

4th Manifesto: the zeroth and final manifesto

My Notes on the preceding/ending manifestos

Dedicated to my academic advisor Victoria Blythe and teacher Avital Ronell, both of whom studied with Jacques Derrida

Hello. Merry Christmas.

We are the artists. Some schools simply don't get it. This is the networked reality of contemporary art but then again that's passe or even more, too much of a given. But we can challenge art and move it forward.

I imagine a hipster in Logan Square simply "not getting it" AT ALL. Fashion, get with it. "Gauntlett Cheng?, do you mean Helmut Lang?" hipster says. That's unfortunate. This is a situation that was created by Heidegger's *What Is Called Thinking?* In returning to the depths of the Origin of Thinking in the face of Rationality and Science and Instruments. Heidegger is his favorite because of the connection between Metaphysics and Poetry. "Man is a sign that is not Read". Then afterwards, its all misinterpretation. There is Levinas, Derrida. We can't overstate the influence of Heidegger. And he jumps to Ancient Greece, before Plato.

There are original thinkers in Greece (but Dustin Hodges as suggested otherwise with the book *The Shape Of Ancient Thought* which pre-dates them to the East) who recite poetry on Being, or sometimes Non-Being. Or Thence the Retribution of the Thing Occurred and Return of its Due, Eternal Return=Anaximander very important for Nietzsche and Heidegger. Parmenides which we can trace to the work of Xenakis. His metaphysical poem stating the One dissolves and all that is left is Non-being. These questions of the One are important for Plato and the Neo-platonists which Jean Wahl suggested has set the stage for poetry (if you consider that the Heaven or Celestial or Pure Form was the antecedent for all of Christianity).

Laruelle will want to use basically everything. I don't mean to be pretentious. But he takes you in literally every direction. He shows the problem of Transcendence.

Now Transcendence is important for Levinas--The Other and Ethics--- which has a provenance in Wahl who is commenting on Heidegger and before that Kirkegaard.

The beauty of Self needs a limit for Ego, Psyche, whatever you call it, and then there is something just past the mark, a horizon which is Beyond. To transcend transcendence and return to immanence. Transcendence destroying itself. The relation of immanence to transcendence and vice versa is beautiful in my opinion as articulated in the 1930s. The paradox of belief. The belief in the other outside of myself. Wahl stating that entering this Meta-domain/realm of the ontological (the interpretation of my being in the world on a different order than the ontic) is transcendence.

Repetition/Eternal Return is shot through and through in philosophy of the 20th century. The Same occurring again but Renewed and Different

Wahl suggests that Heidegger in creating a unified theory of the three registers of Time is trying to find a NUNC STANS. How in the hell is there mystical time completely detached from the world, an attribute of God. This is the Source or the Origin of the Work Of Art. Onto-theology and Destruktion.

Hoelderlin was psychotic during his last poems. The Ister being one of them. The river and then we have What Is Called Thinking. Or the river of Lethe and not-forgetting. This Origin has a Meta according to Laruelle. In Going out there or beyond. Or even below, under the Ground of Reason and the Ratio (rationality) of the procedure or the Systasis of a System. This isn't contempt for these systems, procedures or instruments. I do enjoy listening the the technical virtuoso of Beau Wanzer when I wake up and the Earth feels like its has collided with Hell. Yet there is a provenance of K2 or Vanity or Chris & Cosey, there we approach some Meta. The question of your coordinates within the sociality and the fabric of alternative bohemia and the opinionated cement of a local bar, and a certain fashion or certain dialect.

This brings me to the second half of the first manifesto, which wants SCIENCE. 20th century continental philosophy, especially say Marcuse and Habermas (they strive for universal communication and then look at your freedom) critique instrumentalizing. Heidegger talks a lot about science. Laruelle wants the Philosophy-Science Dyad to remain together.

Like in Jackie Brown, Beaumont is gonna act like Beaumont. We have the Meta behind the acts or events or life philosophy of Beaumont. And he gets killed off the Ground.

I have to control my resentment of Sea Punk because I live in the hispter neighborhood of the Sea Punk Capital. Basically no one is without aporia or presupposition.

This brings us to the first half of the first manifesto. We the community. Artists on some axes of RFA/Lomex/NAB/Jennys/Edouard have the password. And are not kitschy in a provincial Kansas City way (a modality even present in Chicago) and you have to be social to play the game. Get in the game. No one is gonna just discover you. New York is mostly market/galleries. And the Euros get hooked up through institutionalization and teaching. This is Beuys in

Dusseldorf. But he got fame and prestige. Even then one could say he was a fake shaman. This is the information as asset. Drug addict/alcoholic teachers at the Staedelschule.

If we move to the second manifesto, there is our opening out of the pleasure-seeking hedonism (no judgement, this is standard operating procedures which I wish I could binge on). Here Taubes makes a difference between Adorno and Benjamin. Benjamin has an idealist tendency but only as an ant follows very closely the material of the base. Through profanity there is a relation to the Messiah. His last work in his life he tries to invent the Historical Materialism instead of Dialectical Materialism (which was also the end of the first manifesto in Laruelle, that both were necessary). Through the science of the latter, deriving from crazy Althusser, we can give embodiments, philosophemes, epistemes, materials an agency like an object and study their behavior or movement, if they catch on, how it dominates the world (this is a point with the material of the greatest fable Christianity).

The other axis in music is Recital Program/Tochnit Aleph/Blank Forms/Kye/Swill Radio and the warehouse bucket shitter squatters. Music has a romantic program in the face of cold trendy-sphere dark occult minimal technics nihilism--no purpose but its egotistical (closed off from the spiritual opening) proliferation= LOOK AT ME HERE-AND-NOW

Back to Taubes who was a visitor of the Paris Bar and wore a cape. He saw that the aesthetics of suffering were different than our private experience of it. He calls this personal distance modernity instead of antiquity where they were public about it and groaning and yelling. Adorno is faking the weak power to redeem, the gun we are given by Benjamin, Jetztzeit. This is Now or Presence.

Presence is basically all of the West through and through because it is Christianity and then everything antecedent and afterwards too, end of metaphysics, Analytic Philosophy, Sol Lewitt/Kosuth Tautologies, modern medicine without the occult. The consubstantiality of the Father and Son means that Low Christology-human works--is one and the same with High Christology--the Divine. And Jean Luc Nancy writes about the onto-theology moving to onto-teleology if I understand. Heidegger proclaims an end to metaphysics but is there something to be replaced. And then here even naive atheism or militant reason or rationality will always be tainted with Christianity. For Jean Luc Nancy, "sense" is the passage to presence. It is the "Open". Hoelderlin calls it "The free" The distension and tension. The dis-enclosure, or the opening up, but also the tearing down and tearing away/from. Again how could we return to the Beginning as in Enzo Minarelli, the syllables, sound poetry of the speech before we had language, is it pre-ontology? Are the mystics in the desert have psychotic access to this Meta/Onto. Hoelderlin? The proclamation of News and Nothing but waiting around for Christ, which is the presence, The Sky coming to us. Transcendence. Ousia=being
homoousia=father and son
paraousia=presence

The Jean Luc Nancy is a very close study.

He says he can't comment upon our personal act of faith, which gives me some light. That is the space for which the subject is created. Through faith- all things the same/different throughout the day--a subject is born through the entrance of presence.

Christianity is the *Aufhebung* (Hegel's sublation, which Marx wanted to turn on its head) of all things past, history, the Greek philosophy, the Jewish Wisdom, it is the religion that can incorporate literally everything. Even when we separate church and state, Marx writes that a new space is created for religion in the private sphere. This must be something related to what Taubes was saying about our private experience.

Now if we return to Jean Wahl. He says the poets are the one who can make transparent or the subconscious (the physical becomes metaphysical and the metaphysical becomes physical).

I am indebted to Trisha Donnelly for teaching me this in a class with her where we read Wordsworth aloud. Advanced sculpture class = presence of space/time. There is the instant or the flash or the lightning strike in Rimbaud or Baudelaire. These are the connections between here and there and now and then or instant and eternity and there is Cezanne and Van Gogh. Movement expressed. The image through quantity to reach imageless or the Enzo Minarelli spark of before a "word"

Goo Goo Daa Daa

Neither subject nor object and also both subject and object.

The question of temporality comes with Thrownness and Projection and Falling-the three ecstasies of time. Then questions of my being-in is Care or if I am cooking "focusedly" as DJ Khaled says. I am walking. Heidegger went on walks in the Black Forest. Being in the activity. But in the forest. There comes the isolation. We are thrown in the world. Wahl says that there is not an abundance of being in Being and Time.

"Into this world we're thrown / Like a dog without a bone."

What is called thinking suggests Zarathustra is the one who recognizes the mythological undertone to logic. These are the great poems of Homer. Or Orpheus into the Underworld.

The misinterpretation is then Nazi mythology. The artistic path or pacifist is Blood of a Poet and all the French all the way down to the subculture hippie Futurists / free jazz => free improvisation.

Once could be an accelerationist like Marinetti or One could be a Futurist and listen to Sun Ra.

Taubes is a very personal text to me and it was his spiritual testimony. He reads Kafka (a minor literature) as a World only as a Judgement. Nature does not appear as description but rather Falleness, and Downfall, Beetle and Miniscule and Pedantic interviews with adversarial board members.

But there is our task as translators. The drawbridge to the other side. Is it divine inspiration?

Obviously such a transcendence is a doublet.

But Deleuze pulls it off with the transcending transcendence is immanence. The beyond the empirical fact on some intuitive plane of Repetition (the Existentialists or back to the PreSocratics)

The brilliance of reading political theology in modernity is that our texts are poetry / literature.

For Artaud, there is no moral or psychological purpose to the Theater. The theater should be staged in chaosmos.

The sounds, cries, molecules of vital force, organs and the symbol in its relation to the hieroglyph (which Wahl analyzes in Baudelaire, where he distills a "symbol")

The World itself is the stage or rather to get to Deleuze---becomings, machines, organs, bodies are the units of re-composition/de-composition for the stage of Artaud's theater. Laruelle would situate it as Man, Experience, or Ordinary Life.

Here we reach the downfall of the virtuosic hero like Dieter Roth where his work through its expansive de-composition attempts some atomistic unit of Life--the passion of a instant fragment. Does this have problems that are idealist? The plane of composition? Or do we consider the given/doublet? The presupposition of its auto-foundation, or you could say an arche, that through such a philosophy as explanation we change everything, the skyscrapers change our view of the city, we can't see past 57th street.

Here the horizon is the issue for Jean-Luc Nancy. The opening of itself through its stretching of literally nothing but proclamation which is absorbing everything there was and everything there will be. A way out at the end. An Outside. Not a popular opinion in the Contemporary Art Axis Of Galleries that I mentioned earlier.

But if we are self-aware in the experiment then we can superimpose different philosophies and reap the force of their thoughts--they're crux or best case for the explanation of the way it is.

Laruelle in the second manifesto touches about the wave or particle duality. The dualysis is the simultaneity of the thought and its given. For example, the actual AND the virtual

As a duality, i.e. not split or separated. Half analytic. Half synthetic. So reap the benefits of its analysis but you must consider it synthetically within a larger Whole, its place, its presupposition. The Beaumont question again.

Laruelle condemns humanism here and then in Future Christ he says the humanitarian will lead to having to deal with anti-humanitarian (which may be Badiou's ethical position)

These manifestos are the collage or hybridity of many materials at once. But the key is to suspend the belief.

A certain doctrine will state that Mary did not have consummation. Another will state something different.

The key is to suspend Belief and then switch it out for Faith, which is a personal experience or human-in-human.

Laruelle is also not a re-hashing of Levinas approaching the Infinity of the Other. This is another Opening into the Sky of the Face but it is a double transcendence. The One is in the last analysis, the determination of everything from it. We like an ant must try to be cautious and move from the One, along it and not disturb anything through an argument or an uproar or an insurrection of a new political theology. This the genius solution of artists.

The analyses of Klossowski delineate a hypothetical theological power structure in the medieval world which the Republic inherits. The God at the top and then the King as his incorporation or temporalization and the Lord and the Surf, etc.

Now the Republic is birthed through the Terror or the Violent Streak of Robespierre. Here we find the non-literal violence of base materialism. One of my favorite books is Bataille's My Mother. The key is to maintain the genius solution of the artist. The fictionalization of violence like Bjarne Melgaard. We have the question of who is more wrong Sade, the libertine aristocrat or Robespierre the bloodthirsty Enlightenment-principle founder. Klossowski points out that once God is dead within the late monarchy. The political agents merely invoke the power of God as legitimization of their power to be base and dominate their slaves. But if the Slave repeats the same invocation of the death of God to kill the tyrant/their master--- they are merely replicating the same tenuity. Then Klossowski follows the origin of the base behaviour to the state of ennui and disgust. That even in peacetime there is always the virtual possibility of violent re-incorporation of immoral behavior. The Republican is just one drink away even if it has the contradictory belief that it doesn't want to drink.

*“ Here we find again the questions we had at the beginning. On
However, unlike the utopias of good which sin by leaving the evil the one hand, we could
take Sade literally, in which case he appears*

realities out of account, the utopia of evil leaves out of account, not to us as one of the most searching and most revealing epiphenomena of a vast process of social decomposition and recomposition. He composition. Then, while recognizing in Sade his role of executor, would then be shown to be like an abscess on a sick body which we must also attribute to him the function of denouncing the dark thought it was authorized to speak in the name of this body. His forces camouflaged as social values by the defense mechanisms of political nihilism would be but what one calls an unhealthy episode the collectivity. Thus camouflaged, these dark forces can dance of the collective process; his apology for pure crime, his invitation to their infernal round in the void. Sade was not afraid to get involved persevere in crime, would be but the attempt to pervert the political with these forces, but he enters into the dance only in order to tear instinct, that is, the collectivity's instinct for self-preservation. For off the masks that the Revolution had put. on them to make them with profound satisfaction the people exterminate those who have acceptable and to allow the "children of the fatherland" to embody opposed them; the collectivity always senses what is, wrongly or these dark forces with innocence.

pure cruelty; it knows how to disguise cruelty's form and effects. morse, The rites it can invent at the foot of the scaffold free it From

conviction, cruelty and justice without experiencing the least re-”

So Sade is just a localization and focusing of a symptom. the systematic problem of Republican society: e.g. **Abu Ghraib, severely in the name of the nation**
And the focus/locale/axis of boho chic fraternizing

The symbol of the secret society that Klossowski was in was a headless man. We consider it as the killing of Pater authority of the Godhead and the political incorporations IN THE NAME OF

Kafka writes his parable for a different father for one who is not qualified or the worst in the class. How is Abraham appropriate the right to be the Father of the Religion and to kill as a testament of good faith.

The worst student in the class for Kafka gets up when the teacher also calls for the best student because the teacher had intended to either insult the worst student or demonstrate the auto-foundational principle of a Father Land--the minority like Kafka who was neither Czech or

German and wrote a literature without genre--in its niche--could one day write a parable as grounded as The Old Testament.

The final text of the third manifesto is the Futurist question.

If we are not going to deal in Being or Time or Concepts, we can deal in-human and in-past toward the Future. We are in real time constructing the Messiah here. This is Freedom in the substitution. Sun Ra. All Aboard the Mothership. Go wild. Yippee ki-yay. Christianity is typically a mixture of different beliefs, dogmas, churches, sects. But we can use it not as fundamentalism or explanation but rather as material for GNOSIS (KNOWLEDGE). The key point is the occasional aspect of any systematic ontology, where then we reach the onto-theology question, but we choose not to do as Jean Luc Nancy to get at the deeper truth of Philosophy/The West (Everything is Christian). But we can substitute with the primary importance on Man. The problem of humanism is that it places primacy on the object of the thought (the Enlightenment) and creates division through its split of the One into two, the rational utilitarian program of how can we optimize the best ethics for man, and then

*Nevertheless, thinking it is already
to practise it.*

*That cause determines the announcing of the Future Christ,
necessary but insuffi cient since it needs these occasions, it is the
being-foreclosed of Man to religion and faith. Removing religion
in God, it removes God and Christ from religion as well from the
churches and from the devices of the church designed to subjugate*

*human beings in calling them to build it as subjects-of-faith. The Man-
in-person is an a-religious being but only he can become religious or*

*come to faith, because everything conspires to bring it about that
he bears the World's mythologies as soon as he becomes subject for
the World. The indifferentism in terms of religion is a historical
fl uctuation that affects human beings but, we will see, has nothing to
do with the indifference that is the essence, or rather the non-essence,
which makes them real. This religious non-consistency can fi nally
explain their fury in giving their faith over to the World's 'paganism'
and the history that feeds religions and their apparatuses.*

We can finally reconsider paganism--- this is perhaps an insight into the work of Nicolas Ceccaldi

How low can you go?

Good bad art

But then there is still the problem of the determination of the institution.

The Gnostic world --not as a Paradise or the true Godhead out there and we need redemption/salvation---but realized right here and now

There is no 'end of time' (or its modes, end of metaphysics, end of history, etc.) in the diverse sense where common sense, helping philosophy, can understand it, so this is not like having penetrated philosophy with a religious or mythological imaginary. An assumed end of time does not outline the theoretical space of a new messianism,

of a renewal of faith. Future Christianity is not justified by a philosophical conception of time, but by the human reality where it finds

the necessary cause for use, a use of that experience of time and history. That experience occasionally serves to name the three instances of a time-without-temporality which is neither ecstatic as the radical past as 'Time-in-person' is, the present as World or Whole of time, finally the future as Christ-subject. The cause of time is the Living individual [individual] but not as factual possibility or even efficacy, the heretic is no more a phenomenologist than a metaphysician. Time is immanent to time and not to anything else, it is the in-Time, abysmal and barren, a character who would belong to mythology if he was of this World. It is thus a radical past, this is its form as cause in-the-last-identity of time-subject's temporalization. The heretic is not acquainted with phenomenological distance,

transcendence spread out in meta or tightened in epekeina. The One-time is an unlearned knowledge or one without consciousness,

unteachable by a historical or supra-historical experience. At the 'end of time' which was only announced with time as temporalized and temporalization, we oppose the Future as an undivided emergence of the time-World's clone. This time-subject is, by one of his sides, in-past and outside-world and, by his other extremity, a use of the time-world. This is the principle of a non-theochronology such that it supports the announcement of the Future Christ.

The most important thing about this Future Christ is that it is simultaneously FIRST AND FINAL. A Delaney book you probably get **immersed** into it completely yet at the same time you have to cook dinner and you're back, emerged.

How then will the Final Good News not be an Ultimatum, made by Man to philosophy and theology, of having to help the World and not only to care about being in its entirety and the cause of being?

We have only an unlearned knowledge or only a gnosis, it is of the radical past, only a rage, against the present, only a faith, it is the Future.

The scientific mythopoeia of Andre Thomkins or Kai Althoff or Dopplereffekt