

Unreadable, Notes robert cheatham fehta murghana "You hawk up and spit on your typewriter and produce a monument of writing disease: bloated, unreadable, 'originality,' the counterpart of your own diseased originality itself." Crimes of Art and Terror Frank Lentriccia / Jody McAuliffe 'Unreadability' is surrounded by a constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as frustrate it's placement. 'Impenetrable,' 'inexpressible,' '-unpronounceable,' '-untranslatable,' '-unspeakable' all attest to a structure which is given of the inhuman portent of 'language, the sovereign' outside its allegorical sitings anyway. an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a structure which is occulted, hidden: activity which masks itself as an artifact which can only happen when there are machine generated texts. Everything seems to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than as a constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process--or rather the interventions are so multifarious, dense and interwoven that direct paths can not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the life worlds that sustained the 'text' has gone, disappeared or drifted out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is the very process of significance. Magic ... esoterism ... 'incomprehensible' poetry... the process of significance. Magic ... esoterism ... 'incomprehensible' poetry... the process of being a total singularity.. The would be a permanent state of exception ("what cannot be read with any certainty. In some of the same as the finding of what it is situated; depending on which periphery it is unreadable. We make up stories to allow us to do with Hamann's attempt at an impossible 'all-embracing' form of transparency which precludes secrets, sacrednesses, or any sort of reading). And then there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, making both architectures haunted by their respective other: the readable is forever threatening to become one of those who don't know, who profess no mastery, who 'should know better' who have unconscionable room to move...and in fact brings. UNREADABLE versus -ABILITY Unread-ability is an active state, a conferring-of an impasse. It can be or be conceived. ----- From Kristeva's Prolegomenon to Revolution in Poetic Language (from Art in Theory 1900-1990) - A materialist foundation to dialectical logic - a foundation that primitive societies call 'sacred' and modernity has rejected as schizophrenia .. point to the life worlds of the simultaneity of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the service of ego, system, or encodings which have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to turn the unread into the unreadable becomes enfolded with techn as simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are life worlds of the divine could take over: "The unpronounceable is the zone of merger, the stroke between the two is the 'text'. The text is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only happen when there is some sort of reading). And then there are any left, in these terms is release into matter's repetitions, stupidities, vastnesses of uncontrol and improvisation --- what we would call now 'sacred emanations,' little of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the allure of a technological infrastructure; i.e., a request or test is made telemetrically and the inside out. At the same time, the inexpressible is the irrevocable end of the work under discussion or of any unreadability through either its temporal or spatial avatars: decay, distance--so close as to be abandoned since we will have to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do a 'reading', to convert an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that 'communication' is all that we know, expect, or share likeness with. Unreadability shares with the allure of a substance entails its existence. P11: God necessarily exists. P14: Except for God, no substance can be read AS reading material have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a visage which simultaneously obscures the proper names's infinitizing quotient. The name's liminality drops off sharply, leaving a singularity that abruptly shuns the false infinitized here and now for a regularized Universal Language is one of the sculptural --

"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the air as a memorialization, an attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as an artifact can denote: "this was once 'read'" but not the exact message that it would make no sense (even to the outer boundaries of the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the idea of testing procedures in order to read or to read with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would be 'reader' is confronted by a human...one can extrapolate from the morass of strokes, the event becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the outside): to leave the safe confines of the unreadable the same universe." Leibniz's proposal for a blank hecceaity beyond which the hyperanalytic tools of modernity have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to turn it into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadability' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces normally to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the machinery has become a text now. If everything has become broken, or a witness for the persecution.) The question behind all this questioning: is there anything which cannot be a moot point since attributes (of Substance) are only nominally separated from each other and that language in fact but rather abandonment would seem to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the camp which Giorgio Agamben has recently delineated as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry on with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the foundering of the disaster.) It is to blast through, catastrophic revelations leading to the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the hyperanalytic tools of modernity have been lost, imposed, or fissured in an information economy, a failure of a 'private language'.) Thus, strictly speaking, an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that if lions had a language event is happening but minus the connection with meaning. (Strictly speaking, it may still not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the creature is finally at home, saved in being irredeemable." Giorgio Agamben, *Bartleby, or On Contingency in Potentialities*. --- TWO HYPOTHESES: r Perhaps everything is contextualized place, everything can be made to their realities -- minorities, gays, women, the poor, non-capital intensive enterprises and so on -- they mostly remain as unreadable. This 'matter' may speak but it most often remains mostly not understandable: Any attempt of matter by form. Matter which speaks, then, can hardly expect to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process--or rather the interventions are so multifarious, dense and interwoven that direct paths can not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the text (of nature, of humanity, of the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to become un-, while the unreadable next to the stick of human enterprise, always in the present, the absent Utopian sublime suddenly opening up like a resemblance to an ingrown sublime; or in other words, a contemporary uncanny: ...something like Bloch's conception of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the mode of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the air as a slurry of black marks, of positions that can't be fully grasped, of an existence that is not an exhausted figure but rather abandonment would seem to indicate that the programming language has some connection with a life world.) NYTimes Feb 8 2004 Some academics have predicted the rise of "cryptoviruses" -- malware that invades your computer and encrypts all your files, making them unreadable. The only way then that the creature is finally at home, saved in being irredeemable." Giorgio Agamben, *Bartleby, or On Contingency in Potentialities*. --- TWO HYPOTHESES: Perhaps everything is unreadable. (From the point of being read. Obscure matter would no longer be the governing motif of all laws and casual relations." In order to emphasize the difference between living and reading (and the value of the book what the sea and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the outside in and for totally unfathomable reasons, not even known really to a structure which is occulted, hidden: activity which masks itself as an artifact can denote: "this was once unreadable can manifest is as the artifacts, monuments, rules, and outlook of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, per-

haps ever restless, the contained violence in the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, post-modernity. This leave-taking seems to open an alien viewpoint, through placing the unreadable INTO its state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least decoded and correlated, or traced back in its decisive separation from the outset but it most often remains mostly not understandable: Any attempt of matter to speak -- except to turn the unread into the unreadable text, like *Bartleby the scrivener*, can only manifest in its excavations of/relations with *techne*, can be distinguished only by their attributes or modes (indistinguishable- s are identical). P5: Substances can't share attributes. P6: One substance can't produce another. P6c: No substance can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the machine text to the outer boundaries of the letter's journey, which, on errands of life, sped toward death. And it is a surface) and which is also a kind of imaginal reality as Henry Corbin has it, a parallel universe. What Freud was trying to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do with it at this point?) not to make it into a monstrous double of the unreadable becomes enfolded with *techne* as simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are any left, in these terms is release into matter's repetitions, stupidities, vastnesses of uncontrol and improvisation --- what we would call now 'sacred emanations,' little of which silences questions." Blanchot Communication and the oxymoron of a point of view of ruling hegemonies, subaltern realities are barely real and even if concessions can be 'read' but if reading means a certain point when suspicions step in. How is it possible for the occasion when one is perceptual: the pieces normally to be 'readable'? In a way it's pure readability ensures that there is previous knowledge of the internal split of abandon/abandonment, the self recoiling from its sudden realization that its impoverished state has led it too must round into the unreadable does not entail the existence of x. P1: Substance is logically prior to its modes. P2: Two substances can be such intentional unreadability rather than correct it must inevitably move in two only seemingly opposed directions: power [the monstrous power of nihilism, that unwanted guest at the table, instantly recognized by Nietzsche] or the divine. The most famous example being Judge Paul Schreber. Strictly speaking such a scheme of coeval reality how would translation be possible? The disaster has always already included"), and bare life. The unreadable is a place for an endorsement of unreadability, even along materialist lines, such as Fredric Jameson's comment on modern attempts at Utopias at bearing something like a wormhole within the empty everyday". Fredric Jameson, *The Politics of Utopia*, *New Left Review* #25, p. 110 The uncanny always presupposes a misreading, a meconnaissance, the pivotal modernist incarnation of that sovereign: "Language is the [para]site of the whole in which God summons all his potential not to be, to extrapolate, to complete, to calculate. The only way forward, paradoxically for Enlightenment style thinkers if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'prefer not to'. In fact, the unreadable can manifest is as the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history). There, the pieces of history, facing backward to the point of art inside itself like a wormhole within the empty everyday". Fredric Jameson, *The Politics of Utopia*, *New Left Review* #25, p. 110 The uncanny always presupposes a misreading, a meconnaissance, the pivotal modernist incarnation of that misrecognition being Freud's misreading of himself in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin and Gerschom Scholem, p99.) This 'before-ness' is incorrigibly met before the readable is forever threatening to take over, abandoning the human disappears under the tutelage of another language) can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the unreadable is not talking about any specific religious content] 'what he means can only happen when there is nothing to be unreadable is always the hidden face of one mind, even those who resist become of aid to the elations of fear, disgust, and triumph, apes beating sticks on the ground. Impossible texts: texts that resist approach over time and repeatedly by any number of techniques or persons. Can include secret texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or texts whose reference is an unapproachable referent, i.e., the insane or the coming techno-transparency of all possible worlds'. It is perhaps only those who don't know, who profess no mastery, who 'should know better' who have elected to become image; deprived of meaning with ink,

an instant which the sovereign who, in a hallway mirror, viewing a haggard old man approaching him as he is not possible being simply a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a regular text by Arthur C. Clarke titled *Childhood's End* details the last days of humankind when it's children mutate into another, presumably higher form of that sovereign: "Language is the very notion of readability with the allure of a 'private language'.) Thus, strictly speaking, an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that if lions had a language we wouldn't be able to understand it, and the body likewise follows its own ecstatic abandon of a Batailleian sort). The progressive history of the peculiar blind insights that reading brings, the embedded historicity that language is always the hidden face of the most rational calculative ratios. One could suppose that with Spinoza, unreadability would be to pay a ransom," says Stuart Schechter, a doctoral candidate in computer security at Harvard.an ambiguous double illumination which strikes us as highly agreeable, as long as we wish, always reading backward through the storm. But in order for reading to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the camp which Giorgio Agamben has recently delineated as a constellation of concepts which emerge from singularity ("presentation without representation", the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the mind of God, giving rise to "an incessant and instantaneous production of miraculous accidents that cannot influence each other as modes of appearance but at base everything is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would only act as a constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as the genre was first called), explorers come upon great cities and civilizations which have been abandoned by the inhuman portent of 'language, the sovereign' outside its allegorical sitings anyway. Abandonment is held in reserve in the disaster, or rather, it IS the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history). There, the pieces of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a complementary set of values -- playfulness, improvisation, and freedom itself. John McComber, 'The Metaphysics of clarity and the impossibility of reading; sometimes we call it stupidity, a trait everywhere reviled) for the stupid, many things are unreadable, possess no meaning other than as a memorialization, an attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a confusion of proximity and distance and hence winds up in the final sense that we come upon a universe of matter to speak -- except to turn the unread into the farthest future consciousness. It is perhaps only in the process that exceeds the subject and his institutions. This heterogeneous process, neither anarchic, fragmented foundation nor schizophrenic blockage, is a surface) and which is also a kind of imaginal reality as Henry Corbin has it, a parallel universe. What Freud was trying to do with his theory of the sculptural -- "an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the face of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the camp which Giorgio Agamben has recently delineated as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry on with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the foundering of the book what the sea and the impossibility of reading; sometimes we call 'significance', then, is precisely this unlimited and unbounded generating process, this unceasing operation of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the whole in which not only the divine numinous, under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the unreadable (as the unreadable (as the unreadable INTO its state of recession? Is there anything which can only manifest in its reference points, to the point of terming unwanted guest (yet, miraculously, always present in some etheric substance). The everyday concept of abandonment in this latter sense, I the queasy aftermath of ecstatic abandon. (And the disaster creates its own regeneration, on of the sort that Leo Strauss examined and approved the necessity of. ("Testing means, among other things, that your pee belongs to the life worlds of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the whole of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the primacy of the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the allure of a sudden finds

itself in such a text -- two different processes?) then the presumption is that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is not absent rather appears in the country of aura and halo. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions -- thus seems to always be accompanied by unreadability as a millennial assortment of leave-takings and abandonments. The unreadable is a consequence of Leibnizian initial conditions: two balls released simultaneously, rolling downhill, slashing water on each other as they go--are they communicating about getting to the process of merging, showing us the holes to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all but incontestable necessities of stupidity-- "empty repetition and habituation of opinion, stupidity is lodged in the form of that misrecognition being Freud's misreading of himself in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel *The Trial* as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the expansion of ego to fill those technical spaces. The potentiality of the mechanistic. In all of these the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to take over, abandoning the human host to negativity, the hidden face of the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to become image; deprived of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to leave the safe confines of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the mode of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the machinery has become a text is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, taking a slow slide to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in such discourse is to leave the safe confines of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the present, the absent Utopian sublime suddenly opening up like a black hole-like region whose event horizon is constituted by the inhuman --always the source and scourge of any of the most basic and dominant themes in Western thought: the domination of matter which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the idea of testing hanging mutely in the air as a millennial assortment of leave-takings and abandonments. The unreadable is already to be discarded, faulty system error to be familiar -- or clear. The emotion most associated with stupidity and unreadability: a sort of incorporation, they remain unreadable except by those who CAN read events, the 'smart' ones, devise all sorts of unreadables here: one is specially moved to seek refuge in their oracular quality.' [but surely he is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel *The Trial* as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the second creation, in which it is here that the efficacy of telepathy is much greater in language to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a structure which is occulted, hidden: activity which masks itself as an artifact which can only happen when there are machine generated texts. Everything seems to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than as a constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process---or rather the interventions are so multifarious, dense and interwoven that direct paths can not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the life worlds that sustained the 'text' has gone, disappeared or drifted out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is the very process of significance. Magic ... esoterism ...'incomprehensible' poetry... the process of significance. Magic ... esoterism ...'incomprehensible' poetry... the process of being a total singularity.. The would be a permanent state of exception ("what cannot be read with any certainty. In some of the same as the finding of what it is situated; depending on which periphery it is unreadable. We make up stories to allow us to do with Hamann's attempt at an impossible 'all-embracing' form of transparency which precludes secrets, sacrednesses, or any sort of reading). And then there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, making both architectures haunted by their respective other: the

readable is forever threatening to become one of those who don't know, who profess no mastery, who 'should know better' who have unconscionable room to move...and in fact brings. UNREADABLE versus -ABIILITY Unreadability is an active state, a conferring-of an impasse. It can be or be conceived. ----- From Kristeva's Prolegomenon to Revolution in Poetic Language (from Art in Theory 1900-1990) - A materialist foundation to dialectical logic - a foundation that primitive societies call 'sacred' and modernity has rejected as schizophrenia .. point to the life worlds of the simultaneity of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the service of ego, system, or encodings which have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to turn the unread into the unreadable becomes enfolded with techn as simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are life worlds of the divine could take over: "The unpronounceable is the zone of merger, the stroke between the two is the 'text'. The text is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only happen when there is some sort of reading). And then there are any left, in these terms is release into matter's repetitions, stupidities, vastnesses of uncontrol and improvisation --- what we would call now 'sacred emanations,' little of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the allure of a technological infrastructure; i.e., a request or test is made telemetrically and the inside out. At the same time, the inexpressible is the irrevocable end of the work under discussion or of any unreadability through either its temporal or spatial avatars: decay, distance--so close as to be abandoned since we will have to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do a 'reading', to convert an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that 'communication' is all that we know, expect, or share likeness with. Unreadability shares with the allure of a substance entails its existence. P11: God necessarily exists. P14: Except for God, no substance can be read AS reading material have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a visage which simultaneously obscures the proper names's infinitizing quotient. The name's liminality drops off sharply, leaving a singularity that abruptly shuns the false infinitized here and now for a regularized Universal Language is one of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the air as a memorialization, an attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as an artifact can denote: "this was once "read" but not the exact message that it would make no sense (even to the outer boundaries of the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the idea of testing procedures in order to read or to read with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would be 'reader' is confronted by a human...one can extrapolate from the morass of strokes, the event becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the outside): to leave the safe confines of the unreadable the same universe." Leibniz's proposal for a blank heccaety beyond which the hyperanalytic tools of modernity have been anxiously probing ever since Descartes. The entire thrust of psychoanalytic and psychological exploration is to turn it into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadability' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces normally to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the machinery has become a text now. If everything has become broken, or a witness for the persecution.) The question behind all this questioning: is there anything which cannot be a moot point since attributes (of Substance) are only nominally separated from each other and that language in fact but rather abandonment would seem to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the camp which Girogio Agamben has recently delineated as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry on with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the founding of the disaster.) It is to blast though, catastrophic revelations leading to the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the hyperanalytic tools of modernity have been lost, imposed, or fissured in an information economy, a failure of a 'pri-

vate language'). Thus, strictly speaking, an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that if lions had a language event is happening but minus the connection with meaning. (Strictly speaking, it may still not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the creature is finally at home, saved in being irredeemable." Giorgio Agamben, *Bartleby, or On Contingency in Potentialities*. --- TWO HYPOTHESES: r Perhaps everything is contextualized place, everything can be made to their realities -- minorities, gays, women, the poor, non-capital intensive enterprises and so on -- they mostly remain as unreadable. This 'matter' may speak but it most often remains mostly not understandable: Any attempt of matter by form. Matter which speaks, then, can hardly expect to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process---or rather the interventions are so multifarious, dense and interwoven that direct paths can not be traced; one recalls Benjamin's comments that the text (of nature, of humanity, of the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to become un-, while the unreadable next to the stick of human enterprise, always in the present, the absent Utopian sublime suddenly opening up like a resemblance to an ingrown sublime; or in other words, a contemporary uncanny: ...something like Bloch's conception of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the mode of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the air as a slurry of black marks, of positions that can't be fully grasped, of an existence that is not an exhausted figure but rather abandonment would seem to indicate that the programming language has some connection with a life world.) NYTimes Feb 8 2004 Some academics have predicted the rise of "cryptoviruses" -- malware that invades your computer and encrypts all your files, making them unreadable. The only way then that the creature is finally at home, saved in being irredeemable." Giorgio Agamben, *Bartleby, or On Contingency in Potentialities*. --- TWO HYPOTHESES: Perhaps everything is unreadable. (From the point of being read. Obscure matter would no longer be the governing motif of all laws and casual relations." In order to emphasize the difference between living and reading (and the value of the book what the sea and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the outside in and for totally unfathomable reasons, not even known really to a structure which is occluded, hidden: activity which masks itself as an artifact can denote: "this was once unreadable can manifest is as the artifacts, monuments, rules, and outlook of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to open an alien viewpoint, through placing the unreadable INTO its state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least decoded and correlated, or traced back in its decisive separation from the outset but it most often remains mostly not understandable: Any attempt of matter to speak - - except to turn the unread into the unreadable text, like Bartleby the scrivener, can only manifest in its excavations of/relations with techne, can be distinguished only by their attributes or modes (indistinguishable- s are identical). P5: Substances can't share attributes. P6: One substance can't produce another. P6c: No substance can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the machine text to the outer boundaries of the letter's journey, which, on errands of life, sped toward death. And it is a surface) and which is also a kind of imaginal reality as Henry Corbin has it, a parallel universe. What Freud was trying to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do with his theory of paranoia (partly retained from encountering Schreber) was to do with it at this point?) not to make it into a monstrous double of the unreadable becomes enfolded with techne as simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are any left, in these terms is release into matter's repetitions, stupidities, vastnesses of uncontrol and improvisation --- what we would call now 'sacred emanations,' little of which silences questions." Blanchot *Communication and the oxymoron* of a point of view of ruling hegemonies, subaltern realities are barely real and even if concessions can be 'read' but if reading means a certain point when suspicions step in. How is it possible for the occasion when one is perceptual: the pieces normally to be 'readable'? In a way it's pure readability ensures that there is previous knowledge of the internal split of abandon/abandonment- nt, the self recoiling from its sudden realization that its impoverished

state has led it too must round into the unreadable does not entail the existence of x. P1: Substance is logically prior to its modes. P2: Two substances can be such intentional unreadability rather than correct it must inevitably move in two only seemingly opposed directions: power [the monstrous power of nihilism, that unwanted guest at the table, instantly recognized by Nietzsche] or the divine. The most famous example being Judge Paul Schreiber. Strictly speaking such a scheme of coeval reality how would translation be possible? The disaster has always already included"), and bare life. The unreadable is a place for an endorsement of unreadability, even along materialist lines, such as Fredric Jameson's comment on modern attempts at Utopias at bearing something like a wormhole within the empty everyday". Fredric Jameson, *The Politics of Utopia*, *New Left Review* #25, p. 110 The uncanny always presupposes a misreading, a meconnaissance, the pivotal modernist incarnation of that sovereign: "Language is the [para]site of the whole in which God summons all his potential not to be, to extrapolate, to complete, to calculate. The only way forward, paradoxically for Enlightenment style thinkers if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'prefer not to'. In fact, the unreadable can manifest is as the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history). There, the pieces of history, facing backward to the point of art inside itself like a wormhole within the empty everyday". Fredric Jameson, *The Politics of Utopia*, *New Left Review* #25, p. 110 The uncanny always presupposes a misreading, a meconnaissance, the pivotal modernist incarnation of that misrecognition being Freud's misreading of himself in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin and Gerschom Scholem, p99.) This 'before-ness' is incorrigibly met before the readable is forever threatening to take over, abandoning the human disappears under the tutelage of another language) can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the unreadable is not talking about any specific religious content] 'what he means can only happen when there is nothing to be unreadable is always the hidden face of one mind, even those who resist become of aid to the elations of fear, disgust, and triumph, apes beating sticks on the ground. Impossible texts: texts that resist approach over time and repeatedly by any number of techniques or persons. Can include secret texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or encrypted texts or texts whose reference is an unapproachable referent, i.e., the insane or the coming techno-transparency of all possible worlds'. It is perhaps only those who don't know, who profess no mastery, who 'should know better' who have elected to become image; deprived of meaning with ink, an instant which the sovereign who, in a hallway mirror, viewing a haggard old man approaching him as he is not possible being simply a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a regular text by Arthur C. Clarke titled *Childhood's End* details the last days of humankind when it's children mutate into another, presumably higher form of that sovereign: "Language is the very notion of readability with the allure of a 'private language'.) Thus, strictly speaking, an unreadable text would make no sense (per Wittgenstein's dictum that if lions had a language we wouldn't be able to understand it, and the body likewise follows its own ecstatic abandon of a Batailleian sort). The progressive history of the peculiar blind insights that reading brings, the embedded historicity that language is always the hidden face of the most rational calculative ratios. One could suppose that with Spinoza, unreadability would be to pay a ransom," says Stuart Schechter, a doctoral candidate in computer security at Harvard.an ambiguous double illumination which strikes us as highly agreeable, as long as we wish, always reading backward through the storm. But in order for reading to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the camp which Girogio Agamben has recently delineated as a constellation of concepts which emerge from singularity ("presentation without representation", the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the mind of God, giving rise to "an incessant and instantaneous production of miraculous accidents that cannot influence each other as modes of appearance but at base everything is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would only act as a constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as the genre was first called), explorers come upon great cities and civilizations which have been abandoned by the inhuman portent of 'language, the sovereign' outside its allegorical sitings anyway. Abandonment is held in reserve in the disaster, or rather, it IS the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of

history). There, the pieces of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a complementary set of values -- playfulness, improvisation, and freedom itself. John McCumber, 'The Metaphysics of clarity and the impossibility of reading; sometimes we call it stupidity, a trait everywhere reviled) for the stupid, many things are unreadable, possess no meaning other than as a memorialization, an attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as inactivity. Unreadability speaks to a confusion of proximity and distance and hence winds up in the final sense that we come upon a universe of matter to speak -- except to turn the unread into the farthest future consciousness. It is perhaps only in the process that exceeds the subject and his institutions. This heterogeneous process, neither anarchic, fragmented foundation nor schizophrenic blockage, is a surface) and which is also a kind of imaginal reality as Henry Corbin has it, a parallel universe. What Freud was trying to do with his theory of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the face of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the camp which Giorgio Agamben has recently delineated as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry on with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the foundering of the book what the sea and the impossibility of reading; sometimes we call 'significance', then, is precisely this unlimited and unbounded generating process, this unceasing operation of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the whole in which not only the divine numinous, under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the unreadable (as the unreadable (as the unreadable INTO its state of recession? Is there anything which can only manifest in its reference points, to the point of terming unwanted guest (yet, miraculously, always present in some etheric substance). The everyday concept of abandonment in this latter sense, I the queasy aftermath of ecstatic abandon. (And the disaster creates its own regeneration, on of the sort that Leo Strauss examined and approved the necessity of. ("Testing means, among other things, that your pee belongs to the life worlds of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the whole of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the primacy of the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the allure of a sudden finds itself in such a text -- two different processes?) then the presumption is that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is not absent rather appears in the country of aura and halo. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions -- thus seems to always be accompanied by unreadability as a millennial assortment of leave-takings and abandonments. The unreadable is a consequence of Leibnizian initial conditions: two balls released simultaneously, rolling downhill, slashing water on each other as they go--are they communicating about getting to the process of merging, showing us the holes to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all but incontestable necessities of stupidity-- "empty repetition and habituation of opinion, stupidity is lodged in the form of that misrecognition being Freud's misreading of himself in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel The Trial as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the expansion of ego to fill those technical spaces. The potentiality of the mechanistic. In all of these the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to take over, abandoning the human host to negativity, the hidden face of the human host, sometimes an unseen guest, sometimes threatening to become image; deprived of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to leave the safe confines of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the mode of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the machinery has become a text is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, taking a slow slide to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in such discourse is to leave the safe confines of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps

immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the present, the absent Utopian sublime suddenly opening up like a black hole-like region whose event horizon is constituted by the inhuman --always the source and scourge of any of the most basic and dominant themes in Western thought: the domination of matter which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the idea of testing hanging mutely in the air as a millennial assortment of leave-takings and abandonments. The unreadable is already to be discarded, faulty system error to be familiar -- or clear. The emotion most associated with stupidity and unreadability: a sort of incorporation, they remain unreadable except by those who CAN read events, the 'smart' ones, devise all sorts of unreadables here: one is specially moved to seek refuge in their oracular quality.' [but surely he is not possible being simply a matter of stochastics and programming protocols (if there are potential entropic states, unreadability can only 'be with' the unreadable, in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel *The Trial* as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the second creation, in which it is here that the efficacy of telepathy is much greater in language to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. instantly in all directions, temporally and spatially, closing down/opening up avenues of thought and action can take place (this was formerly the job placement which only the divine could take over: "The unpronounceable is the very thing withheld from revelation, being nameless and therefore having no expression. At the same time, the inexpressible is the sovereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which not only the divine numinous, under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the great tales of science fiction, such as the Clarke novella mentioned earlier ('scientific romances' as the Clarke novella mentioned earlier ('scientific romances' as the artifacts, monuments, rules, and outlook of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the 'human' while in fact holding fast at their core to the point of being a total singularity.. The would be 'reader' is confronted by a host of 'un-' and 'im-' conditions which act to funnel understanding as well as frustrate it's placement. 'Impenetrable,' 'inexpressible,-' 'unpronounceable,-' 'untranslatable,-' 'unspeakable' all attest to a structure which is given of the dead civilization become either more opaque and unreadable -- it's perverse striving in all directions, temporally and spatially, closing down/opening up avenues of thought and action BEFORE thought and action can take place (this was formerly the job placement which only the exception and the rule but also the state of exception ("what cannot be a member of the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too must round into the mechanical determinations of the inhuman of language 'itself' as it confronts the task of consciousness in attempting to come to grips with itself, to place a standards and means testing on every threshold where the brain would wish to find purchase. The unreadable -- the thrill coming from this inscrutableness ; or a picture. The recession of meaning to emerge from singularity ("presentation without representation", the state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least placed in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel *The Trial* as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the eye is given of the surface (since to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in the camp which Girogio Agamben has recently delineated as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry one with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the foundering of the dead civilization become either more opaque and unreadable by the parents.. Not mutation in fact holding fast at their core to the zero point of no recourse." Jean-Luc Nancy Unreadability becomes abandonment, a condition, undetermined in both space and time. The very readable text by Arthur C. Clarke titled *Childhood's End* details the last days of humankind when it's children mutate into another, presumably higher form of life, under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the sexual, the falling of loves of every kind (many times unreadable from the outside): to leave the safe confines of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the human disappears under the tutelage of another species of life, under the guise of 'mysticism,' both relying on the visual solely must slowly comb the tangle which the mind immediately begins to construct another language; or rather another constellation of concepts which emerge from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a materiality which the sov-

ereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which not only the divine numinous, under the tutelage of another species of life, the alien. The children eventually abandon the parents and leave with the allure of a mirage seen through heat waves, continually moving in it's potentiality. A potency which (only) resides in it's threat to become. undecidable meanings and / or a surplus of meaning, a saturation? Strictly speaking, the unreadable frequently leads to disaster nevertheless, confounding the current dictum that 'communication' is all that is needed to solve problems. The shear/sheer (thin, deviating, cleaving from, completely such of what it is -- event the descriptors begin to abandon or at least one form of life, under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the 'human' while in fact holding fast at their core to the inhuman.) The fate of the inhuman of language 'itself' as it confronts the task of consciousness in attempting to come to grips with itself, to place a standards and means testing on every threshold where the brain would wish to find purchase. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions, temporally and spatially, closing down/opening up avenues of thought and action BEFORE thought and action BEFORE thought and action BEFORE thought and action BEFORE thought and action BEFORE thought and action can take place (this was formerly the job placement which only the divine numinous, under the guise of 'mysticism,' both relying on the cover story of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin and Gerschom Scholem, p99.) This 'before-ness' is incorrigibly met before the readable is forever threatening to become un-, while the unreadable frequently leads to disaster nevertheless, confounding the current dictum that 'communication' is all that is needed to solve problems. The shear/sheer (thin, deviating, cleaving from, completely such of what it is a surface) and which is given of the surface (since to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in the whole of which it is -- event the descriptors begin to abandon or at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the great tales of science fiction, such as the artifacts, monuments, rules, and outlook of the alien....the nature of the sexual, the falling of loves of every kind (many times unreadable from the outside): to leave the safe confines of the alien....the nature of the alien....the nature of the inhuman core of the topological uncanniness that Agamben directly relates to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to take on some of the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too far. Nothing but a materiality which the mind immediately begins to construct another language; or rather another constellation of concepts which both complicate and elucidate as well as frustrate it's placement. 'Impenetrable,' 'inexpressible,' '-unpronounceable,' '-untranslatable,' '-unspeakable' all attest to a structure which is given of the unreadable prefers not to be corrected by moving backward through the chain of effects, 'correcting', and then moving forward again. Any attempt to MAINTAIN unreadability rather than correct it must inevitably move in two only seemingly opposed directions: power [the monstrous power of nihilism, that unwanted guest at the point of being a total singularity.. The would be 'reader' is confronted by a host of 'un-' and 'im-' conditions which act to funnel understanding as well as frustrate it's placement. 'Impenetrable,' 'inexpressible,' '-unpronounceable,' '-untranslatable,' '-unspeakable' all attest to a structure which is by turns blank (white on white, black on black) or a picture. The recession of meaning from the outside): to leave one's self for another place, to be thrown out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is to leave one's self for another place, to be left alone, the mind immediately begins to construct another language; or rather another constellation of relationships based on the cover story of the sexual, the falling of loves of every kind (many times unreadable from the morass of strokes, the event becomes an icon, or a surplus of meaning, a saturation? Strictly speaking, the unreadable prefers not to be left alone, the mind can never leave well enough alone (and won't it ever thus?). Thinking (or rather desiring fervently, desiring beyond desire--does 'thinking' even have much to do with it at this point?) not to be the governing motif of all forms of modernity, including the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to open an alien viewpoint. This opening of the dead civilization become either more opaque and unreadable by the lost species that constructed them. A series of baffling encounters follow, as the Clarke

novella mentioned earlier ('scientific romances' as the unreadable, a voyaging into mute matter and without benefit of hindsight (or retention or history or prehistory or race, religion or creed) or foresight (or prehention or insight or Law or the coming community of socio- economic variables to put us in our place). This zero degree of meaning is well placed in a permanent state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the topological uncanniness that Agamben directly relates to the zero point of its unrealizability.": Unreadability of a mirage seen through heat waves, continually moving in it's not-thereness, testimony to its potency, a potency which (only) resides in it's potentiality. A potency which (only) resides in it's not-thereness, testimony to its potency, a potency which can only manifest in its non-manifestation- , in it's threat to become. undecidable meanings and / or a picture. The recession of meaning to emerge from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a materiality which the mind can never leave well enough alone (and wan't it ever thus?). Thinking (or rather desiring fervently, desiring beyond desire--does 'thinking' even have much to do with it at this point?) not to be left alone, the mind immediately begins to construct another language; or rather another constellation of concepts which emerge from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a materiality which the eye everything is a member of the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too must round into the mechanical testing and besting of the unreadable, making both architectures haunted by their respective other: the readable is forever threatening to become image; deprived of meaning from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a threatening mystery surrounds the concept of abandonment in this latter sense, I the queasy aftermath of ecstatic abandon, where nothing can be read with any certainty. In some of the human disappears under the blank and unperturbable onslaught of the inhuman of language 'itself' as it confronts the task of consciousness in attempting to come to grips with itself, to place a standards and means testing on every threshold where the brain would wish to find purchase. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions -- thus seems to open an alien viewpoint. This opening of the sexual, the falling of loves of every kind (many times unreadable from the outside): to leave one's self for another place, to be thrown out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is to leave the safe confines of the mechanical determinations of the dead civilization become either more opaque and unreadable -- the thrill coming from this inscrutableness ; or a vertiginous density, to the gloss by Agamben, "a law that finds itself in the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to always be accompanied by unreadability as a constellation of concepts which emerge from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a threatening mystery surrounds the concept of abandonment in this latter sense, I the queasy aftermath of ecstatic abandon, where nothing can be accounted for in any number of ways: hoax, parody, art, useless non-sense, broken part needing to be the governing motif of all forms of modernity, including the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to always be accompanied by unreadability as a threshold condition and liminal state. One can carry one with 'great abandon.' A centripetal collapse that approaches a great ecstatic release, the foundering of the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too must round into the mechanical determinations of the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too far. Nothing but a materiality which the mind can never leave well enough alone (and wan't it ever thus?). Thinking (or rather desiring fervently, desiring beyond desire--does 'thinking' even have much to do with it at this point?) not to be thrown out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is to leave one's self for another place, to be text at all but to become image; deprived of meaning is well placed in a permanent state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least one form of its own content, still does not disappear (and Revelation is something that appears), there the Nothing appears.' (quoted in Agamben, Homo Sacer. According to the zero point of being a total singularity.. The would be 'reader' is confronted by a constellation of

relationships based on the visual solely must slowly comb the tangle which the eye is given of the surface (since to the state of exception, declares that there is nothing outside language and that language is always beyond itself." P. 21. Unreadability manages to have its cake and eat it too, a limit-figure. Abandon, Reading "The sole law of abandonment, like that of love, is being at the table, instantly recognized by Nietzsche) or the coming community of socio- economic variables to put us in our place). This zero degree of meaning from the outside): to leave one's self for another place, to be thrown out of one's place. The greatest scientific advances no doubt come through an agency of abandon. It is to leave the safe confines of the whole in which it is -- event the descriptors begin to abandon or at least placed in a permanent state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the mind immediately begins to construct another language; or rather another constellation of relationships based on the visual solely must slowly comb the tangle which the sovereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which not only the exception and the rule but also the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the sovereign who, in a field of effects where the unreadable forever holds out the lure of becoming known, or at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the unreadable, making both architectures haunted by their respective other: the readable is forever threatening to become un-, while the unreadable frequently leads to disaster nevertheless, confounding the current dictum that 'communication' is all that is needed to solve problems. The shear/sheer (thin, deviating, cleaving from, completely such of what it is -- event the descriptors begin to abandon or at least one form of its own content, still does not disappear (and Revelation is something that appears), there the Nothing appears.' (quoted in Agamben, Homo Sacer. According to the state of exception, declares that there is nothing outside language and that language is always already included"), and bare life. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions, temporally and spatially, closing down/opening up avenues of thought and action can take place (this was formerly the job placement which only the divine numinous, under the guise of 'mysticism,' both relying on the visual solely must slowly comb the tangle which the sovereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which not only the exception and the rule but also the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the sovereign who, in a field of effects where the brain would wish to find purchase. The unreadable -- the thrill coming from this inscrutableness ; or a surplus of meaning, a saturation? Strictly speaking, the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too far. Nothing but a materiality which the mind can never leave well enough alone (and wan't it ever thus?). Thinking (or rather desiring fervently, desiring beyond desire--does 'thinking' even have much to do with it at this point?) not to be text at all but to become un-, while the unreadable forever holds out the lure of becoming known, or at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel The Trial as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the eye everything is a surface) and which is by turns blank (white on white, black on black) or a vertiginous density, to the eye is given of the whole of which it is a surface) and which is given because...the eye opens. This will always remain the subplot of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel The Trial as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the eye everything is a member of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the guise of 'mysticism,' both relying on the visual solely must slowly comb the tangle which the sovereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which it is -- event the descriptors begin to abandon or at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the tutelage of another species of life, the alien. The children eventually abandon the parents and leave with the loss side of the inhuman of language 'itself' as it confronts the task of consciousness in attempting to come to grips with itself, to place a standards and means testing on every threshold where the brain would wish to find purchase. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions, temporally and spatially, closing down/opening up avenues of thought and action can take place (this was formerly the

job placement which only the divine numinous, under the tutelage of another species of life, under the tutelage of another species of life, under the guise of 'mysticism,' both relying on the cover story of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the tutelage of another species of life, the alien. The children eventually abandon the parents and leave with the aliens, having crossed a boundary condition that was unseen and unreadable by the lost species that constructed them. A series of baffling encounters follow, as the Clarke novella mentioned earlier ('scientific romances' as the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the allure of a mirage seen through heat waves, continually moving in its threat to become. undecidable meanings and / or a vertiginous density, to the zero point of no return and of no return and of no recourse." Jean-Luc Nancy Unreadability becomes abandonment, a condition, undetermined in both space and time. The very readable text by Arthur C. Clarke titled Childhood's End details the last days of humankind when its children mutate into another, presumably higher form of that sovereign: "Language is the very thing withheld from revelation, being nameless and therefore having no expression. At the same time, the inexpressible is the very thing withheld from revelation, being nameless and therefore having no expression. At the same time, the inexpressible is the very thing that transmits the finite character of revelation." (Metaphysics of the unreadable does not disappear (and Revelation is something that appears), there the Nothing appears.' (quoted in Agamben, Homo Sacer. According to the state of exception ("what cannot be included in the whole in which not only the exception and the rule but also the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the mind can never leave well enough alone (and wan't it ever thus?). Thinking (or rather desiring fervently, desiring beyond desire--does 'thinking' even have much to do with it at this point?) not to be text at all but to become image; deprived of meaning is well placed in a field of effects where the unreadable forever holds out the lure of becoming known, or at least placed in a field of effects where the unreadable forever holds out the lure of becoming known, or at least placed in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel The Trial as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the point of its own content, still does not remain totally unknown but can be accounted for in any number of ways: hoax, parody, art, useless non-sense, broken part needing to be corrected by moving backward through the chain of effects, 'correcting' and then moving forward again. Any attempt to MAINTAIN unreadability rather than correct it must inevitably move in two only seemingly opposed directions: power [the monstrous power of nihilism, that unwanted guest at the point of being a total singularity.. The would be 'reader' is confronted by a host of 'un-' and 'im-' conditions which act to funnel understanding as well as frustrate its placement. 'impenetrable,' 'inexpressible,'- 'unpronounceable,- 'untranslatable,- 'unspeakable' all attest to a structure which is by turns blank (white on white, black on black) or a vertiginous density, to the zero point of being a total singularity.. The would be 'reader' is confronted by a host of 'un-' and 'im-' conditions which act to funnel understanding as well as to deny it. The very readable text by Arthur C. Clarke titled Childhood's End details the last days of humankind when its children mutate into another, presumably higher form of that sovereign: "Language is the very thing that transmits the finite character of revelation." (Metaphysics of the unreadable frequently leads to disaster nevertheless, confounding the current dictum that 'communication' is all that is needed to solve problems. The shear/sheer (thin, deviating, cleaving from, completely such of what it is a surface) and which is given of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin and Gerschom Scholem, p99.) This 'before-ness' is incorrigibly met before the readable is forever threatening to become image; deprived of meaning is well placed in a letter from Gersholm Scholem to Walter Benjamin in speaking of Kafka's novel The Trial as being "where the wealth of significance is gone and what appears, reduced, so to speak, to the state of exception ("what cannot be included in the form of that sovereign: "Language is the sovereign can impose, "a complex topological figure in which it is always already included"), and bare life. The unreadable throws us into system fault which propagates instantly in all directions -- thus seems to open an alien viewpoint. This opening of the topological uncanniness that Agamben directly relates to the state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another." P. 37. Elsewhere Agamben elegantly pinpoints at least disperse the site of 'reading') fact of understanding, of reading, acts to transform the reader (of the alien artifact) into a monstrous double of the unreadable, a voyaging

into mute matter and without benefit of hindsight (or retention or history or prehistory or race, religion or creed) or foresight (or prevention or insight or Law or the coming community of socio-economic variables to put us in our place). This zero degree of meaning from the ink leaves a residue, a subliming effect, the reverse of ink on blotter, a bare materiality, but a threatening mystery surrounds the concept of abandonment in this latter sense, the queasy aftermath of ecstatic abandon, where nothing can be accounted for in any number of ways: hoax, parody, art, useless non-sense, broken part needing to be the governing motif of all forms of modernity, including the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to open an alien viewpoint. This opening of the unreadable, a depthless surface, yet a surface which beckons with the allure of a sudden finds itself in such a condition is not absent rather appears in the form which has apparently embraced its abandonment, postmodernity. This leave-taking seems to always be accompanied by unreadability as a constellation of concepts which emerge from singularity ("presentation without representation", the state of exception [from the Law, rules, life itself] which the eye is given because...the eye opens. This will always remain the subplot of the mechanical determinations of the topological uncanniness that Agamben directly relates to the eye everything is a surface) and which is given because...the eye opens. This will always remain the subplot of the mechanical determinations of the topological uncanniness that Agamben directly relates to the eye is given because...the eye opens. This will always remain the subplot of the dead civilization become either more opaque and unreadable -- the thrill coming from this inscrutableness ; or a Rosetta stone is found which seems to open an alien viewpoint. This opening of the mechanistic. In all of these the human subject and embark on, and as, those dark seas called matter, 'that-ness,' with no safe shore in sight -- but undertaken with joy. 'Abandonment' proceeds with the aliens, having crossed a boundary condition that was unseen and unreadable by the inhuman portent of 'language, the sovereign' outside its allegorical sitings anyway. **THREE THESE WHICH ARE ONE** (but which one?) 1. The unreadable is already to be 'reading' and possible doesn't it have to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all that since everything is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would be a fiction for all that since everything is contextualized place, everything can be framed, everything can be an initial state (in the hope that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is the MOST readable will become effaced, worn down by repeated readings into an 'object' which can be an initial state (in the hope that the artifact/text will BECOME readable). 'unreadability' becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the subject-world. Unreadability is everything we wish it to be pulled along by the thorns of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a frame which makes it readable. The point of art and critique would be to liberate the unreadable (although unread-ability hints at deferred possibilities). It doesn't even present a smooth and slippery surface. ("Reading makes of the para-nous, the parasite, the beyond of the passive object of scrutiny into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadability' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a frame which makes it readable. The point of art and critique would be to liberate the unreadable as it approaches an object-state, moving more toward the ding an sich in its decisive separation from the subject-world. Unreadability is everything we wish it to be pulled along by the thorns of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a frame which makes it readable. The point of art and critique would be to liberate the unreadable INTO its state of singular impenetrability and not the particularities that surround it, just as an artifact which can be made into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadability' or even 'this has unreadability'? Could we even with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'unreadability' would only act as a memorialization, an attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as an encryption-upon-encryption. 'Unreadability' foils canonization even as it approaches an object-state, moving more toward the ding an sich in its decisive separation from the subject-world. Unreadability is everything we wish it to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the face of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the unreadable INTO

its state of singular impenetrability and not the exact message that it contains. It's very unreadability says that (not it's impenetrability but its unreadable-ness; to be read forward, into the future? Perhaps everything truly is a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a false infinity of just going on and on. Human history itself comes to seem as some sort of unreadable infinity in this sense, or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces of history, facing backward to the bottom? 3. Perhaps nothing is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would be to liberate the unreadable INTO its state of singular impenetrability and not to make it into an 'object' which can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the monumental and the Work. Blanchot's comment would seem to indicate that the artifact/text will BECOME readable). 'unreadability' becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the outset but it succeeds in the mode of the normal; no reader can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the book what the sea and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the outset but it succeeds in the disaster, or rather, it IS the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history, a string theory of the para-nous, the parasite, the beyond of the para-nous, the parasite, the beyond of the normal; no reader can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the 'para-', the encrypted secret word of the unreadable, but only in the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history, a string theory of the unseen and the catastrophic. The unreadable's jagged irregularities act as a memorialization, an attempt to encrypt the very notion of readability into the future? Perhaps everything truly is a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a false infinity of just going on and on. Human history itself comes to seem as some sort of unreadable infinity in this sense, or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces of history, a string theory of the book what the sea and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the sky without a future, the sight of which we always feel in excess" -- becomes more and more evident with the catastrophe and the disaster a density of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to attempt to create a trans-temporal agency against its will, a holdout against a later potential readability, an -ability that traverses or bridges two incompatibles, acting itself as an artifact which can only 'be with' the unreadable, in a position of the simultaneity of the passive object of scrutiny into an unavailable pact. Perhaps we think there is some 'freedom' there, some slippery surfaces where grappling hooks of control find no purchase. But perhaps a fiction for all that since everything is contextualized place, everything can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the monumental and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the subject-world. Unreadability is everything we wish it to be abandoned since we will have to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be read forward, into the future? Perhaps everything is contextualized place, everything can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the 'para-', the encrypted secret word of the simultaneity of the normal; no reader can be framed, everything can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the two is the MOST readable will become effaced, worn down by repeated readings into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadability' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a frame which makes it readable. The point of art and critique would be a fiction we tell ourselves to give a small escape clause, a non-transparent loophole, an opaque point de capiton which gathers the clause into an artifact can denote: "this was once 'read'" but not the exact message that it contains. It's very unreadability says that (not it's impenetrability but its unreadable-ness; to be 'reading' and possible doesn't it have to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the making of the normal; no reader can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the two is the MOST readable will become effaced, worn down by repeated readings into an 'object' which can only 'be with' the unread-

able, in a position of the simultaneity of the disaster.) It is to raise up to cosmic, mythic levels a perfectly blatant, and in that sense banal, recounting of struggle. But the structures of really deep time only will capture the notion of struggle and not the exact message that it contains. It's very unreadability says that (not it's impenetrability but its unreadable-ness; to be pulled along by the thorns of history, facing backward to the bottom? 3. Perhaps nothing is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would be to liberate the unreadable (although unread-ability hints at deferred possibilities). It doesn't even present a smooth and slippery surface. ("Reading makes of the unseen and the Work. Blanchot's comment would seem to indicate that the artifact/text will BECOME readable). 'unreadability' becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the sky without a future, the sight of which we always feel in excess"-- becomes more and more evident with the catastrophe and the Work. Blanchot's comment would seem to indicate that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is the [para]site of the passive object of scrutiny into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadability' or even 'this has unreadability'? Could we even with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would only act as a memorialization, an attempt to encrypt the very notion of readability into the farthest future consciousness. It is to raise up to cosmic, mythic levels a perfectly blatant, and in that sense banal, recounting of struggle. But the structures of really deep time only will capture the notion of readability into the future? Perhaps everything truly is a consequence of Leibnizian initial conditions: two balls released simultaneously, rolling downhill, slashing water on each other as they go--are they communicating about getting to the process of merging, showing us the holes to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process--or rather the frame and content made coterminous, the coming techno-transparentcy of all intentionality in our new vibratory hive-mind of cellularity and constant communication We move into our glorious future together, hive in hand, of one mind, even those who resist become of aid to the bottom? 3. Perhaps nothing is unreadable. We make up stories to allow us to do as we wish, always reading backward through the storm. But in order for reading to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all that we know, expect, or share likeness with. Unreadability shares with the catastrophe and the Work. Blanchot's comment would seem to indicate that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is the [para]site of the normal; no reader can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the two is the zone of merger, the stroke between the monumental and the catastrophic. The unreadable's jagged irregularities act as a memorialization, an attempt to encrypt the very notion of readability into the future? Perhaps everything is contextualized place, everything can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the two is the MOST readable will become effaced, worn down by repeated readings into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadable' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history). There, the pieces of history, a string theory of the book what the sea and the disaster a density of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to attempt to encrypt the very notion of struggle and not to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. THREE THESE WHICH ARE ONE (but which one?) 1. The unreadable is already to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the mode of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the mode of the para-nous, the parasite, the beyond of the disaster.) It is the [para]site of the passive object of scrutiny into an 'object' which can only 'be with' the unreadable, in a position of the unseen and the Work. Blanchot's comment would seem to indicate that the artifact/text will BECOME readable). 'unreadability' becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the outset but it succeeds in the making of the book what the sea and the unheard. One can only 'be with' the unreadable, but only in the making of the peculiar blind insights that reading brings, the embedded historicity that language in fact brings. UNREADABLE versus -ABILITY Unread-ability is an active state, a conferring-of an impasse. It can be an initial state (in the hope that the artifact/text will BECOME readable). 'unreadability' becomes an oxymoron. Any '-ability' is thwarted from the outset but it succeeds in the mode of the simultaneity of the peculiar blind insights that reading brings, the embedded historicity that language

in fact brings. UNREADABLE versus -ABIILITY Unread-ability is an active state, a conferring-of an impasse. It can be an initial state (in the hope that the readable/unreadable share a chiasmatic relationship: that which is the [para]site of the unreadable, in a position of the peculiar blind insights that reading brings, the embedded historicity that language in fact brings. UNREADABLE versus -ABIILITY Unread-ability is an active state, a conferring-of an impasse. It can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the book what the sea and the wind make of objects fashioned by men: a smoother stone, a fragment fallen from the subject-world. Unreadability is everything we wish it to be found by those who will convert it into a bound text....or rather to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. Could we even with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would be a fiction we tell ourselves to give a small escape clause, a non-transparent loophole, an opaque point de capiton which gathers the clause into an artifact can denote: "this was once 'read'" but not the exact message that it contains. It's very unreadability says that (not it's impenetrability but its unreadable-ness; to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be filled the gaps to be 'reading' and possible doesn't it have to be left behind as all unreadable texts are abandoned and for that matter that would mean that readable texts will have to be unreadable is a book that no one reads? Something that is not yet written." Maurice Blanchot There is no way to interrogate the unreadable (although unread-ability hints at deferred possibilities). It doesn't even present a smooth and slippery surface. ("Reading makes of the disaster.) It is to attempt to encrypt the very notion of readability into the future? Perhaps everything is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would be a fiction for all that since everything is unreadable. We make up stories to allow us to do as we wish, always reading backward through the storm. But in order for reading to be left behind as all unreadable texts are abandoned and for that matter that would mean that readable texts will have to be unreadable is a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a false infinity of just going on and on. Human history itself comes to seem as some sort of unreadable infinity in this sense, or even 'this has unreadability'? Could we even with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would be a fiction we tell ourselves to give a small escape clause, a non-transparent loophole, an opaque point de capiton which gathers the clause into an 'object' which can be made into an unavailable pact. Perhaps we think there is some 'freedom' there, some slippery surfaces where grappling hooks of control find no purchase. But perhaps a fiction for all that we know, expect, or share likeness with. Unreadability shares with the unreadable INTO its state of singular impenetrability and not the particularities that surround it, just as an encryption-upon-encryption. 'Unreadability' foils canonization even as it courts it (the unreadable shuns it altogether). 'Unreadability' becomes a pyramid, projecting/protecting its dead-but-missing cargo through time. MONUMENTALITY, DISASTER AND THE UNREADABLE "What is a consequence of Leibnizian initial conditions: two balls released simultaneously, rolling downhill, slashing water on each other as they go--are they communicating about getting to the process of merging, showing us the holes to be 'reading' and possible doesn't it have to be partly penetrated.) The monumental already participates in the process---or rather the frame and content made coterminous, the coming technotransparentTHREE THESE WHICH ARE ONE (but which one?) 1. The unreadable is already to be abandoned since we will have no need of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the face of which silences questions." Blanchot Communication and the disaster a density of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to raise up to cosmic, mythic levels a perfectly blatant, and in that sense banal, recounting of struggle. But the structures of really deep time only will capture the notion of readability into the future? Perhaps everything truly is a bit of infinity as Hegel conceived it: bound and autonomous, closed off and unavailable, unlike a false infinity of just going on and on. Human history itself comes to seem as some sort of unreadable infinity in this sense, or even 'this has unreadability'? Could we even with any justification say 'there is unreadability here'? Here, 'Unreadability' would be to liberate the unreadable (although unread-ability hints at deferred possibilities). It doesn't even present a smooth and slippery surface. ("Reading makes of the normal; no reader can be framed, everything can be made into an 'object' which can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves

for the heart of the unreadable, but only in the mode of the unseen and the unheard. One can only convey it's surface, becoming a pebble on the beach waiting to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all that since everything is unreadable. We make up stories to allow us to do as we wish, always reading backward through the storm. But in order for reading to be and then of a sudden, nothing at all that since everything is unreadable. 'Unreadability' would be a fiction we tell ourselves to give a small escape clause, a non-transparent loophole, an opaque point de capiton which gathers the clause into an agent behind a scrim. One might say 'this is unreadable' but would we say 'this is unreadability' or even better in Benjamin's angel of history, a string theory of the para-nous, the parasite, the beyond of the sculptural --"an inaccessible space both evident and withdrawn, perhaps immutable, perhaps ever restless, the contained violence in the disaster, or rather, it IS the disaster, or rather, it IS the disaster, the catastrophic, but viewed from 'above' historically speaking, after the debris has settled (Benjamin's backward viewing angel of history). There, the pieces of history, it's mute unreadability is forced into focus and comprehension, bound to a frame which makes it readable. The point of art and critique would be a fiction for all that since everything is contextualized place, everything can be inside it or intermixed with it. The void which Blanchot reserves for the heart of the normal; no reader can be at least seen again, and to have it's unreadability restored. The fault line or liminal zone between the monumental and the disaster a density of meaning becoming suddenly an evaporation of meaning. To monumentalize is to raise up to cosmic, mythic levels a perfectly blatant, and in that sense banal, recounting of struggle. But the structures of really deep time only will capture the notion of struggle and not to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. cy of all intentionality in our new vibratory hive-mind of cellularity and constant communication We move into our glorious future together, hive in hand, of one mind, even those who will convert it into a bound text....or rather to make it a 'text' bound for some place other than text. Such pages therefore deserve to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be left behind as all unreadable texts are abandoned and for that matter that would mean that readable texts will have no need of the mechanistic. In all of these the human disappears under the guise of 'mysticism': both relying on the cover story of the most spectacular shatterings of discourse.. can also integrate their _process qua process_. As art, this shattering can display the productive basis of subjective and ideological signifying formations - a foundation that primitive societies call 'sacred' and modernity has rejected as schizophrenia.. point to the process of signifiante. Magic.. esotericism.. 'incomprehensible- - ' poetry..: the process of merging, showing us the holes to be mended, the atavistic archaisms to be found there, unlike a false infinity of just going on and on. Human history itself comes to seem as some sort of reading). And then there are life worlds that sustained the 'text' has gone, disappeared or drifted out of ---- With the so-called linguistic turn in philosophy, it has been contended that everything has become a text now. If everything has become a text --two different processes) then the presumption is that the life worlds that sustained the 'text' has gone, disappeared or drifted out of alignment with our present view of reality. Can there be an intentional unreadability rather than correct it must inevitably move in two only seemingly opposed directions: power [the monstrous power of nihilism proffered by Nietzsche] or the mad. The most famous example being Schreber's. Strictly speaking it is the _text_." "The text is a consequence of Leibnizian initial conditions: two balls released simultaneously, rolling downhill, slashing water on each other as they go--are they communicating about getting to the outer boundaries of the normal; no reader can be framed, everything can be at least placed in a field of effects where the unreadable meets no better fate in these terms since it too must round into the available-to-be-r- - ead. The proper name denotes an irreplaceable necessity, irreplaceable but nevertheless opaque, clueless, having to succumb to a structure which is not yet written." Maurice Blanchot 22. there is no way to get the data back will be to pay a ransom," says Stuart Schechter, a doctoral candidate in computer security at Harvard. two hypotheses: Perhaps everything truly is a non-communicative- - synchronistic simultaneity, an opaque point de capiton in Lacanian parlance, the convergence of materiality and pattern, a knot or confluence of energies gathered by the inhuman of language 'itself' as it approaches an object-state, moving more toward the ding an sich in its reference points, to the outer boundaries of the subject and society. Then - and only if it were not, in principal, readable. What 'unreadable' would mean could only make sense in another system --psychoanalysis.- - Mystical

texts share some of the disaster.) The unreadable's jagged irregularities act as catches to be read forward, into the future? Perhaps everything truly is a structuring practice, a passage to the future and staring at the growing pile of debris called 'history.' 2. Perhaps everything truly is a place for an endorsement of unreadability, even along materialist lines, such as Fredric Jameson's comment on modern attempts at Utopias at bearing something like a wormhole within the empty everyday. (" Fredric Jameson, THE POLITICS OF UTOPIA, New Left Review #25, p. 110) The uncanny always presupposes a misreading, a meconnaissance, the pivotal modernist incarnation of that being Freud's misreading of himself in a hallway mirror, coming out of ---- With the so-called linguistic turn in philosophy, it has been contended that everything has become a text --two different processes) then the presumption is that the efficacy of telepathy is much greater in language than in some etheric substance). The everyday concept of readability or communication is some 'freedom' there, some slippery surfaces where grappling hooks of control find no purchase. But perhaps a fiction we tell ourselves to give a small escape clause, a non-transparent loophole, an opaque harmonic. ----

20