

67th Lecture at the Gramsci Monument, The Bronx, NYC: 5th September 2013
AFFIRMATION OF CONTINGENCY
Marcus Steinweg

1. The subject has never been anything but a specter.
2. The rift that divides it cuts through it from the very beginning by making it teeter on the cutting edge between presence and absence, infinity and finitude, ideality and reality.
3. That man disappears “like a face drawn in the sand at the edge of the sea”¹ means that this disappearance is the mode of his being, that he must resign himself to being the index of his own inexistence; yet an efficient inexistence, an agile and, if we may say so, an operative absence.
4. We might also say that the subject, though impossible (as a full subject of consummate autonomy, self-transparency, etc.), nonetheless asserts, as this impossibility, a certain subject-status.
5. For what is the subject if not the relation to its own impossibility?
6. Within the horizon of the analytic of finitude that supplants the “metaphysics of the infinity,” Deleuze writes, man is “traversed by an essential disparity, almost an *alienation by rights*, separated from itself by its words, by its works, and by its desires.”²
7. It would be wrong to misconstrue this alienation as coming upon man *a posteriori*.
8. It is part of man or of the subject as a sort of originary possession.
9. The rift, the disparity, the *différance* (the spatialization, the split, etc.) are elemental structural features of a subject that, instead of resting (and taking a rest) on an eternal apriori that would serve it as the stage on which to act the

owner of its realities, represents the placeholder for the inexistence of such an apriori, a shaky entity not substantiated by any ontological guarantee.

10. We might also speak of an uncovered credit, a credit to be redeemed by the future, by its indeterminacy and contingency.
11. The thinking that is of itself in relation to the obscure is the thinking of such contingency.³
12. It owes its agility and flexibility to the absence of substantial structures that would absolutely prefigure its being in the sphere of objective finitude: in *reality*.
13. And yet this very sphere—the space of socially, economically, politically, culturally, historically, technologically, etc. codified fact—burdens the subject that inhabits it with hetero-affects that distinctly structure it.
14. We ought not to regress to the Rousseauism of a clean separation between an innocent natural state of the subject and its empirical alienation.
15. The law of alienation affects the subject from the very outset.
16. There is no pure subject, unconcerned by heteronomies: not outside the fantasies of those beautiful souls who interpret any contact with reality as a threat to their narcissistic integrity and must accordingly shun it at any cost.
17. The obscure to which any subject is related *qua* subject marks the incommensurability of its world (of a world, however, that is not *its*), the uncontrollability factor of the reality of fact.
18. Control and self-control are fundamental parameters of occidental metaphysics.

19. The aim was always to furnish the subject with instruments that were to help it minimize the share the uncontrollable had in its existence and its external realities, which is to say as much as, to shrink the incommensurable down to commensurabilities in order to generate at least the sentiment of improved protection against contingency affects.

1 Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 422.

2 Deleuze, "Humans: A Dubious Existence," 91.

3 Let us be on our guard against the misconception that the relation to the obscure is mystical esotericism and cheap obscurantism. Not to avoid the obscure that marks contingency, to confront it as lucidly as possible, is the law of philosophical anti-obscurantism *par excellence*.