of representative democracy arising amidst a neoliberalism obstinate in the face of its terminal condition is far from over. The undue optimism, no doubt in part. The flipside of despair, as left populist projects one after the other. Burnout or a doomed from the start. It also is also a refusal to recognize with the rhythm of Democratic politics. If, as Michelle Fuko argues in *lapu for psychiatric* quote crisis is the moment at which the evolution of the disease risks being resolved, even the point at which the battle is decided. Unquote, he argues, continuing that medical analogy, that quote every disease has its own rhythms on populism or possible crises days when the crisis may be

triggered and quote and he further notes how. For Hippocrates, there's a certain necessity to the ritual rhythm of disease, such that when crises are produced at a propitious moment, they present an obligatory opportunity. And it is the doctors task to judge the rhythm of the crisis to foresee it and to manage circumstances. Such that it takes place at the right time. Perhaps then it's simply too soon, too premature to proclaim any return to normality as if it were possible to outspeed the rhythm of democracies crisis it would fly in the face of temporalities of political history, and of every cogent analysis of this historical juncture. To imagine that we might extricate ourselves from the current crisis by a return to the kind of politics that provoked the very anger that proved to be the fertile ground for the far right. But left populist projects have also faltered. And not only because of relentless attacks from the centrist establishment, but also because the capture or prospective capture of party leadership outpaced the building of power at the base or grassroots. Even so, why am I so determined to rain on the Liberals parade so insistent that this was not a propitious moment? That the timing was not right or not rightly judged, and that the disease must run its course a little longer? When what one might justifiably retort when would be the right time to save democracy. And to address this question, I want today to not speak anymore about US politics, of which we've had far too much in recent weeks. But instead to look at the rhythm of democracy itself, and not simply that of its crises. Or rather more precisely, the rhythm of democracy, insofar as it is always already in crisis, and so far as it is irreducibly and from the outset. Rhythmed, as Derrida suggests, in politic calamity. This would mean to anticipate my conclusion that there would be no propitious moment of crisis. Until and unless democracies inherent tendency to undermine itself, its irreducible risk of oligarchy, zation and liberal racism were. InFocus words to break out in its truth a classical severity. And I want to make 1 final provisional remark more methodological that has to do with this eclipse of truth, which in the book from Fordham and Danielle I mentioned, I've translated as Shatter to capture its owner's quality in the word features prominently in the discourse of deconstruction in the title logik. Nancy l'amour. Nicola for example, but also throughout the resonant clamor that is derrotas most experimental text, namely blah. Which is coming out in the new translation conveniently now entitled Clan and Fuco likewise avails himself of an oral metaphoric's, specifically borrowing the lexecon of Midyett. Auscultation adopted from Rene Linac, such that, and he says, one taps one listens on flap on time. Sorry, that's also from the same text, Localitys psychotic. And that is in the Nietzschean terms Derrida, in political amitie repeats and displaces in on sex. And also in Tampa the one sympathizes listens with a hammer, and this one does not simply listen for a bodily rhythm or heartbeat, but Moreover listens rhythmically with the beads, or whether heartbeats, and thus it seems with the pulsation of blood. Blood then also has resonances of nationhood, and I'm interested in rhythm, because in Derrida's

thought it provides a prism through which to analyze the ways in which listening is implicated in the entanglement of democracy and nationalism. By closely tracking a series of passages in which Derrida deploys the figure of the heartbeat and of the pulsation of blood, I'm going to try to approach the question of democracy and its crises, in which the specter of the nation looms large. So the concept of democracy rarely announces itself. Derrida declares in the preface to *Political Amity* without the possibility of fraternization. That is to say, democracy does not present itself without reference to nation birth species gosh lished without reference. In short to blood. And later, in the epigraph to Chapter 6, taken from call Schmitz debacle. If does politician reads and I quote following its meaning in German, as in so many other languages, friend is originally only the person to whom a genealogical bond unites originally. The friend is, but the friend of blood, the Consanguine parent or again the parent by Alliance through Marriage, oath of fraternity, adoption or other corresponding institutions. And quote. In the epilogue to the chapter, Derrida sets his sights on what he sets his sights, rather on what he calls the fraternal residents that Schmitz term. Gosh, weekly hair clung and of the obscure friendship of rhyme and steroid are whose kinship forges an alliance between speech and the place of the motherland. Between the poem and belonging. Echo with her auto affection means that, right? I'm always risk serving the law of the worst, that is of nationalism or racism, and yet glossing Schmitz reading of Conrad vices Purim. The stamp of the rhyme, like the hammer of a storm, also syncopate's what Derrida refers to as a sibling sonority deconstructing the unifying tone of the schlechte, or species or nation or race. Echo this becomes a name for the testamentary structure of Survivor or living on, the Derrida discerns in friendship, and the prize his notion of La Democratie Avenir the Democracy to come away from democracies. Attachments affiliation an fraternity. Not an ideal double, but a friend of oneself, echo takes the words of the other and carries them away after their death. Exposing democracies irreducible temporal dislocation. As Derrida argues in cash like 3, the type as the strike or hammerblow of inscription produces quote the generality of the genus and quote gathering together a series of singularity's that he says fall under the same type. In the unifying blow or slog of Heidegger's fundamental tone, however, there is also a fresh Logn. A shattering breaking into multiple shards. It's your ability prosthetics city and with it the rupture of the fraternal Homeland. Instead of rhymes ipseity there is rhythm to punctuating rhythm of dissemination. But Derrida characterizes in the earlier Ledoux blue sales as working towards a textual decapitation. The bloodiness coming in there already. It is this not between rhythm, democracy, and blood that interests me blood as the basis for the nation and as the incision of the death sentence or decapitation. The entanglement of rhythm and fraternity plays an important role. English like 3A, recently published text extracted from the end of the 7th lab to the 13th and final session of the first year. That is in 1984 to 85 of a four year seminar Derrida

gave on the theme of philosophical nationality and nationalism. While the concept of connect would appear to be the prevailing preoccupation of this period, geschlecht two stems from the 6th and remaining remainder of the 7th session and Cache left for is printed as an epilogue in the French edition of political limits here. So while Geschlecht is important at this time, I'd argue that rhythm can also be seen to operate as a clandestine governing concept across these texts, in as much as any concept can government deconstruction that links the issues of nationalism to that of democracy English, like 3 it is an irregular rhythm of reading that disrupts the strike. The Heideggerian strike that gathers difference under a single type or family. Unlike the rhythm that flows from the unicity of this unique grunt tone, or fundamental or tonic that Heidegger finds in Trackle, dardas dissemination breaks with Heidegger's rhythm. Precisely, he says, in keeping step with it, which is to say we doubling it, re marking it, re typing, typing over or over, printing it, and thus double striking it in the syncopation of its beat. Is Geoffrey Bennington elucidates dissemination is not a proliferation of meaning such as the manifold meaning that is held together by the term is select which can mean sex, race nation species family and so on. But it takes place is an altogether incommensurable level as a differential spacing or articulation of textuality that makes any semantics possible. In the 1st place, that would be Geschlecht understood, not as a signifier, but as a slagga schlagen from the same root in German that strikes or remarks, or a type that is an example of what it names. In short, was it what is its stake in deconstruction? Art Wager is a rhythmic punctuation. This rhythm, though, might more accurately be described following Derrida's preface to lekula bots typography. As an arrhythmic rhythm that interrupts the alternation between the two and oppositionality. In general, the Transcendental, in other words, is rhythmmed syncopated, dislocated, and thus ruined from the outset price cisely because it beats or strikes against itself. Elsewhere, Bennington suggests that a differential rhythm would be a way to think about Derridis democratia veneer and might just present an answer of sorts to what Derrotar describes as democracies, tragically, irreconcilable laws of equality of all and singularity of each and Erin's own analysis in the seminars from the 80s of cosmopolitanism reveals a similar difficulty with the lure of a good nationalism that draws universality into the closure. A fraternity. Rhythm poses itself as a way to think through these questions. Democracy's inherent crisis might be described by the relative gathering of a scatter to borrow Bennington's phrase. In other words, in my more musical metaphors of dispersed beats without collapsing them under the single stroke of a conductor's baton. The idea of loosely but not tightly raining in democracies, tendency to diversification and differentiation via some kind of rhythmic punctuation, doesn't actually originate with territory by any means. We read. For example, in Aristotle's politics. This critique of Plato's characterization of democracy as multifarious, or Whatley Boy, call on that already announces the themes that we find in data of family,

harmonic, Unison, and rhythm, and now from. Council I quote the error of Socrates must be attributed to the false notion of unity from which he starts unity. There should be both of the family and of the state, but in some respects only for there is a point at which a state may attain such a degree of unity as to be no longer a state, or at which, without ceasing to exist, it will become an inferior state, like harmony passing into Unison or rhythm, which has been reduced to a single foot in quote. But what is novel in Dar? Das thinking is a constellation of these elements that passes by way of blood, interrupting the blood relation of family with the rhythmic punctuation of bloodletting as a strike or incision, and then, as we shall see, linking this blood of cruelty accrued overly reductive cruelty to questions of belief, credibility, credit and capitalization. The two disjunct laws of democracy are not, simply tragically, are considerable data suggests. But I quote forever wounding this wound opens with the necessity of having to count once friends to count the others in the economy of 1's own, there where every other is altogether other, to outweigh total, but where every other is equally altogether other. Encourage the challenge of democracy. As Derrida later elaborates in a discussion of Nietzsche's views on friendship is therefore to think inequality beyond this economy of calculation of counting, and of appropriation thereby exceeding all reappropriation of the proper. Unlike the desire for possession that characterizes love in niches estimation, democracy demands a certain disproportionality or asymmetry that breaks with reciprocity for which friendship during this suggests might be the just name. Specifically, it entails and experience of the knew that is distinguishable from the drive to appropriation or accumulation of new property. In short from capitalization this observation allows the reader to figure the incision of the wound that divides democracies to laws expressly as a rhythmic pulsation. The pathway which the first pull soon drive or pulse we might hear in that word also is transformed, or we might say is dislocated, syncopated or rhythmmed into the second is worth tracking closely. In the first instance, the new kind of non appropriate if loveness, insofar as it is beyond any calculation, can only be experienced. He says. I quote just once, perhaps for the first time, another perhaps once and only once. Therefore, for the first and last time, perhaps, perhaps. Anchors this asymmetrical loveness only arrives with the chance iness of this repeated perhaps beyond the scope of any sovereign calculation as to what will come, it will always be necessary that it may or may not happen, perhaps. Like La Democratie Avenir, it does has the character of an impossible event. Or Derrida will go on to describe as a passive decision. If the decision is what makes the event, it is also what interrupts and neutralizes that which I quote must surprise both the freedom and the will of every subject. Surprising a word, the very subjectivity of the subject affecting it wherever the subject is exposed, sensitive, receptive, vulnerable and fundamentally passive before and beyond any decision. Indeed, before any subjectivation or Objectivation End Quote. Once the aporia of the traditional understanding of a

free voluntarist subject and his sovereign decision according to which nothing would ever happen to a subject. Who remains self identical and thus unaffected by indifferent to even the very decision that he wills. For their it all, this suggests that before or beneath any sovereign decision, there is another decision that makes possible the event a passive decision. The decision of the other that is always already in need. The decision of me as other who thereby makes an exception for and of me. And it's at this point that Derrida introduces the metaphor of rhythm through the figure of the heartbeat, that moniker the heartbeat of sovereign autonomy, by which it open is onto itself. And thus on to heterogamy. And a few later sentences later comes a more detailed elucidation of this figure that stresses its temporal character, and I'm going to read her part of the quote that's given us number one on your handout. We are here by unfolding the classic concept of decision. It is this act of the act that we are attempting to think passive delivered over to the other, suspended over the others. Heartbeat for a few sentences earlier on its heartbeat had to be necessarily accorded thus as the heartbeat of the other. Where I am helpless, where I decide what I cannot fail to decide freely, necessarily receiving my very life from the heartbeat of the other. We say not only hard, but heartbeat. That which from one instant to another having come again from another of the other, to whom it is delivered up. And this can be me. This heart receives. It will perhaps receive in a rhythmic pulsation what is called blood, which in turn will receive the force needed to arrive. So my decision in my life in inverted commas come from the heart of the other, and more specifically from its beats and air dissolves. It pains her to specify that. The perhaps arrives as a rhythmic pulsation, which can be the beat of my own heart as the other of me in me, and this would also be a definition of democracy that would interrupt the Homophilia lore, talk, sinus equality of fraternity and birth. But this means that what just locates the aristoc Aristo democracy of brothers that tends irrevocably towards oligarchy. And this perhaps comes as something of a surprise. What dislocates that is nothing other than blood, even when it is blood that derrotar so fervently wants to escape. What though would describe would divide this giving and receiving of blood from the heartbeat of the other, from the consanguinity of filiation and Fatherland. In short of nationalism. One answer would be to pursue the idea of the gift of friendship of Friendship as gift, which by definition exceeds any obligation to return the favor and thus re directs friendship away from equivalence in exchange towards asymmetry disproportionality, non reciprocity and the provenance of the other. And one would want to think this relation between the heart beats and the an economical than an economical in connection with the discussion of interest at that word understood in all its policy. Mia in the first year of the seminar on Lapenda more the death penalty where there to observe the interest or investment on both sides of the debate that is among supporters of the death penalty, and among abolitionists in disinterestedness, and that is in a vague in a

value beyond any price. Or economy. So on the one hand, I can see an affirmation of the use of the categorical imperative of penal justice puts this principle beyond any worldly interests. Insisting on an equivalence in reading between crime and the moral compensation or indemnification that transcends all empirical calculation. On the other hand, abolitionists assert the dignity and value of life beyond any other value, especially on the beyond, that of the market. A number of figures including Bodla logo and marks, rather suspect that the abolitionists disinterest in the inviolability of life in general conceals a rather hypocritical interest in wanting to save their own necks. In the 7th session of the seminar, there are tracks marks as he links this calculating interest to the notion of fraternity, the abolition of the political death penalty amid of fraternal list. Further in the revolution of February 1848, merely serve the interests of a hegemonic bourgeoisie which could temporarily coincide with those of the proletariat, before the hollowness of universal Brotherhood was exposed as a passing moment in the class, antagonism between capital and labor. Derek Arthur does not retreat from the accusation. He says yes. I am against the death penalty because I want to save my own neck to save the life. I love what I love to live, what I love living. In quotes, but he adds a crucial qualification, arguing that the abolitionist cool is nonetheless driven by another figure of interest as yet undefined, which, but which consists in a certain displacing substitutability. And he says I quit. And when I say I, of course, I mean I, me. But also the I, the, me, whoever says I in its place or in mine, and quote. And at this point, Derrida links this interest or this question of interest to the theme of Pulsion or drive in terms that are strongly reminiscent of political enmity. And this is the second quote, or read from on your handout. What is an interest here? I can believe in and affirm what is called life. What I call what, and I calls life only by setting out from and within, uh, my life. Even if this belief in my life the sense of my life originally passes by way of the heart of the other, even if my life drive my life pulse that's positioned and pulls in the French is first of all, confided to the heart of the other and would not survive the heart of the other. Consequently, in general, even before the question of the death penalty, I can put the living before the dead, only on the basis of the affirmation and preference of my life of my living present right there where it receives its life from the heart by the other. This passage explains a further affinity between the disinterestedness of the supporters of the death penalty and of abolitionists, who each claim to put life before death and to that end, invoke a life before life and above its calculating interests. Sorta life beyond life and before and above its calculating interests from the abolitionist standpoint to privilege the living over the dead, to be for life is to be invested in survival in the priceless interest of life. To save what is left of life. Here, though, Derrida argues that I can only put the interests of life before those of death. Only put one kind of survival 1st and affirm my life at the moment when I'm survived by the other by a life that exceeds and extends beyond mine by definition, which

is to say by another kindness, a viral that precisely isn't mine. The survival of the other or the other in me that comes before me and my life and after me and my life. For this reason, however, the impulse of my life not only cannot survive the other upon whom I depend in order to survive beyond my death, but Moreover cannot survive at or in the heart of the other. The ambiguity between these two sensors points to a paradox. I cannot survive beyond life and a life after death except by being carried in the heart of the other and yet to the extent that I am incorporated or insisted in the heart of the other I then I'm not the same I anymore that lives on. And again, when there are speaks of laughing, muscular preference to Maddie. There is a double sense objective and subjective. It's both the affirmation and preference for my life. Putting my life before the lives of others, and that, incidentally, would be the very crying that is said to warrant the moral reimbursement of the death penalty. But it also refers to that which my life affirms and prefers, which according to the analysis and political Amity is the friend whom I must friend, whom I Miss team more than myself, without reciprocity or equivalence, whose life I thereby put before my own life. The syntax here dispossesses me of my life. Makes me an exception and the recipient of its decision, much as La Democracia veneer. As a matter of friendship and justice, exceeding all appropriation of the proper and I had a moment of credit as we're going to talk about credibility and credit to a friend who precisely assisted in a conversation with this element of the reading of the text, who might actually be here. But I won't embarrass him. But here I'm even indebted to a friend whose life. I hope will exceed my own and suddenly exceeds my own. And finally, and then I will be done with the close reading. Bear with me. Finally, in the past day lives, lives and lies are much more simple sense or simply spending my life or passing the time of my life before I die. But Derrida points out that I can only spend my life in a state of openness to the surprise of the other, to the uncertainty of when my life. When my death. Come on, the death penalty is fordes. It puts life to death in a double sense. It puts an end to the existence that I call my life, but it Moreover puts an end to the very chancy Nesson potential for surprise, including the surprise that is the moment of my death that I don't see coming and it would be that very surprised that makes life worthy of the name. A life in which the moment of death is calculable and predictable is a being towards death. In Heideggerian terms that seeks to appropriate impossibility as an appropriate rible possibility as something of which I am capable Alief, that puts itself in front of stands before death. In judgment, a judgment that, in deciding on my life and deciding my life, exonerates Midara, says of happenstance, and now I will read positive quote as #3 on your hand out. Where the anticipation of my death becomes the anticipation of a calculable instant, there is no longer any future. There is thus no longer any event to come, nothing to come, no longer any other even know more heart of the other, and so forth. So that where my life be, it originally granted by the heart of the other is my life. It must keep this relation

to the coming of the other's coming of the to come in the opening of the incalculable and the UN decidable my life, and especially in my life. In so far as it depends on the heart of the other, cannot affirm itself, and affirm its preference, except over against this which is not so much death's calculation and decision. The calculable decidability. Of what puts an end to it? And it Furthermore transpires that the relation to the heart of the other hasn't expressly rhythmic character. There is a reason I've been working through tracking this. Someone also closely in a multiple word play the life drive or pull soon the fight and struggle for life against the death penalty is figured literally as a beating of the heart, and this is the next quotation on your handle. When I say my life or even my living present here, I've already named the other in knee. Greater, younger or older than me, the other of my sex or not, the other who nonetheless let's me be me. The other whose heart is more interior to my heart than my heart itself, which means that I protect my heart. I protest in the name of my heart when I fight so that the heart of the other will continue to beat. In me before me after me or even without me, where else would I find the strength and the drive and the interest to fight and to struggle with my whole heart with the beating of my heart against the death penalty? I can do it me as me only thanks to the other by the grace of the other heart that affirms life in me. It is therefore there. This is in my own interest in my hearts interest insofar it is, as it is the interest of the heart of the other in me, that I be responsible for, and before the other the common, even fraternal interest shared by proponents and abolitionists, by contrast, is to put an end precisely to this finna tude, to put debt to put to death, the lively undecidability of the perhaps that renders incalculable, the moment at which the Grim Reaper will strike. By putting my life before me. As judge and executioner. On both sides of the debate there is a dream of liberating life from Finna tude of infinite Ising life, by giving and receiving death in a calculated fashion and thus of condemning precisely so as to indemnify life against more incalculable or surprising death. Later in the 10th session of Lapenda, more data once again connects this interest to the question of fraternity in a reading of born Viniste. He points out that the penalty to which one is condemned is the price paid to redeem a familial, filial tribal or National Crime or debt, and thus to acquit a duty of fraternity. But not unlike friendship, the price paid here is in commensurate to the punishment fitting the crime. Besides paying what is owed this reimbursement or indemnification pays interest quote as the incalculable surplus surplus value of capital. This then invites an analogy between the capital of capital punishment of decapitation even and out of capitalism and capitalization insofar as both entail the marketization or economize atian of the incalculable. Thereby infinities is the calculating or appropriating drive. The death penalty, paradoxically, consists in the phantasm. Derrida says, I quote of an infinite survival assured by interruption itself. But when it comes to interest to find otherwise, the one associated with the heartbeat of the other, this interruption or

cut, is never straightforwardly a single strike or interruption. Rather, as Derrida puts it in his reading of launchers, Lattimore, which is features an epigraph on your handouts when Jade eyes on both occasions her pulse scattered like sand. Bancho says she gives herself, I quote a death sentence in an instant, as elusive as the last grain of sand in the time of our glasses. Death also as the result of the dissemination of the rhythm of life without a finishing stroke, onboarded and unbounded air with me on a beach that is a continuation of the sea. And just to clarify that this data I just quoted. Speaking about boshu, the affirmation of life reveals itself to be a double blue, and I read the more that syncopate's itself. There is a suspensive at that defers and holds back death. Beating against one might say a more decisive one that decides, decrees, gives and hence hastens death. Crucially, these two temporalities do not simply, in each interrupt one another. But they also each interrupt themselves, yielding I quote, and a rhythmic pulsation of its syntax, that thereby scatters. We would assume into sound. In other words, there's always a differential rhythm, or disseminating rhythm. And this is more than a straightforward multiplicity, more than a multiplicity of meaning understood as polysemia. What makes it rhythmic is the semantic character of dissemination. The fact that it strikes or cuts itself and remarks itself is an example of itself. And that is what gives democracy its affinity with deconstruction that Derrida claims neither a single immutable regime nor one constitutional form, among others, as we tend to think of it in classical political philosophical discourse. There are just using voiu that democracy just is that dissemination of multiple political forms. And the quasi transcendental example of that indeterminate openness of the political to diversity into transformation. That would exceed any contingent calidor conditioned unconditional political form. In that way, democracy remarks or over types itself in the language of Bush like 3 and if there is no one type of democracy. If it's always a double or multiple strike there Democratie Ave would then be something like the rhythm of a, with Maria interrupting and deferring it's arrival even as it hastens it. This also means that the rhythm of democracy, if it is like a heartbeat, is to be distinguished from the alternation of systole and diastole. The mechanically control and interrupts the internal flow of blood around the body, darida notes in his reflections on rhythm in his preface to preface to Lukula Barts typography, quote 5 on your handle this interruption does not have the dialectical cadence of our relation between rhythm and non rhythm to continuous and discontinuous, and so on. It interrupts alternation. The constraint of opposition. In general, the dialectic and the speculative even the double bind when it maintains an oppositional form that he's going after Hegel. The trouble with the dialectic is that it wants to economize life, economize on life, which is to say on the event ality the perhaps or the surprise of life. And it's this economizing. Let's put in question in the parallel derrotar draws between the death penalty in capitalization. In a quote, an infinite azatian of survival assured by calculation itself and by the cutting decision of the

death penalty. As he says in Quotation 6 on your handout, it is this zone between the capital of capital punishment or even of decapitation, and the capital of capitalism of capitalization that the relations are both necessary and murky. Troubling, causing one's head to spin once capital to the point of Vertigo, Vertigo seizes hold of the calculating drive when capital all the interest of capital is no longer calculable and becomes virtually infinite when death without return. Is a part of the market there where it cannot be part of the market where it ought to remain incalculable. Capitalization and sales. Folding a surplus interest in extortionate interest into the capital. Some, like many students who owe vast amount of tuition fees, especially in the US, face often are a folding of their interest in repayment, some so that is capitalization. Is about forcing a repayment of more than what one owes in order to acquit a duty of fraternity. At stake here is a sudden economy of the an economic or non economical and to economize the an economic or economize on the an economic is to subordinate the event. Aliti of the incalculable to the market Ising drive that counts one's friends in the economy of 1's own there where every other is equally altogether other. One would want to make a fine. Can't cut as one does with policy Mia and dissemination between this capitalizing decapitation and the rhythmic dicola seal, the data refers to in Ladue plus sales and that cuts off and ruins on glues dicola's worth to unstick and to unglue as well as to be ahead. Blue unstick from the outset any capital that is any head, any heading, direction, any head of the family that is any father, and similarly also from the rhythm that is described in Glover as Arrhythmic. Decapitation of metal on garage that regularly re plunges this meta language, this head of meta language back into the text almost as if Bennington's as it were waterboarding torture. In short, one would want to make a distinction between a rhythm that measures and calculates, and a rhythm that Syncopate sun scatters, like sand. And therein also lies the inherent crisis of democracy. That is in my reading. It's capitalization, it's marketization, it's fraternal isation. But before returning in conclusion to this question, I want if you'll indulge me a little in order to give us and wait to the affinity between democracy and deconstruction. So turns to another text in which Derrotar seeks performatively to stage a certain resistance, to economize zation. And this one is very long. So I will not read it is just on your hand out and fill at Liberty to read it. In French or in English as you like. This is the opening period of sick confessional vertiginous breathless 505 word sentence in French, whose peroxin. Going to be able to say this. Who's peroxidized precipitation and an effusion leave LN6U as she says, completely dizzy. That's in answer. Stay, she says that destabilizing the very rhythm of her reading of Derrida, that's the topic of that discussion. And given its length. And just refer you to to reading that rhythm for yourself and seeing how undo stabilized, how destabilizing it is. But I'll say briefly that C. Confessional, for some context, is a text written by Derrida in response to 1 written by Jeff Bennington, and it appears below Bennington's text on each page of the book,

and its aim is to performatively challenge the formalizing interpretation that Jeff gives by arriving as a singular text that could not be foreseen or accounted for. Jeff systematization. Thus undoing the efficacy at the performative in the very same blur. Playing on the disseminator E sense of the word clue from the Latin *clou* meaning blood. So and we have crew and then crude cruelty will say the past participle of *car* to believe the first period here figures the incalculable or impossible. the UN, D constructible as an immediacy of belief credulity, and hence of credit, 'cause credibility is to give credit to someone that flows continuously like a blood transfusion, directly into the ear of an omnipotent God. Confessor, Jeff. Via a pen syringe of a crudeness that Derrida loves, he says, but does not believe in, or rather believes in, without believing, which following the analysis of credibility in *La Pardon* war is, he says the very condition of track trafficking of quote, the market, the exchange, the social contract, the promise, the whole system of supposed equivalences, that ground money, language law as well as penal law. So this crude event, which threatens to bleed out, leading to the end, the cessation and destination of deconstruction in a glorious appeasement, is interrupted in this period at a propitious moment by the sudden withdrawal of the syringe that staunches the flow of blood from the young Derrida. If, as data quote clips in the second year of *Lapenda* more quote, we are a long way of very long way from being done, will we ever be done staunching the flu they told she? And quote there is no absolute concept that would put an end to the effusion as a play here and friendship, or shall rather the wound from which one concept hemorrhages into another. For instance, bleeds into another, like bleeding colors on a damp canvas is always also partially sutured, partially sewn up, partially bound up with a ligature rhythm. As Derrida characterizes it elsewhere lies somewhere between the greatest predictability and the most. Unpredictable singularity. Or even *talasi*. Deconstruction would then be nothing other than this incessant rewriting of the event that even with each rewriting aspires to have something left still to say, that would surprise a reader like Jeff. However, familiar *anthera* read it, he is. And to bring about something for him. That his transcendental deduction might not foresee. So imagine my own surprise. As a familiar reader, though far from having the expertise that Jeff has, so imagine my surprise when having some months ago in fact conceived as the title of this talk or so I thought, invented the second part of the title for today, a friend proposed that our little *derrotar* reading group that we have going on during the pandemic should next tackle another text that I didn't know come see setup possible within such limits. But which happens to contain the following paragraph, reproduced in eight on the handout, whose conclusion would therefore surprise in kind of not surprising me? And it ends with this. It ensures its rhythm in its breathing. Diastole systole and syncopate the beating of the impossible possible of the impossible's condition, at the possible from the very heart of the impossible, one hears thus. The pulsation or the pulse of a deconstruction that's pollution or

pulse. I think I may have made a typo in English, so forgive me. I don't know if that's just in my text or the handle. There it is tiny. Anticipate re rewriting of my cycle. If I may be so bold. Softly displacing my rhythm has the effect of inserting dissemination within this thing called deconstruction, which is not one, but singularly multiple, a deconstruction, a democracy, if you like then of deconstructions each equally altogether other, receiving their life from the heartbeat of the other. So my conclusion. Afterwards seeks you notes referring to the first period of cecum Fishel quote. He rewrites a lot, but not tampering with the flow, little things, commas, or rhythm. In quotes. In what would this difference or differentiation or dissemination algorithm consist? Not simply the rhythm of deconstruction, but also insofar as they keep step with one another. And remark each other. The rhythm of democracy. To return to my opening gambit, this would not be the rhythm of crisis, which is, Derrida argues, would be to submit democracy to our predictable temporality, to the reassuring belief in the rhythm of the IT will pass soon enough, and also to the horizon of judgment and decision, including one might assume electoral decisions. However much those decisions might be deferred. The crisis says Derrida and I quote is not just any form of the incalculable, it is the incalculable, as a moment of calculation. To speak of a crisis of democracy then, and to imagine a moment at which that crisis might be ended decisively is thus already to have tamed, appropriated it and neutralized. It's radically unsettling effects. Democracy is nothing other than the opening of politics, for there are, but also the risk of the closure of fraternity, even of the alternative democracy as the alternative to democracy. Any attempt to auscultate democracy to sound out it's crisis. Where does only serve to economize on and to economize the very democracy it purportedly wants to save. And at that point I will end with my final beat.