

SEMIOTEXT(E) INTERVENTION SERIES

© 2012 by Franco "Bifo" Berardi

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher.

Published by Semiotext(e)
2007 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 427, Los Angeles, CA 90057
www.semiotexte.com

Thanks to Robert Dewhurst, John Ebert, Marc Lowenthal and Jason Smith.

Design: Hedi El Kholti

ISBN: 978-1-58435-112-2
Distributed by The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
and London, England
Printed in the United States of America

Franco "Bifo" Berardi

The Uprising

On Poetry and Finance

semiotext(e)
intervention
series □ 14

POETRY AND FINANCE

EMANCIPATION OF THE SIGN: POETRY AND FINANCE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Money and language have something in common: they are nothing and they move everything. They are nothing but symbols, conventions, *flatus vocis*, but they have the power of persuading human beings to act, to work, to transform physical things.

Money makes things happen. It is the source of action in the world and perhaps the only power we invest in. Perhaps in every other respect, in every other value, bankruptcy has been declared, giving money the power of some sacred deity, demanding to be recognized. Economics no longer persuades money to behave. Numbers cannot make the beast lie down and be quiet or sit up and do tricks. Thus, as we suspected all along, economics falsely imitates science. At best, economics is a neurosis of money, a symptom

contrived to hold the beast in abeyance [...]. Thus economics shares the language of psychopathology, inflation, depression, lows and heights, slumps and peaks, investments and losses, and the economy remains caught in manipulations of acting stimulated or depressed, drawing attention to itself, egotistically unaware of its own soul. Economists, brokers, accountants, financiers, all assisted by lawyers, are the priests of the cult of money, reciting their prayers to make the power of money work without imagination. (Sardello 1983, 1–2)

Financial capitalism is based on the autonomization of the dynamics of money, but more deeply on the autonomization of value production from the physical interaction of things.

The passage from the industrial abstraction of work to the digital abstraction of world implies an immaterialization of the labor process.

Jean Baudrillard has proposed a general semiology of simulation based on the premise of the end of referentiality, in the economic as well as in the linguistic field. In *The Mirror of Production*, Baudrillard writes: "need, use value, and the referent 'do not exist.' They are only concepts produced and projected into a generic dimension by the development of the very system of exchange value." (Baudrillard 1975, 30)

The process of the autonomization of money is a particular level of this general trend, but it also has a long history, according to Marc Shell in *Money, Language, and Thought*.

Between the electrum money of ancient Lydia and the electric money of contemporary America there occurred a historically momentous change. The exchange value of the earliest coins derived wholly from the material substance (electrum) of the ingots of which the coins were made and not from the inscriptions stamped into these ingots. The eventual development of coins whose politically authorized inscriptions were inadequate to the weights and purities of the ingots into which the inscriptions were stamped precipitated awareness of quandries about the relationship between face value (intellectual currency) and substantial value (material currency). This difference between inscription and thing grew greater with the introduction of paper moneys. Paper, the material substance on which the inscriptions were printed, was supposed to make no difference in exchange, and metal or electrum, the material substance to which the inscriptions referred, was connected with those inscriptions in increasingly abstract ways. With the advent of electronic fund-transfers the link between inscription and

substance was broken. The matter of electric money does not matter. (Shell 1982, 1)

As I've already said, the dephysicalization of money is part of the general process of abstraction which is the all-encompassing tendency of capitalism.

Marx's theory of value is based on the concept of abstract work: because it is the source and the measure of value, work has to sever its relation to the concrete usefulness of its activity and product. Concrete usefulness does not matter from the point of view of valorization. Baudrillard speaks of the relation between signification and language in the same vein. The abstraction process at the core of the capitalist capture (subsumption) of work implies abstraction from the need for the concreteness of products: the referent is erased.

The rational, referential, historical and functional machines of consciousness correspond to industrial machines. The aleatory, nonreferential, trans-ferential, indeterminate and floating machines of the unconscious respond to the aleatory machines of the code [...] The systemic strategy is merely to invoke a number of floating values in this hyper-reality. This is true of the unconscious as it is of money and theories. Value rules according to the indiscernible order of generation by means of

models, according to the infinite chains of simulation. (Baudrillard 1993, 3)

The crucial point of Baudrillard's critique is that referentiality and the (in)determination of value has come to an end. In the sphere of the market, things are not considered from the point of view of their concrete usefulness, but from that of their exchangeability and exchange value. Similarly, in the sphere of communication, language is traded and valued as something that is performed. Effectiveness, not truth value, is the rule of language in the sphere of communication. Pragmatics, not hermeneutics, is the methodology for understanding social communication, particularly in the age of new media.

Retracing the process of dereferentialization in both semiotics and economics, Baudrillard speaks of the emancipation of the sign.

A revolution has put an end to this "classical" economics of value, a revolution of value itself, which carries value beyond its commodity form into its radical form.

This revolution consists in the dislocation of the two aspects of the law of value, which were thought to be coherent and eternally bound as if by a natural law. *Referential value is annihilated, giving the structural play of value the upper hand.*

The structural dimension becomes autonomous by excluding the referential dimension, and is instituted upon the death of reference [...] from now on, signs are exchanged against each other rather than against the real (it is not that they just happen to be exchanged with each other, they do so *on condition* that they are no longer exchanged against the real). The emancipation of the sign. (Baudrillard, 1993, 6–7)

The emancipation of the sign from the referential function may be seen as the general trend of late Modernity, the prevailing tendency in literature and art as in science and in politics.

In the following pages I want to retrace the evolution of poetry in the passage from romantic realism to symbolist transrealism.

Symbolism opened a new space for poetic praxis, starting from the emancipation of the word from its referential task.

The emancipation of money—the financial sign—from the industrial production of things follows the same semiotic procedure, from referential to nonreferential signification.

But the analogy between economy and language should not mislead us: although money and language have something in common, their destinies do not coincide, as language exceeds economic exchange. Poetry is the language of nonexchangeability, the

return of infinite hermeneutics, and the return of the sensuous body of language.

I'm talking about poetry here as an excess of language, a hidden resource which enables us to shift from one paradigm to another.

A PLACE WE DO NOT KNOW

Angel, if there were a place we do not know, and there
On some ineffable carpet, the lovers, who never
Could achieve fulfillment here, could show
Their bold lofty figures of heart-swings,
Their towers of ecstasy, their pyramid
That long since, where there was no standing-ground,
Were tremblingly propped together—could succeed
Before the spectators around them, the innumerable
silent dead:

Would not these then throw their last, ever-hoarded,
Ever-hidden, unknown to us, eternally
Valid coins of happiness
Before their pair with the finally genuine smile
On the assuaged carpet?

—Rainer Maria Rilke, "Fifth Elegy"

(Translated by C.F. MacIntyre)

The reactivation of the social body is the precondition for the full deployment of the general intellect.

Since 2001 we have witnessed a dismantling of the general intellect that started after the dot-com crash in the spring of 2000. During the first decade of the new century, cognitive labor was disempowered and subjected to precarization.

The social and affective body of the cognitive workers has been separated from their daily activity of production. The new alienation is based on this separation, on the virtualization of social relations. The new alienation takes the form of psychic suffering, panic, depression, and a suicidal tide. This is the affective character of the first generation of people who have learned more words from a machine than from the mother.

The insurrection against financial capitalism is aimed to recompose the social and affective body. The student struggles that have exploded in Europe since the fall of 2010 should not be seen as sudden outbursts of rage, but as the beginnings of a long-lasting process that will encompass the next decade: a cognitarian insurrection of sorts. Insurrection means a rising up, and also implies the full deployment of the potencies of the actor. The actor that is appearing on the historical scene today is the general intellect in its process of subjectivation. The potencies of this actor are the potencies of collective intelligence in the network, the potencies of knowledge, reduced to the narrow dogmatic utilization that the capitalist economy is forcing on them.

The full deployment of the general intellect falls beyond the sphere of capitalism.

When general intellect will be able to reconstitute its social and erotic body, capitalist rule will become obsolete. This is the new consciousness that comes from the explosion of the last months of 2010, from the reclamation of knowledge's autonomy.

In the same period of the student revolt, the Wikileaks event has exposed the other face of cognitarian subjectivation. What is its meaning, beyond the remarkable effect that Wikileaks has had in the field of diplomacy and politics and war, and obviously in the field of information?

Wikileaks has displayed the infinite potency of the collective networked intelligence. The unleashing of the creative force of the general intellect is the momentous event that Julian Assange has been able to orchestrate. I don't think that we really needed to know the contents of all those cables and e-mails that Wikileaks disclosed. Actually, we already knew that diplomats are paid to lie, and that soldiers are paid for killing civilians.

Many interesting things have come out from the disclosures, but this is not my focus here. What is more important concerning this event is the activation of solidarity, complicity, and independent collaboration between cognitarians that it represents: between programmers, hardware technicians, journalists, and artists who all take part in an

informational process. The activation of the potency of this connected intelligence, autonomously from its capitalist use, is the lesson Wikileaks has to offer. And the new generation of rebels will find in this lesson a way to the autonomization and self-organization of the general intellect.

In street demonstrations, the social and erotic body of the cognitarians is finding rhythm and empathy. The main stake of street actions is the reactivation of the body of the general intellect. Bodily sensibility, blurred and stressed by precarity and competition, are finding new modes of expression, so that desire may begin flowing again.

Connection and Sensibility

Sensibility is the ability to understand what cannot be verbalized; and it has been a victim of the precarization and fractalization of time. In order to reactivate sensibility, art and therapy and political action have to all be gathered.

In the sphere of precarious work, time has been fragmented and depersonalized. Social time is transformed into a sprawl of fractals, compatible fragments that can be recombined by the networked machine: this is why I speak of the fractalization of time.

Aesthetic perception—here properly conceived of as the realm of sensibility and aesthesia—is

directly involved in the technological transformation of communication and work: in its attempt to efficiently interface with the connective environment, the conscious organism appears to increasingly inhibit what we call sensibility. By sensibility, I mean the faculty that enables human beings to interpret signs that are not verbal nor can be made so, the ability to understand what cannot be expressed in forms that have a finite syntax. This faculty reveals itself to be useless and even damaging in an integrated connective system, because sensibility tends to slow down the processes of interpretation, making them ambiguous and downgrading the competitive efficiency of the semiotic agent.

Sensibility is in time, and we need time to understand the hypercomplex communication of the body. Due to the acceleration of the info-rhythm, precarious workers are obliged to detect and interpret signs at an ever-accelerating pace, and their sensibility is disturbed. This is why therapy is increasingly involved in the political field of reactivating the social body and recomposing work in a process of subjectivation.

If we want to think through the relation between art and (schizo)therapy, we have to think in terms of the refrain. Guattari says that the refrain is a semiotic concatenation (*agencement*) that is able to latch onto the environment. Cosmic, terrestrial, social, and affective environments can

be grasped and internalized thanks to refrains that we have in our minds, in our sensitive and sensible brains.

In his book *Chaosmosis*, Guattari speaks of the "aesthetic paradigm." This concept redefines the historical and social perspective, and it is fully integrated into the vision of ecosophy. An environmental consciousness adequate to the technological complexity of hypermodernity, ecosophy is based on the acknowledgment of the crucial role of aesthetics in the prospect of ecology.

Actually, aesthetics is the science dedicated to the study of the contact between the derma (the skin, the sensitive surface of our body-mind) and different chemical, physical, electromagnetic, electronic, and informational flows. Therefore, aesthetics has much to do with the modern psychopathology of contact, with the pathological effects of the acceleration of the info-flow and the precarization of social existence. Guattari views the universe as a continuum of diverse and interrelated entities in bodily contact with each other. It is both an organic and inorganic continuum, animal and machinic, mental and electronic, and the concatenation is made possible by *ritournelles*, semiotic markers of rhythm. Rhythm is the common substance of signs (word, music, vision) and the brain. The mind hooks onto the other (the other mind, nature, artificial, or social world) thanks to rhythmic concatenation.

In the past century, the century that trusted in the future, art was essentially involved in the business of acceleration. Futurism defined the relation between art, the social mind, and social life. The cult of energy marked the artistic zeitgeist, up to the saturation of collective perception and the paralysis of empathy. Futurist rhythm was the rhythm of info-acceleration, of violence and war.

Now we need refrains that disentangle singular existence from the social game of competition and productivity: refrains of psychic and sensitive autonomization, refrains of the singularization and sensibilization of breathing, once unchained from the congested pace of the immaterial assembly line of semio-capitalist production.

Once upon a time, pleasure was repressed by power. Now it is advertised and promised, and simultaneously postponed and deceived. This is the pornographic feature of semio-production in the sphere of the market.

The eye has taken the central place of human sensory life, but this ocular domination is a domination of merchandise, of promises that are never fulfilled and always postponed. In the current conditions of capitalist competition, acceleration is the trigger for panic, and panic is the premise to depression. Singularity is forgotten, erased, and cancelled in the erotic domain of semio-capitalism. The singularity of the voice and the singularity of

words are subjected to the homogenization of exchange and valorization.

Social communication is submitted to technological interfaces: in order to exchange meaning in the sphere of connectivity, conscious organisms have to adapt to the digital environment.

In order to accelerate the circulation of value, meaning is reduced to information, and technological devices act as the communicative matrix. The matrix takes the place of the mother in the process of generating language.

But language and information do not overlap, and language cannot be resolved in exchangeability. In Ferdinand de Saussure's parlance, we may say that the infinity of the *parole* exceeds the recombinant logic of the *langue*, such that language can escape from the matrix and reinvent a social sphere of singular vibrations intermingling and projecting a new space for sharing, producing, and living.

Poetry opens the doors of perception to singularity.

Poetry is language's excess: poetry is what in language cannot be reduced to information, and is not exchangeable, but gives way to a new common ground of understanding, of shared meaning: the creation of a new world.

Poetry is a singular vibration of the voice. This vibration can create resonances, and resonances may produce common space, the place where:

lovers, who never
Could achieve fulfillment here, could show
Their bold lofty figures of heart-swings,
Their towers of ecstasy.

Vagrants

But tell me, who are these vagrants, these even a little
More transitory than we, these from the start
Violently wrung (and for whose sake?)
By a never-appeasable will? But it wrings them,
Bends them, slings them and swings them,
Throws them and catches them; as if from an oily,
More slippery air they come down
On the carpet worn thinner by their eternal leaping,
This carpet lost in the universe.
Stuck there like a plaster, as if the sky
Of the suburb had hurt the earth.
—Rilke: "Fifth Elegy," verses 1–11

These verses can be read simultaneously as a metaphor for the condition of precarity, and as an annunciation of a place that we don't know, that we have never experienced: a place of the city, a square, a street, an apartment where suddenly lovers, who here (in the kingdom of valorization and exchange) never "could achieve fulfillment," toss their last ever-hoarded, ever hidden, unknown—to us—eternally valid coins of happiness.

There is no secret meaning in these words, but we can read in these verses a description of the frail architectures of collective happiness: "Their towers of ecstasy, their pyramid that long since, where there was no standing-ground were tremblingly propped together."

This place we don't know is the place we are looking for, in a social environment that has been impoverished by social precariousness, in a landscape that has been deserted. It is the place that will be able to warm the sensible sphere that has been deprived of the joy of singularity. It is the place of occupation, where movements are gathering: Tahrir square in Cairo, Plaza do Sol in Madrid, and Zuccotti Park in New York City.

We call poetry the semiotic concatenation that exceeds the sphere of exchange and the codified correspondence of the signifier and signified; it is the semiotic concatenation that creates new pathways of signification and opens the way to a reactivation of the relation between sensibility and time, as sensibility is the faculty that makes possible the singularity of the enunciation and the singularity of the understanding of a noncodified enunciation.

Viktor Shklovsky, the Russian formalist theorist, says that the specificity of literary language lies in the ability to treat words according to an unrepeatable singular procedure, that in Russian he calls *priem*: an artificial treatment of verbal matter generating

effects of meaning never seen and codified before. Poetical procedure is a form of enstrangement (*ostranenie*, in Russian) that carries the word far and away from its common use.

"Art is not chaos," say Deleuze and Guattari in *What Is Philosophy?*, "but a composition of chaos that yields the vision or sensation, so that it constitutes, as Joyce says, a *chaosmos*" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 204–205). The relation between the organism and the environment is disturbed by the acceleration of info-stimula in the infosphere, by semiotic inflation, and by the saturation of attention and the conscious sensitive sphere of subjectivity. Art is recording and detecting this dissonance, as it simultaneously creates the aesthetic conditions for the perception and expression of new modes of becoming.

Relative to schizoanalysis, art is acting differently in two ways: it represents a diagnostic of the infospheric pollution of the psychosphere, but also a therapy treating the disturbed organism.

The refrain is the sensitive niche where we can create cosmos elaborating chaos.

Social movements can be described as a form of refrain: movements are the refrain of singularization, as they act to create spheres of singularity at the aesthetic and existential levels.

In the process of singularization that the movement makes possible, production, need, and con-

sumption can be semiotized again, according to a new system of world expectations.

Changing the order of expectations is one of the main social transformations that a movement can produce: this change implies a cultural transformation but also a change in sensitivity, in the opening of the organism to the world and to the others.

Insurrection is a refrain helping to withdraw the psychic energies of society from the standardized rhythm of compulsory competition-consumerism, and helping to create an autonomous collective sphere. Poetry is the language of the movement as it tries to deploy a new refrain.

The Limits of the World

In the chapter of *Chaosmosis* that is dedicated to the aesthetic paradigm, Guattari speaks of the new modes of the submission and standardization of subjectivity produced by network technologies and by neoliberal globalization. Simultaneously, he tries to find new pathways to autonomous subjectivation.

As far as concerns the first side of the problem, he writes:

Subjectivity is standardized through a communication which evacuates as much as possible trans-semiotic and amodal enunciative compositions. Thus it slips towards the progressive

effacement of polysemy, prosody, gesture, mimicry and posture, to the profit of a language rigorously subjected to scriptural machines and their mass media avatars. In its extreme contemporary forms it amounts to an exchange of information tokens calculable as bits and reproducible on computers.

In this type of deterritorialized assemblage, the capitalist Signifier, a simulacrum of the imaginary of power, has the job of overcoding all the other Universes of value. (Guattari 1995, 104–5)

Digital technology is canceling the singular enunciative composition of polysemy, gesture, and voice, and tends to produce a language that is subjected to the linguistic machinery. While analyzing the standardization of language, Guattari simultaneously looks for a line of escape from the informational submission (*assujettissement*).

An initial chaomic folding consists in making the powers of chaos co-exist with those of the highest complexity. It is by a continuous coming-and-going at an infinite speed that the multiplicities of entities differentiate into ontologically heterogeneous complexions and become chaotised in abolishing their figural diversity and by homogenising themselves within the same being-non-being. In a way, they never stop diving into an umbilical chaotic zone where they lose their

extrinsic references and coordinates, but from where they re-emerge invested with new charges of complexity. It is during this chaomic folding that an interface is installed—an interface between the sensible finitude of existential Territories and the trans-sensible infinitude of the Universe of reference bound to them. Thus one oscillates, on the one hand, between a finite world of reduced speed, where limits always loom up behind limits, constraints behind constraints, systems of coordinates behind other systems of coordinates, without ever arriving at the ultimate tangent of a being-matter which recedes everywhere and, on the other hand, Universes of infinite speed where being can't be denied anymore, where it gives itself in its intrinsic differences, in its heterogeneous qualities. The machine, every species of machine, is always at the junction of the finite and infinite, at this point of negotiation between complexity and chaos. (Guattari 1995, 110–111)

Guattari here questions the relation between the finite and infinite in the sphere of language. He is mapping the territory of the informational rhizome, that was not yet completely discovered when *Chaosmosis* was written. The ambiguity of the info-rhizomatic territory is crystal clear: info-technology is standardizing subjectivity and

language, inscribing techno-linguistic interfaces which automatize enunciation.

We are tracing here the dynamic of a disaster, the disaster that capitalism is inserting into hyper-modern subjectivity, the disaster of acceleration and panic. But simultaneously we have to look for a rhythm which may open a further landscape, a landscape beyond panic and beyond the precarious affects of loneliness and despair.

In the chapter on aesthetic paradigm in *Chaosmosis*, Guattari rethinks the question of singularity in terms of sensitive finitude and the possible infinity of language.

The conscious and sensitive organism, the living individuality walking towards extinction, is finite. But the creation of possible universes of meaning is infinite. Desire is the field of this tendency of the finite towards a becoming-infinite.

To produce new infinities from a submersion in sensible finitude, infinities not only charged with virtuality but with potentialities actualisable in given situations, circumventing or dissociating oneself from the Universals itemised by traditional arts, philosophy, and psychoanalysis [...] a new love of the unknown... (Guattari 1995, 161)

The finitude of the conscious and sensitive organism is the place where we imagine projections of

infinity which are not only virtual, but also a potentiality of life, and that can be actualized in situations.

We are on the threshold of a deterritorialized and rhizomatic world, realizing the antioedipal, schizo-form dream. But this dream is becoming true in the form of a global nightmare of financial derealization. On this threshold we have to imagine a politics and an ethics of singularity, breaking our ties with expectations of infinite growth, infinite consumption, and infinite expansion of the self.

In the preface to his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Wittgenstein writes: "in order to draw a limit to thinking we should have to be able to think both sides of this limit (we should therefore have to be able to think what cannot be thought)." (Wittgenstein 1922, 27)

And he also writes:

The limits of my language mean the limits of my world. Logic pervades the world: the limits of the world are also its limits. So we cannot say in logic, "The world has this in it, and this, but not that." For that would appear to presuppose that we were excluding certain possibilities, and this cannot be the case, since it would require that logic should go beyond the limits of the world; for only in that way could it view those limits from the other side as well. We cannot think

what we cannot think; so what we cannot think we cannot say either. (Wittgenstein 1922, 68)

And finally, he writes: "The subject does not belong to the world: rather, it is a limit of the world."

When Wittgenstein says that the limits of language are the limits of the world, he is saying something that should be read in two different ways. First, he is saying: what we cannot say we cannot do, we cannot experience, we cannot live, because only in the sphere of language can we interact with the reality of Being. But he is also saying that, because the world is what resides within the limits of our language, what therefore lies beyond the limits of language will only be able to be lived and experienced once our language is able to elaborate that sphere of Being that lies beyond the present limit.

In fact, the philosopher writes: "the subject does not belong to the world, rather it is a limit of the world."

The potency and extension of language depends on the consistency of the subject, on his or her vision, on his or her situation. And the extension of my world depends on the potency of my language.

Guattari calls "chaosmosis" the process of going beyond the limits of the world, and he calls this going beyond resemiotization: i.e., a redefinition

of the semiotic limit, which is also the limit of the experimentability of the world.

Scientists call this effect of autopoietic morphogenesis "emergence": a new form emerges and takes shape when logical linguistic conditions make it possible to see it and to name it. Let's try to understand our present situation from this point of view.

Digital financial capitalism has created a closed reality which cannot be overcome with the techniques of politics, of conscious organized voluntary action, and of government.

Only an act of language can give us the ability to see and to create a new human condition, where we now only see barbarianism and violence.

Only an act of language escaping the technical automatisms of financial capitalism will make possible the emergence of a new life form. The new form of life will be the social and instinctual body of the general intellect, the social and instinctual body that the general intellect is deprived of inside the present conditions of financial dictatorship.

Only the reactivation of the body of the general intellect—the organic, existential, historical finitude that embodies the potency of the general intellect—will be able to imagine new infinities.

In the intersection of the finite and infinite, in the point of negotiation between complexity and chaos, it will be possible to generate a degree of complexity

greater than the degree of complexity that financial capitalism is able to manage and elaborate.

Language has an infinite potency, but the exercise of language happens in finite conditions of history and existence. Thanks to the establishment of a limit, the world comes into existence as a world of language. Grammar, logic, and ethics are based on the institution of a limit. But infinity remains unmeasurable.

Poetry is the reopening of the indefinite, the ironic act of exceeding the established meaning of words.

In every sphere of human action, grammar is the establishment of limits defining a space of communication. Today the economy is the universal grammar traversing the different levels of human activity. Language is defined and limited by its economic exchangeability: this effects a reduction of language to information, an incorporation of technolinguistic automatisms into the social circulation of language.

Nevertheless, while social communication is a limited process, language is boundless: its potentiality is not limited to the limits of the signified. Poetry is language's excess, the signifier disentangled from the limits of the signified.

Irony, the ethical form of the excessive power of language, is the infinite game that words play to create and to skip and to shuffle meaning.

A social movement, at the end of the day, should use irony as semiotic insolvency, as a mechanism of disentangling language, behavior, and action from the limits of the symbolic debt.

IRONY AND CYNICISM

Mass Zynismus

In his book *The Courage of Truth*, a transcription of lectures delivered at the College de France in 1984, Michel Foucault speaks of Diogenes and the other ancient philosophers known as cynics, and defines their thought as a practice of telling the truth (*parrhesia*). Twenty-five years later, the word cynicism has acquired a totally different meaning, almost the opposite: the cynic is someone who routinely lies to everyone, especially to him or herself. An intimate lie, the contradiction between speech and belief, lies at the core of contemporary cynicism. Still, there remains a kind of consistency between the ancient notion of cynicism—rigorous truthfulness, individualism, ascetic behavior, and disdain for power—and our own, which consists largely of lip service, moral unreliability, and conformist subjugation to those in power. This consistency lies in an awareness of the ambiguous nature of language, and an ability to suspend the