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Editor’s Preface vii

1. Publishing History
   a. Initial translation delayed (John Drury, Oster)
   b. Parker revised
      i. Ranciere has “highly allusive prose”
      ii. Challenge to sound as English as possible
2. Polyvalent words [Jonathan Rée “thinking only becomes philosophical when familiar words grow strange”]
   a. Partage – “division” AND “sharing” (viii)
   b. Savant – expert, scholar, or scientist
   c. Fin – end, aim, goal, purpose, conclusion
   d. Comédien – “actor” (neutral) “comedian” (slightly pejorative)

Editor’s Introduction: Mimesis and the Division of Labor ix

[Editor]

Epigraph: “Are they my poor?” - Emerson’s “Self-Reliance”

1. ‘What has philosophy to do with the poor?’
   a. often supposed the poor have no time for phil
   b. men of poor:
      i. plebes, men of iron, demos, artisans, common people, proles, lumpen, series, groups
         in fusion, masses
      ii. shoemaker
   c. Ranciere = in Western thought poor play leading role
      i. Objects of analysis
      ii. Illustrative of phil argument
2. PHP: Bourdieu and Historical Conjuncture
   a. Initially published in 83
   b. 20 years of “detours” (each with their own turn) (x)
      i. seminar on Capital
      ii. protest interrupts thesis on Feuerbach
      iii. university-factory
      iv. 10 yrs in worker archives
3. Late 70s/early 80s (xi)
   a. Initially thought the image of working class = autonomous
   b. But found that there was not class “in itself”
      i. No universal ‘pride in work’
      ii. Desired escape
   c. “we look too much at worker culture and not enough at its encounters with other cultures”
   d. imitation (block quote)
   e. mélange – “hybridity” (xii)
      i. constitutive iterability, imitative incorporation of discursive norms foreign to itself
4. Nights of Labor
   a. evenings of mid-19C French workers – Writing
   b. “doubly and irremediably excluded for living as workers did and speaking as bourgeois people did
      i. list of names
   c. anti-positivist social history
      i. not authenticity
ii. “what gave this writing its political efficacy was not that it reflected or embodied a specific class identity but that it disrupted such identities in miming the norms of a culture foreign to its writer’s origins”

d. ***EQUALITY
   i. not a theme, but the condition of their performance as a speech event
   ii. FN on later Ranciere on equality
e. Critique of NOL (xiii)
   i. “a-conceptual”
   ii. no historical or philosophical model
      1. it’s free indirect discourse cf. D&G’s linguistics
      2. impossible to separate Ranciere form the characters

5. PHP
   a. PHP appears to be phil v/v NOL
      i. Differentiate authorship
      ii. Engages classical Western philosophy
   b. But it’s not classical phil
      i. Attempt to mark closure of poor from W Phil
         1. Obj/subj (cf. Lukacs)
      ii. Can one critique from the inside? (of a closure, eg of phil) (xiv)
         1. Cretan Liar’s paradox (“I always lie”)
   c. Poor as ersatz of philosophy (ersatz = substitute/replacement, displaced element)
      i. Threatens philosophy, therefore must based phil on it
         1. Œ unfair division
         2. “other”, “supplement”, or strange figure of “abjection” (included outside)
         3. phil creates ‘inoculation’ (cf. autoimmunity)
   d. Plato = artisan
      1. *****→ philosophy as totalitarian practice (vb xiv-xv)
   e. Marx
      i. poor as class has ‘own work’ to do
      ii. contrad (not mélange)
         1. purges hybridity from proles
         2. sacrifices lumpen
      iii. straubinger bohemians = Cretan Liars of communism
   f. Sartre
      i. Subject-groups of worker-philosopher
      ii. R’s critique: world is hybrid (xvi)
         1. Sartre can’t imagine workers who can do two things at once
         2. “luxury” eliminated through serialization
   g. Bourdieu
      i. Reversal of Platonism
         1. R, ‘B only radicalizes platonism’
      ii. R’s critique @ time when socialist gov embraced B
      iii. “B’s sociology assume an inequality even more obdurate than Plato’s”
         1. because “necessary” to B rather than arbitrary for P
         2. a logic only the sociologist can read (204)
         3. “even while condemning philosophy for its naturalization of class distinctions, the sociologist king presupposes the poor can only ever do their own business, for such homogeneity is what Bourdieu’s notion of habitus entails” (cf 178)
         4. ***making the hybrid writer-intellectuals of NOL inconceivable (175) xvii
            a. direct quote 189, 200, 199
b. but Kant/Schiller can...

h. status of NOL
   i. philosophy of appearance
      1. Bachelard: “there is no science but the science of the hidden”
      2. ‘concealed truth reflect only the needs of those who profit from maintaining these distinctions: does mystification exist anywhere but in the words of the demystifier’ (cf 170/173)
   ii. NOT ideology critique nor symptomatic reading (contra Althusser)
      1. Not “linguistic turn”
      2. Shares with deconstruction v/v Plato
   iii. R’s reading of Phaedrus (xviii)
      1. Political -- Democratic Equality
      2. “literarity” [littérarité] structural capacity of writing-equality
      3. “theatocracy” – rule of the audience disdained by Plato
         a. ‘dangerous’ ‘iterative miming of roles not one’s own’
         b. Plato (10-11), Marx (62-3), Nietzsche (121)
      4. ‘division of labor = philosophical attempts to regulate mimesis
         i. Shoemaker is everywhere (xix)
            i. In Republic
            ii. Characteristics:
               1. division of labor (4)
               2. out of place (48)
               3. against the ‘glory’ of work (59)
               4. in unexpected places
            iii. Wagner (61), Marx (68-9)
         j. Autonomous role of Art (xx)

Interlude on Dirk Rembrantsz
1. Dutch Peasant
2. Shoemaker
   a. immiserated
3. Knowledge of mathematics
   a. Cultivated, “often at the expense of his livelihood”
4. Consulted M. Descartes
   a. “had pictured him as most approachable person in the world”
   b. but D was under swiss guard
5. Three Visits
   a. First R was ‘rebuffed as an impudent peasant’
   b. Second, was presented to D as a beggar
      i. Offered money to leave
      ii. R refused the money
   c. Third, D had him welcomed
      i. → close to D
      ii. R becomes one of foremost astronomers of his century

A Personal Itinerary
1. Proceeds from 2-3 questions that are “at once, very simple and very complicated”
   a. How are we to conceived of the relation between the order of thought and the social order – as harmony or as rupture?
   b. How do individuals get some idea in their heads that makes them either satisfied with their position or indignant about it?
c. How are representations of self and other – which sustain hierarchy, consensus, or conflict – formed and transformed?

2. Own history – “a certain number of detours”
   a. “a seminar on Capital called to unexpected notoriety”
   b. “a thesis on Feuerbach interrupted by the din of the street”
   c. “some time spent circulating between university halls and factory doors”
   d. “ten years of research in worker archives”

3. set out as own guide
   a. dissatisfied by teachers
   b. → becoming historian (xxvi)
   c. 1830/50 [fn: NOL]
      i. utopian socialism
      ii. contra working-class expression
         1. ethereal poetry
         2. combating pamphlets
         3. doctrinal newspapers
   d. Questions:
      i. Positivist Question:
         1. what could a person think at such a moment in the history of discourses and in such a position within the order of society?
      ii. ‘more fundamental question:
         1. how can those whose business is not thinking assume the authority to think and thereby constitute themselves as thinking subjects?
      iii. Response:
         1. “when proletarians, in granting themselves permission to think, invaded the territory of the literati, the literati answered evasively by celebrating work as the true culture of the poor and the future of the world, and by warning the representatives of that world of the dangers of developing a split personality”

4. Ranciere’s recollections
   a. Plato’s double-sided betrayal
      i. Borrowed from artisans the paradigms of philosophy
      ii. Ordered these same partisans not to think about anything beyond their jobs
   b. R’s own era:
      i. Homage to labor, prole consciousness, spirit of the people
         1. Perfection of forms of authority
         2. and the discourses of servitude
      ii. was an effort to restore
         1. a class its consciousness
         2. people to its culture
         3. exclusion by homage, most importantly
      iii. typified in Bourdieu’s Distinction
         1. which opposed
            a. prole ‘amor fati’
            b. bourgeois culture games
         2. proles thought as unable to think expert questions [des savants] (xxvii)

5. history of castration of poor = “straight line”
   a. plato
      i. philosoper as weaver
      ii. shoemakers = non-philosophers
   b. modern discourse of experts and leaders
i. virtue of populism  
ii. denunciation of ideological vanities  
c. ‘along the way’  
   i. Marx – prolonged the Platonism he was overturning  
      1. Only gives proles = truth by virtue of their exclusion  
d. But not really a straight line  
   i. Plato’s artisan: “how can justice be established beyond all questions of technique and the hygiene of individual and social preservation?”  
   ii. Opposite: Marx, whose “brutality toward the old moons of the philosophy firmament was purchased at the price of every-recurring lacerations and paradoxes”  
      1. Sancho, not Don Quixote??  
      2. Inconsistent prole but bourgeoisie quick to swoon?  
      3. Work made unending: by ill health or by ‘a more fundamental question regarding the distance between revolutionary justice and social health’?

6. Short apology for the end of the book as polemic
7. ‘closely related thought’ on two presuppositions of his reading (xxviii)  
   a. violated accepted practice of asking author questions that author didn’t ask himself  
      i. power of a mode of thinking = its capacity to be displaced  
      1. “just as the power of a piece of music may derive from its capacity to be played on different instruments”  
   b. doesn’t distinguish between readings recognized/disavowed by a given author  
      i. ie: youth/maturity (contra Althusser’s use of B’s epistemological break in Marx)  
      ii. singular modes of thought = always ‘basically say the same thing’  
      iii. “only imbeciles ever truly change, since they alone are free enough regarding all thought to feel at home in any particular mode of thinking”  
      iv. → “a simple rule of morality: not to take for imbeciles those about whom I was talking, whether they happen to be floor layers or university professors” (cf Gauny the floor layer, chp 3/9)

I. Plato’s Lie

Epigraph  
1. The Order of the City  
   n. Intro  
      a. Plato’s city  
         i. 4-5 persons who provide the material necessities  
         ii. farmer, mason, weaver, shoemaker...  
         iii. masterpiece of economy  
            1. self-miraculating  
               a. no deity or founding legend  
      b. founds sociology  
         i. 19C will be grateful  
         ii. own century = different judgement  
         iii. Aristotle thinks need something more –  
            1. “justice” – power of what is better over what is less good  
            2. → DOL  
      c. R = look for justice in Plato
   o. Fifth Man  
      a. First clue of justice: “fluctuating number of equals”  
         i. Four OR five  
      b. All are equals...
c. But could one person be ‘less’ indispensable?
   i. Shoemaker? (4)
   ii. Plato doesn’t think shoes seem necessary...
      1. Shoemaker always at the front line of DOL argument
      2. As if his “retained some usefulness for the philosopher that goes far beyond the products of his trade”
   iii. Fundamental principle of tradesmen “a person can do only one thing at a time”

d. DOL and Adam Smith (5)
   i. Plato = infinite needs
   ii. Time limited
      1. Not constantly work
      2. But tradesmen must always be ready to work (‘nick of time’)
   iii. (Socrates) Aptitudes distributed among diff individuals

e. More on time
   i. Why must worker always stand ready, esp if there are “off-seasons”?
   ii. Can’t a worker switch tasks?

f. Four Terms “arranging themselves into a pattern” (6) (*****summary)
   i. Countless needs
   ii. Time in short supply
   iii. Workers who are more or less indispensable
   iv. Aptitudes among which we do not know how to distinguish

g. Argument’s “two lame legs”
   i. Arbitrariness of nature and conventionality of social order
   ii. Difference in natures = excuse why one can’t complete 2 diff tasks
   iii. ...and something about time

p. Question of Time

   a. Feuerbach – time is most important category for dialectician
      i. It excludes and subordinates where space tolerates and coordinates

   b. Plato’s time = unique
      i. Not that of physical necessity
         1. Generation, growth, death
      ii. More ambiguous
         1. Half phil/half pop
         2. Half nat/half social
      iii. Not time needed to accomplish task (ergon)
         1. **yes: time that permits or prohibits pastime (parergon)
         2. “beside” necessity to work
         3. leisure (schole) or its absence (ascholia)

c. exclusion
   i. excluded by virtue on ‘absence of leisure’ or time: ascholia
   ii. commonly found relation btwn labor/political order
      1. Xenophon, Aristotle, plato (7)
   iii. Xenophon:
      1. Impossible for artisans to participate in politic life (absence of leisure)
      2. Farmers, however, have the ‘least absence of leisure’ so they can!
   iv. Aristotle = reverse
      1. Artisans ruin democ – too much leisure!
      2. Farmers ‘least bad’, ‘do not have time to exercise their power’
   v. Plato
      1. Also agrees artisans cannot make good citizen
      2. Doesn’t posit it ‘as such’, however
a. In terms of occupations
vi. In *Republic*: ‘matter of fact’
   1. Community – occupations
   2. Differences in natures but no *differences in nature* (8)
   3. Everyone can be a citizen
vii. Doesn’t exclude by reason of baseness of job, just the impossibility of holding more than one job at a time
   1. Only one special category, those whose occupation = two things in one:
      *imitators*
q. The Order of the Banquet
8
   a. Imitators don’t threaten “first city” order
      i. Expand beyond 4-5: 3-4 supplementary categories:
         1. Joiners, smiths, wage earners (heavy labor), exchange (shopkeepers and merchants)
         2. Harmonious, piety, fraternity
   ii. Not communism but egalitarian republic
      1. Labor, vegetarian, pacifist
      2. Production commensurate to need
      3. Apolitical and industrious
      4. Follows anarchist/Malthusian myth
   iii. But justice? Division of labor!?
      1. Glaucon: Socrates’s interlocutor and Plato’s brother (9)
         a. Wants to raise the bar!
      2. Justice = returning of healthy and useful workers to their specific place
b. *New* city where both justice and injustice are possible/thinkable
   i. = Banquet – confusion and distinction
      1. democratic aspiration with aristocratic pomp
      2. simulacra of discourse conspire with reality of needs
r. Imitators, Hunters, and Artisans
9
   a. Order of banquet = order of *mixture*
      i. If city = distr of useful workers
      ii. Politics = ‘motley crowd’ of un-useful
         1. Mass of ‘workers’ who cater to a new range of needs
         2. “superfluous”
   b. ‘superfluous’ can be divided into two types (10)
      i. simple production of luxury goods
         1. acquisition: provide superfluous needs as such
      ii. production of images
         1. imitators: reproduces and falsifies the image of the necessary
c. injustice!
   i. Not luxury that corrupts (it just gives an odd balance to things)
   ii. Imitation!
      1. Socrates attempt to reintroduce imitation into DOL fails
         a. Attempt: ‘human nature is “minted in such small coinage” that one can imitate only one things at a time’
      2. Theater is too strong – tears the DOL to shreds (11)
d. ‘cross-play’ (jeu croisé)
   i. artisan is simple, makes useful objects
      1. no leisure time to be sick – shares virtue with warriors
   ii. imitator
      1. appearances
2. will mix everything into a cacophony

s. Professional Qualification: Dice Players and Exterminators 12
   a. Warriors take from artisans, but not vice versa
   b. New sense of time for artisans: ‘time devoted to professional training’
      i. Could never have time to do anything else, let alone learn arms (13)
      ii. “no one could become an expert players of draughts or dice who did not practice the
          game exclusively from childhood but played it only as a pastime”?
   c. Dice player
      i. Dice player = superfluous
         1. Demonstrates necessity of warrior, to protect taste for luxury/hunting
         2. ‘hunt for superfluous’
      ii. dice payer’s superfluousness corresponds to equivocal necessity of 5th man
         1. & gives the shoemaker’s full employment its meaning
      iii. DOL no longer reflects relationship of usefulness to profession
         1. No longer egalitarian
         2. Rather, ➔ hierarchy of natures
            a. Distribution of aptitudes = distribution of gifts of unequal value
   d. Justice-nature relationship now in question
      i. Indispensable nature of smith, warrior etc no longer establishes egalitarianism (14)
   e. New starting point: warrior as man who ‘could do something else’
      i. Requires special education
      ii. philosophy

t. The Philosophers in the Workshop 14
   a. New role: philosopher who trains warrior (added to artisan apprenticeship of warrior)
      i. Phil too (in add to warrior) is child of luxury
   b. ‘true’ philosophers: laborers in truth, not artisans of appearance (15)
      i. have to mark selves off from imitators
      ii. establish relation to artisans (classic refs incl here)
   c. philosopher looks to weaver in order to create ‘social fabric’
   d. ‘mixing together shoemaking and philosophy’ to purge simulacrum (16)
      i. first, prove philosophy through baseness (‘positivity’ of a sort)
      ii. second, denouncing technique: no mass production
   e. only possible by saying artisan = unique: ‘producer of one thing and one thing only’ (17)
      i. not as a technician of the useful but solely as a monotechnician
      ii. specialization = prohibition against doing anything else
         1. playing, lying and appearance are forbidden
         2. *****painter/sophist aren’t false artisans, they are artisans who transgress
            the rule fixing their status
   f. summary: artisan is the technician who has no right to lie!

u. The Three Metals: Nature’s Lie 17
   a. Hierarchy appears as knowledge and regulation of simulacrum
      i. Science of orders = science of the lie
      ii. Prevents the Promethean threat: democracy or equiv power of tradesmen-people (18)
   b. Philosopher
      i. becomes specialist
         1. in nature and
         2. the lie
      ii. makes him engineer of souls
   c. difference in nature
      i. established solely by philosopher-guardian
ii. not irrational or concealed (and therefore not ‘ideology’)

iii. “a story, declared to be such”
   1. phil = only who has knowledge/power of the lie (‘good lie’)
   2. ‘necessary and sufficient lie’
      a. creates an educational machine

d. the noble lie ... of the three metals
   i. “while all of you in the city are brother, we will say in our tale, the deity who
      fashioned you mixed gold in the makeup of those fit for rule, for which reason they
      are the most precious. In that of the defenders he mixed silver, and iron and brass
      in the makeup of the plowman and other craftsmen” (19)

v. The Two Moneys: Communism in Power  19
   a. 3 metals myth not necc anti-egalitarian
      i. myth of education allows every new generation to be different (iron->gold, etc)
      ii. but seems to operate in only one direction, downward...
         1. the goal then becomes preservation of bottom corrupting top
   b. creates myth to get elites to accept principle of non-ownership of good, preventing
      corruption of the state (20)
      i. creates a reverse trick:
         1. ‘gives us to understand that which is specific to souls of iron is the thinking
            only of money, hard cash, to the exclusion of all symbolic honors’
         2. “the oligarch is the good worker”
         3. “always a potential capitalism and, for this reason, the philosopher can
            stigmatize him while reserving to highborn souls the symbolic current and
            honor and power associated with the rulers’ lack of ownership” (21)
      ii. “to say that the worker cannot be a guardian or warrior is simply to say that he is
          unworthy of being a communist”********
         1. “communism is not the fraternity of the classless society but the discipline of
            a class domination ideally removed from the logic of work and property”

w. Another Banquet, Another Lie  21
   a. “some functions are more indispensable, some qualification more serious”
      i. “the state does not needs so many piece of pottery; it merely needs to know how to
         recognize potters” (22)
         1. and how, if not at their wheel? Maybe just to appear to be at work...
      ii. ***“the danger is not a drop in production but a lack of identity, for while all forms
          of production may be equivalent, the same is not true of identities”
   b. ***artisan has right to one lie: the lie of the specialty that defines ‘his’ being
      i. ‘were so many shoes really needed?’ (no)
      ii. “a true shoemaker is not someone who makes good shoes but someone who does
          not pass himself off as anything other than a shoemaker”*******
      iii. the thing that ‘marks him off’ and serves to ‘put him in his place’
      iv. “a shoemaker is simply a man who is forbidden to engage in any activity other than
          shoemaking” → the philosopher’s “double game” (23)

x. The Virtue of the Artisan  23
   a. Aristotle’s squaring of the circle
      i. Diff btwn functions/natures is primary
      ii. Inequality of virtues establishes hierarchy: everyone naturally condemned to their
          lot in life
   b. But artisan is “an impossible being” (24)
      i. An unthinkable nature
      ii. Free worker – denatured, an accident, neither included/excluded
iii. Hybridity is unworthy of political economy of such and an unpardonable disturbance for the city
c. Plato’s solution?
   i. Artisans don’t have own virtue, must come from outside
   ii. Philosopher-guardians necessary to put them in their place
y. The Paradox of Justice  
a. Justice?
   i. Everyone should do his own business and nothing else
   ii. The DOL that already organizes the healthy city
      1. But the artisans virtue of “moderation” simply means he stays in his place...
      2. Only lie allowed is to cheat on his function...
b. Tyrant Critias and “science” (26)
   i. “the paradoxical fact that in the Platonic city it is not necessary for the specialist to be competent—or, if you wish, that their competence has nothing to do with truth an can even be a lie in order to preserve the only important thing: the “nothing else,” the virtue of those to whom the philosophic lie concerning nature has bequeathed iron as their portion. Missing in Critia’s science and city is this Platonic incompetence, which is the other side of the philosophic lie that anticipate truth and reserves the place of science. The science of good and evil comes by way of the science of truth and lying. The latter must find effect the apportionment (le partage), reserving room for the royal science of the idea of the good. Only lying permits a radical separation of the royal science from the division of competences.” (27)
z. Women, Bald Men, and Shoemakers  
a. First definition of DOL = a double lie (nature and function)
   i. One who is shoemaker by nature should make shoes and nothing else (28)
   ii. Yet we can’t even recognize specific aptitude for shoemaking
b. Or even more: relationship btwn natural apt and social function when new orders challenge old?
   i. Ex: sexual division // chall to sexual aptitude
   ii. (Bad) example: what if ‘bald men’ became characteristic?
c. “anything else”
   i. “the barrier of orders is the barrier of the lie” (29)
   ii. illusion that ‘puts him in his place’
   iii. just a prohibition

2. The Order of Discourse  
a. Intro
   a. Concerns of corruption
      i. Necessity of preserving radical purity of phil
         1. Parvenu = “the only one real enemy of the phil’s city”
            a. Parvenu = newcomer to a socio-economic class
         2. Phil’s exercise of power ‘is not a promotion’
b. Phil can’t seek power, others must call on him to exercise it
   i. How does one know the phil from the imitator?
   ii. Philosopher-guardian doubly menaced
      1. Knows truth
      2. Knows lies
   iii. To distinguish self from ‘technological imitation’, phil must come imitator himself...
      1. Not artisan of lies (31)
2. Not intellectual jack-of-all-trades (bricoleur) (sophist)

c. privileged status of phil (32)
   i. If shoemaking is wide-open, why is phil not? (DOL?)
   ii. Phil not within DOL! (else it would fall into the democ of trades)
   iii. Rather, it’s due to nature
      1. Some bodies cannot accommodate phil,
      2. they are marked & stigmatized by the servitude of the work for which they have been made
         a. *servile labor!
         b. Artisan who meddles in phil = a fugitive slave! (“akin to those who take refuge in the temples”)
   iv. Priv of phil maintained by servitude, not DOL! (33)
      1. “it is for the sake of the phil, not the city, that one must postulate a radical break between the order of leisure and the order of servile labor”

b. From One Cave to the Other
   a. Slavery = metaphor
      i. Plato’s complaint: people attempt to flee the bonds of slavery in the temple of phil
         1. For plato, they don’t desire freedom & be led to the abode of phil
         2. They desire petty spectacle, not the ‘invisible sun of the Idea’
      ii. Philosophers only select the cave prisoners who ask nothing of him
         1. Order of phil = selection, constraint
         2. Functions through the askesis of renunciation “loser takes all”
            a. Ex: Warriors/guardians prove selves through renouncing ownership
            b. Ex: Phil = receive power only through not desiring it (34)
            c. **the surest loser is always the man about who it will be said that he has “nothing to lose but his chains”

   b. counter-story to the cave
      i. the fugitive slave
      ii. sorts access to education
         1. those who try but not worthy are bastards – bald smiths

c. Bastard Thinking
   a. Right to think
      i. No longer Q of labor/class, but philosophical legitimacy
      ii. Birth is critical
   b. Purity through designation of bastardly (35) ("a contrario", argument by proving contrary)
      i. Birth has condemned/marked those with a defect making them not worth of phil
      ii. Differences in bodies, irreducible to moral hygiene
         1. “philosophy is not a medicine but a second birth”
   c. “heritage” (36)
   d. power of the people = greatest vice
      i. the people turn politics into an art of flattery
      ii. a kingdom of parvenus

d. The Philosopher’s Slave
   a. Meno’s slave
      i. Proves science is possible
      ii. But a special science
         1. “drowsy science” of slave is only possible, first, by the phil
         2. to awaken the drowsy science, need to “dialectical provocation of the elect”
      iii. once the experiment is over, the slave returns to nothingness
   b. Plato’s prole subject (38)
      i. the possibility of losing his chains exists only by philosopher’
ii. ‘never lose them except within the rules’

c. link of phil to social
   i. freedom’s relationship to knowledge
      1. “there had been too much play in the knot joining the two”
      2. ‘even a certain Socrates’
   ii. → “virtue cannot be taught”
      1. divine election / initiation
      2. the philosopher chooses who to transform
   iii. some knowledge unleashed / some science chained down (39)
      1. → harmony btw social order and order of discourse
      2. city: 3 classes, no slave
      3. order of disco: freedom or servitude

e. The Babbling Mute
   a. Egyptian tale that “makes the divisions of discourse understandable”
      i. god Theuth and King Thamus – offers writing to help memory and science
      ii. Thamus responds: writing will hurt memory!
   b. Writing (40)
      i. Mute discourse
         1. “external marks” are simulacra – they do not answer questions
         2. cannot “defend itself”
         3. same thing over and over
      ii. living discourse is opp to written (not ‘oral’)
   iii. written is also too loquacious (talkative) – ‘drift’
      1. 'knows neither its audience nor their needs, can trasmit anything anywhere'
      2. does not know the sharing [partage] of the logos
      3. “the uncontrolled democracy of this discourse-at-liberty makes philosophy’s fine titles and beautiful appearances sparkle before the eyes of our too-clever artisans”
      4. bastardy! “it puts the logos at the disposal of men whose work has damaged their bodies and mutilated their souls”
   iv. must pure thought must be divided to protect against imitation (41)
      1. “world of techniques and technicians must be divided from play of appearances that governs the road to the Idea”
      2. “two lives, and everything must be cut in two”
      3. ((a philosophical truth, not a social truth))
   c. tied to the critique of rhetoric
      i. “rhetoric only mirrors the relationship of the rhetorician with his public”
      ii. “but the rhetoritician doesn’t know to whom he is speaking” (like the phil)
         1. rather, he does not want to conduct soul but to hold his public
         2. so the rhetorician only wants to know:
            a. ****the number
            b. “less a technique than merely a routine, a kind of cuisine served not to producers but consumers who always choose the same food”
   iii. “discourse-at-liberty” is put back in its place by Plato’s critique: a discourse in and among fellow slaves

f. The Order of Delirium
   a. Love
      i. Not part of the “the freedom of the discourse that remains in chains”
      ii. Loves is “the privilege reserves to those willing to let themselves be had, to be possessed” (43)
iii. A 'divine delirium' forbidden to shoemakers and their orator because they forbid it to themselves
   1. They only know technique and reproduction
   2. “the people's orator makes discourses on love the way shoemakers make love, which is in fact the way they make shoes”

b. artisan are “securely shut up in the kingdom of the useful”
   i. “the law of delirium authorizes the division of discourse by dividing up the world of imitations that bars and guards access to it”
   ii. two types of imitators:
       1. divinely inspired: dialectician-philosopher
       2. false poet – art of imitation
   iii. “it may well happen that a poet is in fact a sophist, but never that a sophist is a poet”

(44)

The New Barrier

a. “the eschatology of the Phaedrus”
   i. “there is...a clear order overall”
      1. “between the poet and the producer the line is drawn separating daimonic from demiurgic men. The artisan occupies a place from which it is no longer possible to climb back toward the divine”
   ii. a hierarchy of imitation
   iii. missing = hunter (45)
      1. “false imitators... are nothing but hunters – of gifts, votes, or bodies”
      2. “a hunter is only a cook on campaign”

Theatrocracy [la théâtrocratie]

a. The philosopher’s ‘clean sweep’ of the artisan
   i. “divine delirium has put order into the world of imitation”
   ii. “the world of imitations divides itself on the subject of the artisan, leaving to the philosopher the guarding of appearances”

b. ‘displays of the theater’: an un-tidied remainder of the division of imitations
   i. “theatrocracy is the mother of democracy”
   ii. **music (46)
      1. musician gives ‘the common people jurisdiction over his art’
   iii. not just a regulation of spectacles

c. “the power of the musician, the tragedian, or the rhapsodist is a divine power”

(delirium)****
   i. “he only need by beside himself, his eyes filled with tears and his hair standing on end...for his public, too, to be beside itself...lead(ing) back once more to the god who conducts souls where it will”
   ii. “If Ion is truly inspired, the disorder is irremediable”

d. only retains grip if ‘people want and get their money’s worth’ (47)

e. **************complicated argument on spectacle that merits closer inspection
   i. deals with:
      1. turning back into a “regulation of spectacle”
      2. getting people to only love an imitation of the beautiful (rather than the real thing)
      3. reducing the power of spectacle to the non-power of self-congratulation

a. The Chorus of Cicadas

   The “phenomenology of the spectacle” is the inverse of the “nothing else” of specialization
   i. Sociology + aesthetics – puts One and Many in its places
      1. Philosopher as legislature
      2. Shoemaker as one of the noisy multitude (48)
ii. Key is to prevent shoemaker or carpenter from forgetting the diff between useful work and simulacrum

b. True pleasure
   i. Not to ‘please the people’
   ii. Not to ‘please the body’, ease suffering, fill a void, gratify a need...
   iii. But pleasures a contrario the slavish ones – leisure pleasures

c. Leisure as a duty
   i. obligated not to sleep by the ‘signing of the cicadas’
      1. chorus of cicadas = intoxicates with divine music → forget to eat/drink and eventually die as a result!

d. Chorus of Cicadas = “traces the circle that isolates” phil from artisan (49)
   i. “the fact of being incapable of resisting sleep can be used to detect the presence of servile natures among those who are neither bald nor lame nor bastards” (culls)
   ii. a quick jab at the dialectic

e. “the myth of leisure establishes the natural link between the law of labor and that of the theater”
   i. division between dumb music lover and ‘political animals’
   ii. *****softening remark (50)

j. The Division of Appearances 50
   a. Singing of cicadas allows the order of delirium (music / love) to be cut by the barrier of leisure (a duty only afforded to non-artisans)
      i. [But then a love in four pieces...] (51)
   b. “for everything to be cut in tow, a final birth myth is needed”
      i. division into the order illegitimacy (too)
      ii. Penia and Eros: the sociology of functions recuperated by the genealogy of values

c. Delphic Oracle:
   i. To the phil: “know thyself”
   ii. To the artisan “nothing to excess”

k. At the Foot of the Rampart 51
   a. “the philosopher is not afraid that men of iron will get hold of the truth; he is afraid that artists will get hold of appearance”
   b. the philosopher’s exclusion
      i. the philosopher ‘locks the door twice’
         1. first: division of labor (excludes imitators and keepings artisans ‘in their place’)
         2. second: the delirium of inspiration (doubling of appearances) (52)
      ii. also stated, “the philosopher-king invents two sciences”
         1. a sociology that dismisses appearances from the universe of useful functions
         2. an aesthetics that causes the appearances guarding philosophical legitimacy to recoil before the functionaries of the useful
      iii. two figures are distributed on either side of the artisan:
         1. the sophist: negativity and illegitimacy of artisan who has departed from role
         2. the poet: the philosopher-kings companion-buffoon

c. R’s read of Plato:
   i. “that the order of the true can no more be grounded in a science of science than the social order can be grounded in the DOL”
   ii. the lie of art – the noble lie of nature
      1. “the philosopher claims to found the legitimacy of his own lie in the science of the true”
      2. rather, it founds legitimacy by decreeing its own genealogical myths
   iii. not totalitarian, but to protect its own nobility
d. Summary/conclusion
   i. “philosophy can trace the circle of its own autonomy only through an arbitrary
discourse on nature and nobility, a discourse that makes possible its own tension by
imitating its *telos*, perfect nature. But this imitation is forever destined to border on
its own caricature” (53)
   ii. R disagreeing with Nietzsche on the noble lie
   iii. ‘the tavern is at the foot of the rampart’
   iv. a string of references I don’t get.

II. Marx’s Labor

Epigraph
   a. marx attempts to become a “practical man” and get a real job
      a. gets rejected because of his bad handwriting

3. The Shoemaker and the Knight
   a. Intro
      a. Workers songs (whether in a work or in leisure)
         i. “Help maintain that semblance of love which, more than skill, keeps the worker at
his post”
      b. hans sachs (german poet, playwright, shoemaker)
         i. proposes the people as judges
         ii. scrambles everything (Classical) by suggesting a poet-knight, not a fellow artisan
   b. The Insurrection of the Shoemaker
      a. Wagner in 1868 illustrates the great nightmare
         i. The invasion of the shoemakers (into other domains)
      b. Already exists in apprentices
         i. Police & business-owners already recognize (58)
            1. Theater-owners employ them as paid applauders
            2. Police know better than to encourage it
         ii. “the greatest evil lie not in the mass as such but in its *decomposition*”
            1. theater gives them the wrong idea, so police dislike
      c. insurrection of shoemaker
         i. sociologists: pride of the skilled worker & shoemaker virtue
         ii. no shoemaker virtue, only the extension of the classical division
      d. prohibition and hierarchy (59)
         i. order of the guild
            1. on its way out by mid-19C
         ii. “the insurrection of the shoemaker is not a battle *for* their status but a battle *against*
it”
            1. story: luddite son, resisting the profession!
         iii. “nothing else” now protested on two sides:
            1. those who decide to acquire a new skill
            2. those who appropriate the pleasure of appearance the leisures of the
dialectic
         iv. “the routing of nature, the mixing of functions and metals, the passage of
monotechnicians into the motley world of imitators where they counter knights
inspired by divine art and philosophers who hand over their secrets to the people” (60)
            1. proponents of order are disturbed: aesthetic disorder, political disorder,
symbolic disorder, real disorder
2. others are afraid of ‘democracy of the arts’: turning good artisans into imitators
   a. "solution: return pop culture to the people
   b. “anyone who upsets the order of estates can be called a shoemaker”
      (61)
   c. who gets called a shoemaker? Marx!

c. The Night of St. John 61
   a. Wagner’s 1845 fable of shoemaker/knight
      i. Exception to reinforce the rule...
      ii. Functioned through an intermediary
           1. Beckmesser – town clerk and a “marker” (62)
           2. Petty bourgeois – the ‘discount sophist of modern times’
      iii. Positivist-izing of artisanal virtue + pop cultural genius
           1. Shoemaker + Knight
   b. Two critiques: Nietzsche and Marx
      i. For R, Nietzsche’s critique of Wagner only echoes Plato
      ii. Settled by appeal to Theatrocracy & defense of philosophy

d. The Ideologue, the Shoemaker, and the Inventor 63
   a. Marx diff. than Nietzsche
      i. Not territorialized civilization vs barbarism
      ii. An interpenetration of the two
   b. Marx’s critique of Daumer’s philistinism (‘backwardness’): (64)
      i. 1) Ideology as the inability to comprehend the development of productive forces
      ii. 2) ‘the opposition between two theatrical figures of history’
           1. tragic, authentic expression of the struggle between old/new world
           2. comic, derisory reptition of a hist already played out/values dead
      iii. therefore, Daumer is unable to see the “liberating elements in the ruptures of the industrial age” and have nothing to appeal to but a past (R calls it Don Quixote)
           1. that appeal is to repeat an already existent (past?) social form – the productive activity of Nuremberg industry in its golden age (65)
      iv. Marx: Nuremburg is already “stillborn” because it’s hybrid, bastard
   v. ‘overcoming Platonic prohibition’ for Marx
      1. not through hybridity but through textile mills (66)
         a. large-scale industry and the world market
         b. invention of the machine
      2. machine = further specialization
         a. curse for the bourgeoise: compete among each other (suicide)
         b. curse for the prole: must abandon “competence” of artisanship (‘stripped of all positivity’)
   c. R’s own critique of philistinist ‘backwardness’
      i. ‘false nobility’ (67)
      ii. critique of M:
           1. ‘naive pastoral about the communist of the future’
           2. “most important for what it excludes”
              a. industrial fabrication and artistic imitation
              b. “which is certainly the most radical way of not mixing the two”
      iii. “bastardy...is the force of the lie at the very heard of production” (which R says Marx agrees)
           1. numberg was decadent because it was shabby compared to the factory world
   iv. Marx vs Hegel (68)
1. “good history is on the side of tragedy, there where the tragic hero fights against history”
   a. hegel = tragedy → ascension, the moment where powers of nature clash with those of the law of the state
   b. marx – it is sancho panza not don quixote who battles windmills (german ideology)
      i. “the ploughman’s son who thinks only of his stomach and speaks in proverbs”
      ii. the ideologue is not the chimerical dreamer but the strong spirit who “demystifies” knightly illusions (and therefore understands nothing about history)
   v. “for marx, the shoemaker-poet is the man of bad history, the man of the double as opposed to the man of contradiction, the work who wants to improve his status when he must sacrifice it – the man who, in the world of manufacturing, makes prosaic the great pastoral dream” (69)
      1. workers for marx must sacrifice to “machine, science, and combat”
   2. same genealogy of values as nietzsche:
      a. in the division (partage), they oppose the artisans of comic decadence to the knights of tragic decline
      b. tragedy is the grandeur of line in death, comedy the pettiness of death in life
      c. for marx, as for n and plato, there are two ways to be born and to die
  3. “In the face of those who denigrate decadence, the supposed optimism of the theory of productive forces is immediately ripped to piece by the play of two contrary powers: the grand tragedy of water and fire, of production and destruction, and the low comedy of earth and air, of fabrication and imitation. One may talk as much as one likes about marx’s “Promethean” theory, but the body of prometheus is fragmented from the outset. The materialism of history and the dialectics of revolution run the risk of never encountering each other in it.”******

4. The Production of the Proletarian
   a. Intro
      a. history has only one principle
         i. “one first must live in order “to make history””
            1. but life involves simple reproduction
            2. “nothing else” becomes golden rule of worker’s life
            3. a ‘general law of history that resounds obsessively through the rhetoric” of german id and manifesto of communist party
         ii. literary examples...
            1. “unifies the historical process, production” (71)
      b. the order of production
         a. marx’s big reversal is heaven → earth, through production
            i. But humans does a few more things than ‘simple reproduction’ (or production) lets on...
            ii. But production is the ‘point of departure’ for M
               1. Everything is produced, all forms of activity, even society
               2. Everything then traces back to the “iron” (artisanal) production (72)
                  a. Should work to the advantage of the ‘man of iron’
                  b. Philosophers are limit figures, who transform production into its own imitation
c. The Other Cave
   a. Inversion (but not a simple inversion)
   b. Philosopher = reduced to rank of the most backward producer
      i. “philosopher-slave enchained” (73)
      ii. “critical criticism creates nothing” (marx: holy trinity)
   c. “if the king has taken the place of the slave, we still need to know which attributes the slave received from royal power”
      i. shoemaker no longer excluded
      ii. but there’s no philosophical realm to be included (reduced to empirical fact)
         1. no science
         2. universe where all are fabricators and imitators – produce only the illusion of craft

d. The Scaffolding of Work
   a. Who can devote himself to the “empirical observation” of history?
      i. Problem, if: ‘everything is production and people are producers of their ideas at the same time as their material life’
      ii. because “those who ‘perceive’ the process are also the ones who ‘appear to themselves’ in the phantasmagoria produces by this process”
         1. so “there is no german ideology”
         2. bauer/stirner actually do see “things as they are” (it’s all illusion?)
      iii. would have to assume there’s somewhere with less illusion...
   b. ideology, may then be that “each does his own business” where fabrication and imitation, truth and doxa, exchange their powers
      i. everything becomes equivalent
      ii. The ideologues (Proudhon) is someone who tries to the raise a scaffold above the earth to reach the heavens (namely, science) (75)
         1. But doesn’t understand that truth no longer resides in heaven
   c. ‘seeing’ isn’t illusion but the activity of changing things
      i. Proudhon just fabricates where he should see, contemplate where he should change
      ii. But all know-how forges a vision of the world...
      iii. Therefore: ideology is just another name for work (76)*****

e. The Non-Place of Science
   a. both philosopher and worker are then ideologues
      i. therefore, must create a phil who’s not a phil and a worker who’s not a worker
      ii. scientist & prole (non-place or utopian)
   b. science
      i. completely inexplicable
         1. an accident, improbable throw of dice in the orderly play of fabrications/imitations
         2. non-place of all places: truth behind apperance, but deaith in life and nonbeing in being
         3. power of ‘dissolution’ - criticism
      ii. Marx’s book on Hegel (77)
         1. Backwardness of German
            a. Perfect non-place of the old feudal world and new bourgeois world
            b. Prevents political revolution but “draws in outline the future subject of the human revolution”
            c. the prole’s pure identity of being and nobeing
         2. Marx then risks being a science of philistinism
         3. “the ethics of demystification is that of preservation; the ethics of critical science is that of destruction” (78)
f. Labor and Production: The Discreet Charm of the Radical Bourgeoisie 78
   a. Labor
      i. Disappears in 1844 Manuscripts
      ii. Any further use = use of ideologues
      iii. Only thing left = productive forces
   b. Hegel: “the discreet charm of the radical bourgeoisie” (78-9)
      i. Master-slave
   c. ‘cracking the history of production in two’
      i. 1) accumulation of transformations
      ii. 2) revolutionary “getting rid” of labor
         1. to “succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew” (Marx quote: German Ideology)
   g. The School of the Proletarian 80
   a. School of labor = “lose his status as a worker”
      i. Apprenticeship comes to an end where labor has become completely an alien power
      ii. Prole = agent in history not because it “creates everything” but because it is dispossessed of everything
         1. Complete alienation from fruits of labor, even self
   b. “nothing could be more grotesque than imagining a class consciousness based on the virtue of the laborer”
      i. “the proletarian is someone who has only one thing to do – to make revolution – and who cannot not do that because of what he is”
      ii. “the pure loss of every attribute, the identity of being and nonbeing”, not the empty ID of Hegel, but “an identity that has gone through the school of labor, i.e. through the opposition between the nothing of the laborer and the everything of wealth”
         1. **the prole is Meno’s slave: tabula rasa, the blank surface on which – on the condition that the Manifesto give them existence as a subject – the Revolution will inscribe itself with the same necessity as the diagonal of a square” (81)
      iii. proles are anti-worker
         1. workers not yet proles are: artisan, lumpen, petty bourgeois, ideologue…
         2. “merely comic masks disguising the distance between worker and prole, the noncoincidence of the time of development and the time of revolution”
   c. **once again the “nothing else”
      i. division through techne...
      ii. but techne is divided
      iii. to gain access to communist realm worker must negate self to become prole
   h. The Backward Worker, or the Paradox of Communism 82
   a. ‘weight of the dead on the living’
      i. obstacle = backward artisans attached to crafts “stauhinger”
      ii. R says Marx knows better:
         1. Attraction of artisan = desire to do something else
   b. Engels, recognizes “the obstacle to the transformation of stauhinger communists into revolutionary proles is not their status as artisans but their status as communist – not the heavy weight of their journeyman past but the lightness of their anticipation of the communist future” (83)
      i. Their problem is... they are already living the world the ‘young revolutionary science’ seeks to create and it (the science) can’t find anything superior... [[I might have gotten this wrong]]
   i. A Communist Among the Lapps 83
a. The problem is “from workers whose sense of the vanity of their trade has carried them farther along in the stripping away of the old artisanal character from those who fit most closely the def of a prole” (84)
   i. Not those resistant, but those always ready to be on board

j. A False Exit: Class and Party 85
   a. Backwardness of the staubinger is the communism
      i. Claim to already be ‘prole’
      ii. Dialectician can’t show they’re not ‘prole’ because the dialecticians ‘prole’ doesn’t even exist
   b. Materialist solution becomes: waiting
      i. But waiting (for the material conditions) doesn’t work (86)
      ii. While industrial production could create a class, that’s not what is needed
         1. ‘non-class’ is needed
         2. prole will be rev only to the extent that it is the dissolution of all classes
   c. why did marx+engels decide on both a class + its dissolution?
      i. The “manifesto” should have never existed
      ii. Parties (paradoxically) divide, not unite
         1. “prole of all countries, unite” means “workers of each country, divide”
      iii. science+vanguage = division
      iv. Marx and Engels hated the party anyway (87)

k. The Genius of the Straubinger 87
   a. “nothing could be better than the clowns of the party in general and the staubinger in particular” (88)
      i. the clowns
         1. “can hardly undertake any initiative without botching it”
         2. “but for this reason they can be trusted to do the job of representing nothing”
      ii. “to arrive at the tragic dimension of the revolution, the bourgeois drama of representation...must be doubled with the shakespearean tragicomedy of dissolution”
      iii. “the legitimacy of ‘the first-born sons of modern industry’ must be doubled with the bastardy of the mendicant philospher-kings and mercenaries – staubinger – of communism”
      iv. “the rationality of the development of productive forces must be doubled with the legend of the mole of revolution”

5. The Revolution Conjured Away 90
   a. Intro
      a. Detours necessary for the prole to exist through its party & manifesto
         i. But they’re repressed behind ‘optimistic rationality of a history that is and does “nothing else” than what everyone can see plainly”
         ii. ‘discursive cast’ of COMm Manifesto”
            1. proclaims that there is nothing to proclaim
            2. except something that is mafesto to everyone’s eyes
         iii. grave-digging proles stir the whole strata of official society
      b. marx loves geology (because of his utter confidence in modern society)
         i. confidence isn’t in proles though, but the bourgeoisie!
   b. The Absolute Bourgeoisie 91
      a. Mise en scene, subject of manifesto = communist party
         i. Not a result of the staubinger
         ii. Nor the virtual power of the children of industry
         iii. But because of the terror of its specter
b. Legitimacy of “specter of communism” derived from all those united against it!
   i. ‘reverse the specter to get the subject’
   ii. ‘division alone can do the trick’
      1. it presupposes unity (the All)
      2. a totality presupposed by its very division
   iii. party is birthed as the One to which all other are opposed
      1. bourgeoisie recognize the prole as its own double, sealed with the god-or devil- of the productive forces
   iv. bourgeoisie alone have agency in the manifesto (92)
      1. universal history
      2. do all the ‘breaking down’
      3. its even the agent of its own destruction
   v. proles are players, but not gods
      1. gravediggers, not even assassins
      2. everything they do, they owe to the bourgeoisie
      3. reliant on either the division or their backwardness
      4. the “nothing” is the one privilege remains (and even that was given to them by bourgeoisie…)
         a. ‘lack status’ (93)
   vi. bourgeoisie revolution...also because it is already the movement dissolves all classes!!
      1. Its action isn’t dialectical, simply materialist

c. The Bourgeois Betrayal 93
   a. Comm Manif entrusts prole with:
      i. Materialist demsyt
      ii. Dialectical destruction
      iii. “the credit that the text gives to bourg radicality goes hand in hand with its confidence in the political readability of history”
   b. but that ‘confidence’ was doubly disappointed with revs of 1848
      i. botched representation
      ii. ⇒ “demystifier mystified”
   c. 1848:
      i. partage of classes in place
      ii. but then everything becomes confused
         1. ‘revelation of the manifest’ is covered over by “troupe of substitute comedians whose burlesque performance reaches its climax in the triumph of the clown Louis Napoleon”
         2. = backwardness (94)
      iii. reinforces failure of class in itself
   d. prole = caught between old and new
      i. “it abandons its power without putting up a fight to a swindler, a leader of a society of parasites, a boor whose representative capacity derives, aside from the pickpockets surrounding him, solely from the backwardness of old peasant France”
   e. the bourgeoisie were afraid: fear!
      i. Was afraid of a victory presaging its own death
      ii. Wanted to give Bonaparte merely the appearance of power
         1. Sacrificed its political interest for its social interest
      iii. Was entrusted in Comm Manifesto through its power of production and destruction, but shrunk to the task (95)
      iv. Instead, acted like a senile class
   f. ‘demystifier mystified’
i. the limit of decomposition
ii. each class appears to be doubled, decomposed by its own caricature – its lumpen

d. The Triumph of the Lumpen 95
   a. The decomposition that doubles every class, generally only recognized in lumpen-proles
      i. Marx's sociology is incoherent (96)
      ii. Lumpen isn't a class, but its myth
         1. "bad history that comes to parasitize the good"
         2. "it is inscribed in an already constituted political mythology"
            a. bourgeois denunciations (disturbances of order)
            b. worker denunciations (non-militants)
   b. "rottenness" of lumpen
      i. not just garbage in the streets
         1. decomposition of classes, which can take two opposed forms
            a. active decay (good → death to class)
            b. passive decade (bad, fail to realize full potential)
         2. "every class, insofar as its members defend their own "social interest" is virtually its own lumpen to itself" (97)
      ii. explains the falling short of the bourgeoisie
         1. has its own lumpen: parasite of 'finance aristocracy'
         2. failure of 1848 = "simply a mob of individuals eager to fill their purse by any means" (98)
         3. state vampirism
         4. "the modern bourgeoisie is still merely a backward mob replicating the villainy of the criminal underworld, the rottenness of the Middle Ages, or the pigsty of the peasantry"
   e. The Swamp Flower 98
      a. 2 forms of additive decomposition
         i. small-holding peasant
         ii. Napoleonic mobster
      b. Marx doubles "the lower peasant youth" with the "swamp flower of the rural subproletariat" (99)
         i. Backward peasantry is the secret of 'modern’ classes
         ii. So “the laborer was ever only a petty bourgeois, the ideologue a swinherd, the staubinger a lapp”
         iii. ‘every entrepreneur a troglodyte”
      c. defeat of revolution is then the other side of class struggle (99-100)
         i. ‘non-sense of a history ruled by the law of addition alone’
         ii. platonic myth of the world upside down (mixture, masses of the theater, etc)
   f. The Comedian King and the Beggar King 100
      a. Paradox
         i. Allows the Napoleonic clown to triumph at the supreme hour of the class struggle
         ii. Engorges the state vampire at the moment when bourgeois economic rationality demands cheap government
      b. Makes both bourgeois and state into backward parasites (101)
         i. ‘revolutionary dialectic of production and destruction is corrupted by the materialist history of preservation and reproduction”
         ii. doubling = reversal of science
            1. reduces everything back to individual interests
            2. imitation and theater is just to mask 'petty knavery’
      c. 'revolutionaries in exile’
         i. the bonapartist ‘artificial class’ that liquidates the French revolution
ii. the society where Marx himself lives
   1. list of Marx’s motley companions (102)

   d. the liquidation of marx’s ‘party’
      i. moves to science
         1. which requires ‘new men equal to the new world’ (103)
         2. the absolute One of science is affirmed, amid the motley mass of revolutionary parasites
      ii. ‘only science concentrates the cutting edge of contradiction, which is forever socially postponed and always politically stolen away’
         1. philosophy as pure non-place produce by extreme backwardness****
         2. “but the work of science belongs to “immature fools who have still not recovered from their revolutionary fantasies”” (104)
         3. it belongs to the beggarly army that gnaws away at the order of classes and its factory rationality even as it is gnawed away at by that order
            a. marx as a parasite (via engels) devoted to the destruction of capital

6. The Risk of Art
   a. Intro
      a. The failure of rev puts science back in its time
         i. But backward movement is also a rejuvenation
         ii. In exile in London, (marx’s) science accumulates
      b. Marx and Engels’ great dream is the expansion of production/exchange
         i. ‘the rationality of economics, as with any political representation, has its own roguery that both doubles and gnaws away at it’
            1. intoxication of the new world vs. crisis
            2. magic of gold vs riffraff of prospectors
         ii. M says: California and Australia = cases no foreseen in manifesto
            1. First: countertendency of crisis
            2. Second: ensures triumph of lumpen
      c. The backward march, the comedy of the lumpen also parasitize the “royal road” of the ‘last instance” (107)
         i. Corruption of european working class
            1. 1) Betrayal of militants attracted by gold of New World (deserters)
            2. 2) workers happy to become party to the bourgeois order
         ii. working class helps conjure away revolution, too bourgeois to seize the crisis (108)
      b. Cavalrymen and Comedians 108
         a. Science and rev = in league with backwardness
            i. By 1884, everything stabilizes
            ii. Engels welcomes calm (end to social conflict) so he can devote time to pure theory (109)
         b. Engels the horseman (110)
            i. Not the scientist corruption of marx (111)
               1. ‘marx’s geological materialism’
            ii. Was actually more into history
         c. Revolution
            i. Risk of rev action not defeat/death, but comedy
               1. ‘Ridicule kills’
            ii. ‘rev is a physics, not subject to social laws’
               1. “scientists and strategists try to be “objectively” more revolutionary than “phrase-mongers”
               2. but objectivity always comes too late
c. The Duty of the Book
   a. “the whole of difference must be concentrates in the science of the party to come”
      i. ‘science alone entails the negation of the bourgeois world’
      ii. ‘science is at once the absolute leisure of the philosopher and the total dedication of the militant’
   b. science of interval:
      i. gap between two crises that can be dedicated to research/writing
      ii. distance between occupations of the multitude
         1. “work-sacrifice” (113)
            a. Flaubert
            b. Marx
         2. Both committed to the “absolute work” of the total negation
   iii. Flaubert demonstrates that marx is not producing the science destined to arm the prole with knowledge of the “objective conditions” of their struggle
      1. Prole don’t need the science of cap to be educated
   c. “myth of science” (114)
      i. “a work of absolute sacrifice, of the descent into hell required to give to the voiceless mass of dead souls the Book that will redeem it from oblivion, ushering in the Proletariat subject in place of the motley crowd of laborers.”
   d. Job of Capital: inscription of contradiction
      i. Not through SV or even labor value
         1. Need to combat Proudhon’s solution of ‘free exchange among producers’
      ii. Found in commodity fetishism:
         1. “the equivalent form of the commodity is an exclusive one”
      iii. Also in the inscription of the prole in science
         1. Only possible if he examines how capital always keeps on escaping death (115)
   d. The Unknown Masterpiece
   a. Capital as an artistic whole, an entirety
      i. Marx holds back, not wanting to make it public (116)
      ii. Almost complete, but left systematically incomplete
         1. Preventing it from being imitable, repeatable, prostituted, “Marxist”
   b. Marx not a member of his own party.
      i. Party members imitate, repeat, transform art into comedy and technique
      ii. Gotha program. (117)
         1. All the party members get it wrong...
         2. It’s art: anti-technique, anti-imitation, anti-labor
         3. (funny aside on value labor-power [not labor!])
   c. capital = “critique of political economy”
      i. critique of labor
      ii. true production = without bosses or calculation (‘silk worm’)****
   e. The Errant Science
   a. No political art
   b. “everything is bourgeois” means there is no outside (119)
      i. no other place from which to raise another army (no sci)
      ii. everything take places within the sublime and grotesque tragicomedy of the bourgeois era
         1. ‘rev justice’ only as a product of a 2x annulment
            a. reversal between normality of hist development
            b. pathology of its decomposition
      iii. sci can’t provide us a way out
1. (of productive forces vs. rev decision), reform or revolution
2. just look at Marx’s diss – epicurus and Democritus
3. “one will never have anything more than external marks without life”***

iv. “none of (Marx’s) theses of science teach us whether we should study in our room, stand instead for elections, or prepare weapons for an insurrection”******* (120)

1. science only teaches one thing, not knowledge but a way of being
2. it teaches those who study it to be equal to the new world***
3. it doesn’t offer laws, only models
4. Capital as art is reminiscent of the one real rev, the Copernican one

v. “the application of science can only be this: learning to interpret the work on the stage of revolution. There is no escape from the theater” (121)

1. one must do it better than the comedians, and even take their place
2. “raising consciousness” is an impoverished virtue
3. rather, it is the art of becoming historical agents
4. and is an anti-comedian (122)

f. The Testament of the Artist 122
   a. “the art of contradictions” (123)
   b. Engels was really a poet and an artist....

III. The Philosopher and The Sociologist

Epigraph 125
a. Sartre, on a prole who desires to be bourgeois but is still “the people”

7. The Marxist Horizon 127
a. Intro
   a. What happens when the tomb of the scientist (Marx) is erected and the artist’s (Engels) ashes are thrown away?
      i. Marxism.
      ii. The whole system we’ve come to know (artistically created here by R)

b. The Décor of Production 127
   a. Marxism is...
      i. The scene set with the rationality of the new technological world (128)
      ii. Via Sartre “the unsurpassable horizon of our time”
         1. That horizon is décor: “line of flight reduced to backdrop”
   b. Marxism-horizon = décor of production
      i. ‘the cold edge of polished steel, the solid line of unadorned concrete, the precise work of the machine’
      ii. hard over soft, straight over curved
      iii. “it works” (D&G’s AO)
      iv. productive bodies liberated from the “prison of the soul” (Foucault)
   c. new guardian: worker-machinist
      i. philosophy ‘sings the democracy of productive bodies’
      ii. man of the soul (129)
   d. philosopher – shoemaker scene turns again
      i. phil now among men of steel
      ii. shoemaker not endowed with a soul without value (backwardness), ‘the productive body’s distance from itself’
      iii. the new hierarchy: ‘more or less productive bodies, organs, and production more of less liberated from the soul, which is to say, from anti-production’ (129)
      iv. some Barthe thing I completely missed

   c. The Sun and the Horizon 129
      a. Sun and moon: Phil/doxa redistribute their values
i. Division between phil/peasant understanding of the sun (130)
ii. ‘churchmen’ (philosophers) want to give each its share – establish a certain nature of the visible

b. long-term future of phil
   i. in the slow collapse of eternal truths.
   ii. What will be the permanence of optical illusions that maintain divide between what scientists knows and what the peasant sees?
   iii. *stage of conflicts and compilicities between philosophy and social knowledge (131)
       1. “the philosophy of the poor”
       2. the ersatz (displaced) function of philosophy – denouncing philosophy by establishing other form of knowledge****

c. ersatz = ‘social knowledges of acculturation’
   i. goes through laundry list of positivism and empiricism
   ii. new terrain = division (partages) of science and misrecognition (132)

d. The Paradoxes of Production 132
   a. Marxism modifies horizon of visible
      i. Via Theses on Feuerbach
         1. Delegit’s the ‘country philosopher who wants to liberate humanity and science by demystifying the speculative sun, turning the heavenly divinity into the sesible fervor of earthly love’
         2. Critique of reps = still within horizon of impotent contemplation
      ii. But people “make” history but they “do not know” they do so
         1. They also do, but nalways fabrice a knowledge “that is always besides what they are” (133)
         2. necessity of misrecognition
         3. harkens back to machinery
   b. misrecognition
      i. how do you learn what you don’t know? (listen up don Rumsfeld...)
      ii. illusion machines that turn technical demystification into general simulacrum...
      iii. “too classical for the world he invests, marx continues to love the science of Truth more than the demyst of doxa, lit more than the theater, the knights errant more than machinists.”
         1. Presence/absence, spoke/unspoken → subjects make/miss truth of social (134)
         2. Leaves the answer to the phil/soc of the future
   c. ‘more radical problem’
      i. “engineers of souls will always know how to consign their shares to the dialectics of nature and history as the needs of the new autocrats dictate”
      ii. and now “the world of making or doing” is now a world no longer distinguished form its simulacrum
      iii. cross-plays begin (135)

8. The Philosopher’s Wall 136
   a. Intro
   b. The Tired Guardian 136
   c. The Party, or Continuous Creation 139
   d. The Dialectical Seal 142
   e. The Philosopher’s Window 143
   f. The Worker at His Machine 145
   g. The Absolute Weapon 147
   h. The Sartrean King 149
9. The Sociologist King

a. Intro
   a. Philosopher can’t think own place
   b. The Musician, the Chief, and the Dyer 165
      a. Bourdieu’s anti-philosophy
         i. Summarized through Sartre’s words:
            "wherever an elite functions, an aristocracy of the aristocracy outlining for
            aristocrats the shape of the whole man, new values and work of art, far from
            enriching the oppressed man, increase his absolute impoverishment. The
            production of the elite are, for the majority of people, rejection, want and
            boundaries. The taste of our ‘art lovers’ forcibly defines the bad taste or lack of taste
            of the working classes, and as soon as refined mines consecrate a work, there is on
            more ‘treasure’ in the world which the worker will never possess, one more thing of
            beauty that he is unable to appreciate or understand.” (166)
      b. The generals strategy is the dye of the dyer (universalize own taste to all)
         i. the craftsman’s dye hold him in place like a common dyer
   c. The Science of Right Opinion 166
      a. Philosophy doesn’t offer dye to shoemaker (only the warrior) (167)
      b. Sociologist pledges to think the dye of the shoemaker
         i. But isn’t the territory that claims to wrest from philosophy also the circle where
            philosophy imprisoned it, the territory of the poor where philosophy gave sociology
            the leisure to inform philosophy of the social causes of optical illusion?
         ii. That’s the “dirty trick” played by the phil
   c. Marx ‘took sociology backward’
      i. Placed the truth outside itself
         1. Established in the relations of production and productive forces
   d. “caught between the pincers of economy and phil, sociology responded by hollowing out
      the space of doxa to reverse the game – to reinscribe the particularity of historical
      materialism into the generality of disenchantment of the bourgeois world; to make the
      economy of production a particular case of the economy of symbolic practices” (168)
   d. The Scissors and the Kettle 168
      a. ‘the sociologist’s weapons are those of his adversary’
         i. statistical tables (scissors) and opinion polls (kettle)
         ii. but stats should be simple: reproduction and consumption
            1. the ‘justice’ of stats = demystification (169)
         iii. opinion:
            1. plato says: ‘right opinion always misses itself’
            2. “to a survey taker, it will only reflect clichés”
      b. “roaming the streets with opinions on a leash when they roam there already on their own,
         the sociologist always false behind his own caricature, trapped in the circle of these
         verisimilitudes that impose themselves only as they distance themselves from the truth
         they resemble in every detail except the critical one: truth, by definition, does not roam the
         streets”
i. so where are we to ‘find the hidden’? (170)
ii. ‘evidence roams the streets to dissimulate its own secret’
c. ‘if the social machine captures us, it is because we do not know how it captures us’
i. ‘all recognition is misrecognition, all unveiling a veiling.’

e. The Dye of the Shoemakers 171
a. Stats on ed from bourdieu (and passeron) -- classist
   i. Republican explanation: lack of resources
   ii. Libertarian: ed structure is authoritarian
   iii. Sociologist: ‘it is school that really eliminates proles’
      1. Through what is makes people believe
         a. Name: believe that it doesn't eliminate
         b. Obliging those who the school wasn’t created for to eliminate themselves spontaneously
   b. “it is the illusion of inspiration that produces the dye of the shoemakers” (172)
      i. school eliminates by dissimulating that it eliminates
         1. even better: it eliminates in order to dissimulate the fact that it eliminates while pretending not to eliminate
      ii. “school makes the children of the common people believe that it welcomes them and their others with equal opportunities, that success and failure depend on personal gifts independent of social conditions” (173)
c. common-sense objections *****
   i. did the great mystification of eq op and inequ of gifts ever really exist (other than anywhere else than in the words of the demystifiers)? (no)
   ii. the founders of the public school never designed it for social equality, only for political equality & marginality
      1. it promotes children of common who can complete and demotes those of the elites that can’t
f. The Denouncer Denounced 174
a. ‘it is precisely by “denouncing” the institution that they express its truth despite themselves
   i. in decnouncing the authoritarianism of the pedagogues, they claim in dissimulating it the real law of the institution of which they are the quintessential representatives
b. “sociological description is first and foremost a mythical tale” (175)
   i. ‘keeping the children in school who eliminated themselves from it is the best way of eliminating them through the dissimulation of their elimination’
c. a reversal of Platonism
   i. “if he thinks he can study, it is because he belongs to a social circle in which people already have done so; if he deludes himself about his “gifts,” it is because of his “exceptional abilities” (inheritors quote)
   ii. behind this tautology emerges the verdict that one escapes the impossibility of the principle only through the betrayal of its principles (176)
      1. parvenu (newly acquired class status) of education appears doubly as a traitor to his class:
         a. 1) individually, in forcing himself to acquire the “disposition” that allow the privileged classes to assimilate legitimate culture
         b. 2) collectively, in masking with his own success the global effect of elimination

g. Epimenides the Cretan and Parmenides the Marxist 176 (main argument, dunno if I completely get it, though)
a. There is no science but the science of the hidden
   i. But the only hidden that can return to soc is misrecognition
b. “the arbitrary” (177)
   i. pedagogic action is arbitrary in a double sense:
      1. reproduces a determined cultural arbitrariness (the culture of a class whose
         power it thus confirms)
      2. its existence introduces into the field of possibilities a division that never
         bears its necessity within itself

c. Cretan Epimenides “all cretans are liars” – nothing can be concluded
   i. If arbitrary proclaims itself as necessary:
   ii. “pedagogic authority is arbitrariness necessarily misrecognized and, for this reason,
        objectively recognized as legitimate authority” *****
      1. arbitrary is then out of reach
         a. “the non-necessity of the necessity the pedagogue will never have
            pronounced”
         b. ‘one can never force non-being to be’
            i. never can the arbitrary be necessary
            ii. the language of the necessary can never proclaim the arbitrary

d. pedagogy of the three metals (178)
   i. the sociology pretending to tell the truth about the lie....

e. The phil started from the arbitrary in order to reach necessity (179)
   i. The sociologist reaches necessity starting from the illusion of freedom
   ii. Proclaims that it is the illusion of freedom that binds artisans to their places
      1. Declared arbitrariness becomes a scientific necessity

f. Parmenides the marxist:
   i. Combination of both:
      1. “let each remain in his place” and ”do not forget the class struggle”
      ii. the disenchanted banality of a bourgeois world that cries out, at every street corner,
        the great secret everyone ignores: class struggle has become an eternal truth
        possessing the double credit of long killing anyone, but also of lending to science the
        eternal denunciation of its eternal forgetting

h. The Physician and His Patients 179
   a. Sociology can do no more than explain why phil misrecognize the true reasons keeping the
      lowly ranked in their place (180)
      i. Only result = psychoanalysis (??)
      ii. Only possibility = enjoy your symptom (take on their habitus without guilt or
           suffering)
   b. The critique of elitism becomes new justification of hierarchy (181)
      i. Prof who demystified elitism...
   c. Soc becomes the imaginary of the Sartrean communist party
      i. Representing those who can’t represent selves
      ii. “denunciation for the sake of an absent class becomes the daily fare of semi-learned
          opinion, and the struggle against elitism reproduction the common program for
          minister of every trend” (182)

i. The Science of Practices 182
   a. Shift focus to small machines
      i. ‘espouse and retrace the configuration of the social field’
      ii. ‘the forms of habitus through which social agents enabled the incorporated past to
          serve the anticipation of possible futures’
   b. sociology as a ‘science of practices’ (183)
      i. not a dictionary of regulations or collection of lock room opinions
      ii. an objectivization of the game
   c. ‘game’ becomes restricted
i. game requires a specific notion of exchange
ii. ‘the symbolic game is reserved for the rich and is merely the euphemizing of domination’
   1. the poor’s habitus forecloses their ability to play the game
d. “knowledge effect” (184)
   i. “the capitalist is only Capital’s puppet, or, conversely, the prole is a little capitalist, a liberal entrepreneur managing his “human capital.”
e. Way out? Partage
   i. Those who have capital to place on the symbolic market, and those who have only their labor power to reproduce – free will vs fate
j. The Pianist, Peasants, and the Sociologist 184
   a. Bourdieu and Kant...
   b. ‘music’ (185)
      i. experiment of Miguel-Angel Estrella: played piano in a village to see what people liked
      ii. illusion of ‘cultural communism’
         1. the illusion of making those without the habitus to appreciate ‘legitimate works’ believe they can appreciate it
         2. ‘the formidable perversity of this illusion is obviously that it does everything as if it were not an illusion. It works’
         3. but that’s because of music’s silence. It resists commentary. (186)
   iii. the sociologist “will judge musical tastes without having anyone hear music” (187)
c. bourgeois survey takers already know the right answer
   i. winner every time: sartrean subject who can freely make himself a philosopher or a waiter (188)
d. photographs 188-
   i. “fictitious questions of aesthetics about photographs that are not perceived as aesthetic”
e. “all these produce inevitably what is required by the sociologist: the suppression of intermediaries, of points of meeting and exchange between the people or reproduction and the elite of distinction” (189)
f. “there must be no mixing, no imitation.”
g. “in the aesthetic universe, there must only be distance” (190)
   i. “the expulsion of art” 190-1
   ii.
k. The Vulgar Sociologist and the Distinguished Philosopher 197

For Those Who Want More 203
1. Summary
2. In the beginning:
   a. Givens:
      i. Philosophy defined itself v/v other
      ii. Disco delimited by excl thought from laborer
   b. Double-move that fed the privilege of philosophy
      i. ‘elevated’ (classant) labor to reproduction
         1. “love of solid realities”
         2. Inscribed rationality of technical success & financial gain
      ii. ‘demoted’ (déclassant) philosophers
         1. “shadow makers”
         2. ‘reserved the right to the luxury of appearance that command the privilege of thought’
3. Modern sociology that “tears from the philosopher the mask of his divine freedom”
   a. ‘recognizes behind the games of phil aesthetics, the law of a symbolic order based on the exclusion of the ‘vulgar’ enjoyments of the dispossessed
   b. denounces in the freedom of philosophers the simple denegation of the social relations of domination
   c. Two sides of argument that connect them (204)
      i. The means & ends (ethics) of demystification
         1. ‘reversal’ of Platonism, only radicalizes its interdictions
         2. sociology in plato = rationalize hierarchy according to DOL
            a. a certain arbitrariness of the natural order that commands one to “do his or her business”
         3. sociological demyst recasts that arbitrariness as necessary
            a. circumscribes universal freedom
            b. a science that old hierarchies and divisions (partages)

4. “Value”
   a. Plato: “what is best?”
      i. Contra “what costs more, what works better, what is more profitable?”
      ii. Platonic split: (205)
         1. Love of phil vs. love of people
         2. technique (rhetoric) – character (artisan) – principle (democracy)
      iii. Plato’s redistribution of orders = degrade false nobilities (206)
   b. Rembrantsz
      i. Descartes = open to Artisan
      ii. Comte’s prole must abandon politics (207)
         1. “abandoning the fevers of political equality to comply with its contemplative vocation and sing in chorus around the priests of science”
         2. overcoming politics through science
         3. = the ‘Cartesian phil’ of 3rd Estate
   c. Guarding of appearances in 18C
      i. Glaucon, Voltaire, Kant/Schiller
         1. “the optimistic vision of an industrious world freed from corporations, superstitions, and childishness”
      ii. “civilization of work” backfires on worker (208)
         1. excellent at producing commodities
         2. firmly fixes artisans as destined for simple reproduction & machinelike gesture
         3. “the social” becomes utility
      iii. Ends in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right
         1. ‘overcomes’ sociability of political economy
         2. through rationality of the state universal
         3. → ‘police of the corporations’ (which it was supposed to end)
   iv. Nietzsche reference, Schiller (209)
   d. ‘Revolutionaries’
      i. Three “cross-plays” (jeux croisés) between demsy/egal
         1. reign of production through ‘specialists’ (savants)
            a. discourage children of prole from pursuing the ‘vanities’ of imitating the producer-king (the enemy of idle!)
            b. specialists have own crisis of value:
               i. power of the working order
               ii. or, proportion of brotherly harmonies
2. artists reproach bourgeoisie
   a. for “turning aesthetic excellence over to industrial leveling”
   b. only by affirming themselves as “pure representatives of the work ethic”
3. schools of the Republic (importance??)
   a. initiate children of the people in aesth values/equality of citizen sense
   b. without separating them from the state

e. Marx:
   i. Theses on Feuerbach
      1. Attempt to establish rev via “social practice”
      2. ***R’s critique of practice
         a. practice not opposed to theoretical speculation
         b. practice opposed to Aristotle’s “poietics”
            i. the production of technique
            ii. an Artisanal practice
3. status of Politics and the Man in Marx v/v Hegel (210)
   a. “outcome of own labor”/labor of negative
   b. not State, but advancement of cap “sweeps away…the old grim and archaism of representations”
4. basic principle via Feuerbach “social relation of ‘man to man’”
ii. two operations of communism:
   1. universal equality of leisure / participation of all in what is valuable in itself
      a. techne & sociability of exchange
   2. communism’s telos = Schiller’s aesthetic figure:
      a. Reintegrated man (l’homme recomposé) (211)
      b. Not possible by means of education
iii. Possible only through
   1. Demystification of democratic heaven
   2. Refutation of political of paideia
   3. Shoemaker-thinkers → prole without qualities
      a. “dispossession” of the prole
      b. Marx’s contrib. to Hegel’s POR
      c. Prole as absolute being-other of laborer
      d. “value can arise only through generalized devaluation”
iv. Bolshevik split
   1. Ultra-Bolshevik radicalism of ‘philosophies of freedom’
   2. Infra-Bolshevik skepticism of ‘sociologies of dispossession’
   3. Marx never resolves what he expounds (212)
v. Two-part critique:
   1. Reduction of the ideal figure of the best to the attributes of social subjects
   2. Reopening of the gap in which existence lets itself be compared to essence
vi. “declared a death sentence to all forms of existence where human essence is denied”...
   1. possible through ‘parlor game’ called “critique of the critique”
   2. demystification of demystifiers (ie Marx K of Stirner/Proudhon)
vii. requires technicians freed from heavenly suspicions
   1. ***Marx: “it is not for tailors cobbler” (213)
f. Two figures of the Marxian “becoming-world”
  i. Marxism of leaders
     1. power of the actor [comédien]
     2. ascribes social ID on basis of ’proffered speeches’
3. decided prole/rev never where one thinks they are
   ii. Marxism of scientists
      1. Grounds self in philosophy
         a. Actualize sociology or econ
         b. Complete with politics or aesthetics
      2. Incompleteness of Marxist knowledge
         a. Infinite work of construction
         b. Analysis of its own impossibility

5. Sociological encounter (‘mavericks’)
   a. Ex: Veblen, Weber
   b. Sociologies “radicalization of its interdictions”
      i. → ‘a single demystification in the name of the social’ (214)
         1. assigning of ID/social difference
         2. to which every political, theoretical, or aesthetic emergence can be boiled
            down
      ii. world solidifies around one/two simple axioms
         1. a thing cannot be valuable in itself but draws
               a. its consistency from social concourses
               b. its worth form social distinctions
      iii. nothing new can happen unless arranged through socius
         1. grossed example: electoral sociology (which mocks democracy) “the realized
            simulacrum of democracy”
   c. *******“the becoming-philosophy of sociology is the mourning of the thought of equality”
      i. “denying that the subject of democracy can ever happen, sociological critique speaks
         of the eternal reign of the slight difference through which the brute positivity of
         ethos unites with the pure discrimination of the symbolic order”
      ii. “sociology satisfies the contradictory requirements of our liberal-corporatist order:
         the liberal resignation to the game of interests driving the world, and the syndicalist
         reduction of egalitarian hopes.” (215)
      iii. “the demystification of what is ideological in the name of the social becomes the
         ordinary fare of conforming thought where the transformation of the sovereign-
         people into a surveyed population, of political discourse into journalism, of
         instruction into pedagogy, and of aesthetics into animation of the environment all
         feed the transformation of democracy into its substitute, sociocracy”
      iv. ex: “school failure”
   d. the ‘real knowledge’ of sociocracy
      i. “A double knowledge of the ignorant to which responds the double truth of science”
         1. “it forces us to see undershirts sticking to bodies in working-class cafés, to
            recognize unavoidable social positivities that heavenly discourse denied”
         2. while at the same time claiming that differences are all constructed
            (bourdieu) (216)
      ii. nihilist ‘professorial cunning’ that claims privilege of knowing diff between reality
          and simulacrum

6. Recovering the vigor of philosophy
   a. Not naïve nostalgia to end simulacra and return to native earth of Earth
   b. Rather, to evaluate imitations
      i. “to refuse to see in them only monetary signs being exchanged at a rate fixed by the
         state of forces”
      ii. “to judge if what our institutions, our images, and our discourses imitate is
         democratic hope or its mourning” (217)
   c. phil finds itself implicated
i. previous attempts only guard purity of thought via exclusion (partage is used)
ii. “is it possible to think at the same time the hierarchy of values and the equality of mixture?”
iii. review of figures (Aristotle, Kant, Marx)... ends with historicity....

1. Review of NOL
   a. Two themes
      i. French labor movement in 19C
      ii. Social conflict in general
   b. Against:
      i. Historical materialism
      ii. Political avant‐gardism
   c. For:
      i. Reveal nature of working‐class intellectual revolution
      ii. But not counter‐discourse of era which valorized:
         1. Craft traditions
         2. Forms of pop culture/sociability
      iii. ‘symbolic rupture’ with culture of craft& pop soc (‘working class “identity”’)
         1. not affirmation of “values” specific to labor
         2. against this division (partage) of thought to some, production to others
   d. Ex: French workers in 19C “claiming status of fully speaking and thinking beings”
      i. Create dnewspeapers or associations
      ii. Wrote poems
      iii. Joined utopian groups
   e. Not:
      i. “importation” of scientific thought
      ii. affirmation of a worker culture
   f. Instead:
      i. transgressive will to appropriate lang/culture of the other
      ii. act as intellectually equal
2. Intellectual status of NOL
   a. Differences:
      i. Rupture with Marxist orthodoxy
      ii. Divergence from social science of dominated classes
         1. And the political propositions it inspires
   b. Critique of progressivist & “bottom” against “top” that preserves social order (nb: I wonder how this relates to race war: gobineau/foucault)
      i. Historical naivete resorts that to working‐class “cultures” and “sociabilities”
      ii. Sophisticated sociological demystification of “distinguished culture”
      iii. Development of new discourses of ID as through old discourses of class struggle
3. PHP
   a. Attempts to show how ‘most modern scienfitif discourses’ maintains the partage
      i. Splitting times/occupations
      ii. Philosopher/artisan
      iii. ‘their respective shares’
   b. specific historical moment
      i. ‘brief euphoria’ of Socialists after the 70s
      ii. ephemeral Marxist revival + reformist ambitions
         1. social science egalitarianism
         2. via education
iii. dominance of Bourdieu’s 1) Reproduction and 2) Distinction
   1. general interp of symbolic violence that set dominant classes in place
   2. school rituals and culture games exclude the dominated
      a. via an ethos which they can’t adapt (221)
      b. bear blame of own failure
   3. → reduction of high culture
      a. conviviality
      b. adapting sociabilites of children of low-income classes (largely migrant)

iv. Two ideas of inegalitarian symbolic violence (which confront one another)
   1. Imposition of high culture forms/manners
   2. Division of thought/language to upper and “autochthonous” cultr to lower
   3. → struggle between two kinds of “progressivism”
      a. old republican pedagogy: universalism and promotion of children
         i. “excellence”
      b. modernist pedagogy: sociological re-shaping to reprod needs
         i. “reduction of inequalities”
      c. politically opposed as: “social sciences” vs “common good”/citizen

c. PHP = attempt to intervene
   i. Against both:
      1. Sociological demystifications of aesthetic “distinction”
      2. Philosophy of “everyone in hisplace”
   ii. Unfortunately proximity to counter-movement in 80s that began anti-68ism
      1. Critique of illusions of soc science
      2. Good philosophy, healthy democracy, republic elites, wealth

iii. R distinguishes himself via two moves:
   1. impact of modern idea of lit on democracy
      a. ‘poetics of knowledge’ – Names of History & more recent work
   2. egalitarian equality – “democracy”

d. Jactot & Ignorant Schoolmaster [on equality]
   i. Equality as presupposition, not goal (223)
   ii. “even if equality were to ground inequality in the last instance, it could be realized
      only individually in the intellectual emancipation that always could extend to every
      person the equality denied by the social order”
      1. neither formal nor real
      2. “neither in the uniform teaching of the children of the republic, nor in the
         availability or bargains in supermarket displays”
      3. fundamental and absent, current and untimely.
      4. “Available through the transgressive appropriation of an intellectual equality
         whose privilege others had reserved for themselves”
      5. neither law common to all nor equality grounded on rights or values

e. New historical conjuncture – end of ‘actually existing socialism’ (vb223)
   i. In France: bicentenary of French rev. intellectuals vs socialist admin
   ii. Two paradoxes from ‘consensual realism over Marxist utopia’
      1. End of Marxist at the cost of economic determinism
         a. Makes the roles of gov “business agents of international capitalism”
      2. End of social conflict & class struggle in the face of radical archaism
         a. National Front
         b. ‘realist’ centralism defined utopia as optimized calculations but bred
            racism and ethnic warfare in the theater of appearances than
            consensus sought to eliminate
R reviving idea from PHP:

1. ‘link between power of equality and that of appearance’
   a. plato: demos(ppl w no share) vs appearance
   b. “aesthetic communism” of workers emancipation

2. appearance: the supplement that divides reality, not the illusion that masks the reality of reality
   a. democratic appearance is not identifiable with legal form of the legit state that would conceal class interest/conflict

3. “form” of democ = forms of dispute (225)
   a. not
      i. interests/opinions between social parties
      ii. the consultation of parties concerning interest
      iii. common law

4. demos
   a. not
      i. ideal people of sov
      ii. sum of the parties of sov
      iii. the poor/suffering sector of society
   b. a supplement to any “realist” account of social parties
   c. Def: “the constitution of a scene of appearance in which political subjects inscribe themselves as litigious, “fictitious” supplement in relation to every account of social parties”

Disagreement (fn, recent R work in English)

1. “the forms of the political were in the first place those of a certain division of the sensible”
   a. “the cutting up [decoupage] of the perceptual world that anticipates, through its sensible evidence, the distribution of shares and social parties”

2. interplay of form of sensible evidence
   a. way people do “their own business”
      i. personal/common
      ii. private/public
   b. inscribed
   c. redistribution presupposes
      i. visible/not visible
      ii. heard/not heard
      iii. noise/speech

3. in NOL worker emancipation division
   a. night as time of rest
   b. cycle of production/reproduction
   c. leisure of thought

4. in PHP – platonic allocation of work’s “absence of time” -> worker’s virtue
   a. “absence of time” = symbolic division of time/space (226)
   b. Plato excludes
      i. slack time/empty space of artisan from (re)production
         1. space/time of meetings in
         2. only insofar as they have the time to do something other than their work
         3. find themselves in a place other than that of work’s performance
4. **empty supplement accounting for social parties/organization**
   ii. marks two antagonistic division of the sensible
      1. agora/assembly
         a. “power of people”
         b. where equality is affirmed
      2. demos = collection of workers

5. Disagreement = formalization of the antagonistic division
   a. Police/politics (*police et politique*)
      b. Police:
         i. The division of the sensible that claims to recognize only real parties to the exclusion of all empty space and supplements
            1. Groups committed to specific mode of doing
            2. ‘place’ where occupations are performed
            3. modes of being correspond to these occu/places
      c. Politics
         i. Mode of acting that perturbs this arrangement by instituting within its perceptual frames the contradictory theater of its “appearances”
         ii. Dissensus = its essence
            1. Not the opp of interes/op
            2. But the production, within a determined, sensible world, of a given that is heterogeneous to it
         iii. Production
            1. An aesthetics of politics
            2. Not an aestheticization of forms of power or the manifestations of collectivity
            3. It ‘makes visible’ (& ‘audible’) what had been excluded
        iv. Inscribes one perceptual world within another
            1. Antagonistic subjectivation of the division of the sensible
            2. Ex: world in which proletarians or women may participate in a community within another in which they both are “visibly” domestic beings outside the life of the community

f. Moves he’s mistake for, but not actually taking part in
   i. Not opposing the “voices from below” to the “voices from above”
      1. but of reflecting on the relation of division of discourses and the division of conditions
      2. Interplay of borders and transgressions according to which the effects of speech that seize human bodies become ordered or disturbed
   ii. Not passing from politics and society to lit/aesthetics
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