

## Metalepsis Seminar / Virtual Session 4

[metalepsis seminar](#) / WAAC-PSU / 22 January 2014

### CHIRALITY AND DJANA/DJANUS

METALEPSIS SEMINARIANS, 9-ERS, AND AUXILIARY MEMBERS:



### \* the ever-expanding idea of chirality

Of course the question should be, "why should the topics of chirality, silent trade, information theory, inventory/collecting, and fetish be related in the first place?" Welcome to the world of metalepsis, which (thanks to Genette's formulas and the predication calculus) circulates its own polar vortex of ideas, adding a few, losing a few, but always making new discoveries. Just as chiasmus led to the discovery of Simonides' secret of memory, chirality takes us to the [perennial story of Diana and Actæon](#), both hunters, and invites us to add to the centuries of commentaries, interpretations, misprisions, falsifications, impertinences, misappropriations, and sometimes insights.

We have on our side the **polythetic method**, which allows us to keep all the rot alongside the good stuff, because as good Freudian-Lacanian, we know that one sinthome begets another. There is always a reason for a "slip of the tongue" that gets something wrong, so we never throw away the errors — in fact they are our stock and trade. Not throwing away the "marriage" of Hestia and Hermes led to some interesting conclusions, no?

Monothesis is a political ploy, and to understand it we have to bring up the *matheme* for university discourse, S2/S1—a/\$. We can add [Allan Pero's](#) ("The Chiasm of Revolution: Badiou, Lacan, and Lefèbvre") insight that ...

S2 | a (privation)

S1 | \$ (prohibition)

Pero calls privation "impossibility" and prohibition is "impotence." Our contribution to the Pero idea is that privation is a natural barrier that is converted into a cultural one, most directly through the phallic rule, which is also the Twins Rule (can't be in the same place at the same time — the basis of "transitive" boundaries in space and time).

Just as a is "naturally" outside of the range of the Symbolic (1—it cannot be symbolized, 2—the Symbolic and its networks cannot work smoothly with it there), the master's relation to the subject (and mastery's relation to subjectivity) is put in terms of transgression. So now you see why they make you work so hard to get a Ph.D.? All those secret meetings and trick questions ... and you thought it was a meritocracy!



Privation (the impossibility of assimilating/domesticating the *objet petit a* in any symbolic networks or expressions) is converted into the *prohibitions of the Other* as a condition of subjectivity's "barred" status, and that sends us directly to the formulæ for sexuation — the Woman as the not-all. Not-all of anyone who has decided to call herself "woman" is subject to the phallic rule (incl. the twins rule), and THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONS.

In other words, as [Russell Grigg](#) puts it, Lacan subscribes to an "intuitionist logic" rather than a constructionist one. This means that you can't get an X by negating not-X. Not-not-X is not X in intuitionist terms. It is "not-all" (*pas-tout*) X. This means that ladies get in free, hah hah — that the relation of the feminine to boundaries is quite interesting, so the VIOLATION of boundaries, as in the case of Actæon — descendent of Cadmus who, like Tiresius, saw coupled snakes and was punished by the gods (and don't forget the caduceus which is the sign on the license plate of all doctors who are "followers of Asklepius"). Two snakes coupling is another way of writing the Uroboros, the self-consuming reptile that symbolizes the boundary of the visible universe, a.k.a. Okeanos.



African uroboros

The interesting thing is that at the edge of the known world we have the boundary between civilization and the Other, which in European history is represented as the boundary between the inventory and the (spiritually cathected) savage. True fact.

Another true fact:

$\sim(\forall x)\Phi x \rightarrow (\exists x)\sim\Phi x$  (not-all of the "woman" is subject to the phallic rule, no exceptions).

So, the next time you're tempted to sniff at Lacan's *matheme* of the not-all, think about Magellan, or Vasco da Gama, or Cortez! Then review your thoughts about the INVENTORY and the SINTHOME. You will wonder why there was not more of a brouhaha at the boundaries of the European œcumene and the rest of the world. This is perhaps the essence of the friction between global capital and Islam (or any other sinthome-intense system).

Diana in the graphic above is shown with a javelin I prefer the bow, and I think you may guess why! (☺).

## \* cashing in on Allan Pero's "discourse" predications

The chirality of the discourses is that privation (the twins rule for example,  $\sim\sim P=P$ ) gives way to the "not-all"

position, i.e. that "in theory you can do something but you SHOULDN'T." And, we can fantasize about doing it; we can imagine transgression. Furthermore, Grigg and Pero taken together point to the idea that privation and prohibition are, as Pero's symbolism suggests, reverse predicates of each other. When the Other contains the Agent, we have privation; when the TRUTH contains PRODUCTION, we have prohibition. But, more basically, the left and right take place containing and being contained, giving rise to conversions of impossibility to transgression. Actæon transgresses. Djana reverse predicates. Here are some quick translations of the main discourses in "Pero-ese":

**MASTER-SERVANT:** there is no real "universal" in the chain of symbolic networks/formations, but this lack is converted into  $\$ \diamond a$ , fantasy about the role of the S1.

**HYSTERIC:** there is no subjective access to mastery, but this lack is converted to a pleasure conceived within the Symbolic — any system that can be used to signify.

**ANALYSIS:** the subject does not have access to his/her own desire — it comes from the Other — but this lack is experienced in terms of the meaninglessness of dreams, the unconscious, sinthomes — i.e. there is no "explanation," S2, for all the S1 evidence. [THE BASIS OF THE MYSTERY STORY, WITH ITS CAUSAL MCGUFFIN]

**UNIVERSITY:** There is no way to symbolize the role of desire other than the command to Enjoy!, but this lack can be converted into a relationship of subjectivity to mastery.

## \* watch demonstrations on YouTube

[The first video](#) in relation to the development of the Djana idea is an analytical section through the famous crane shot in Hitchcock's *Notorious* (1945). This demonstrates Zizek's idea of a "logic of the fetish" — an ever tightening scale-reduction process where, at a critical point, the cathexis that has invested objects with value relative to a broad frame of reference give way to a "sinthomatic" binary code logic that, in this film, mandates a trip to the cellar. This could be called the "theory of the two poisons," since the wine bottles in the cellar contain uranium and, once Alicia is discovered to be a spy, she is held prisoner in the upstairs bedroom, poised by arsenic. Note the role of "reversed predication" in the binary code.

In a longer show, "[binary deduction](#)" reveals that fetishistic-inventory space still contains "demonic" sinthomic space — an overlay of a target on a grid. This demo uses a left-right interrogation to locate a dot positioned within a square field. This "stereognostic" procedure reduces the scale of inquiry by ruling out the spaces where the dot isn't, and a double spiral develops whose "thickness" is based on the left-right automaton of interrogation. This  $\emptyset/\emptyset$  aspect of spiraling is the structure of the "sinthomatic" (demonic) view of space that counters the "inventory" view. In this sense, it parallels Benoit Mandelbrot's idea of internal infinities within fractal space.

### NEWSLITTER ARCHIVE

- 1—[january 1](#)
- 2—[january 8](#)
- 3—[january 15](#)
- 4—[january 22](#)

remember our motto: "unlimited semiosis!"



Don Kunze  
PhD / Prof of Architecture and Integrative Arts, Emeritus  
web: [art3idea.psu.edu](http://art3idea.psu.edu)