SPECTRES OF A CRISIS: READING JACQUES DERRIDA AFTER THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS OF 2008

by

JOHN JAMES FRANCIS

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Modern Languages
School of Languages, Culture, Art History, and Music
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
JUNE 2019

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates a theoretical response to the question of what constitutes the political implications of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. This thesis, working within the tradition of critical and cultural theory, undertakes a sustained engagement with the works of Jacques Derrida to theorise the traditions, norms, and practices that inform a response to an event such as the crisis of 2008. This thesis works with his proposals that: the spectre of its limitations haunts politics; that this has led to the 'deconstruction' of the meaning of politics through complex textual frameworks; and that this dynamic leads to a tension between the arrival of new political possibilities on the one hand and new forms of political sovereignty on the other. After examining the significance of Derrida's approach and secondary literature debating its interpretation, this thesis deconstructs the political implications of the crisis from politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state, the textual politics of scholarship, and finally the politics of the media, the domain, I argue, that incorporates the most discrete and sophisticated forms of sovereign decision-making. Finally, this thesis opens up its findings to secondary literature that suggest contrasting arguments.

For Phoné

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been made possible by the expertise and guidance of my supervisors, Dr Joanne Sayner and Dr Ross Abbinnett, by the support and encouragement of my family, friends, and colleagues, and by the kindness and patience of my partner, Phoné.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 2007 the bubble in the US subprime housing market burst. Housing markets have always gone through cycles of boom and bust, but the repercussions of this crash were so widely unexpected, so fast, and so catastrophic that their spectral afterlives can be traced in business, politics, policy, society, and culture today. Why then was it so catastrophic? On this occasion the financial industries were blindly investing in the continued growth of the subprime market. Loans had been offered at extremely low interest rates and then repackaged, rebranded, and sold as derivatives and securitisations, with the risks of investments masked by their complexity and savvy industry marketing. These packages proved so lucrative that even the most prestigious of financial institutions invested heavily, drawing in funds from outside the United States to keep growing. When the subprime bubble burst interest rates started to skyrocket, and money stopped flowing. During this "credit crunch" phase governments around the world offered emergency loans, but when the US government decided to draw a line with Lehmans in September 2008 global financial panic ensued and the 'Global Financial Crisis' was born. Despite governments pumping hundreds of billions of dollars into the financial sector, the crisis triggered the 'Great Recession', the worst recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s (Ciro, 2012; Blyth, 2013; Fulcher, 2015). The unthinkable had happened; a global collapse in the credibility of capitalism. For Slavoj Žižek the crisis indicated that 'the time for liberal-democratic moralistic blackmail is over. Our side no longer has to go on apologising; while the other side had better start soon' (2009, p. 8).

In many ways, the responses to the global financial crisis of 2008 by those in power were utterly predictable. Wealth was secured in the hands of the very actors, institutions, and

industries that brought about the crisis; policies of austerity were inflicted on those already marginalised by societies; the contradictions and limitations of the capitalist mode of production were covered up; and there was a failure to acknowledge how the repercussions would intersect with so many other issues facing the world today, from inequality, marginalisation and poverty to discrimination, fanaticism, to the collapse of ecosystems and biodiversity. Critical and cultural theorists have long argued that the ability to put forward alternative, more inclusive responses to events are conditioned and even prohibited by the dominance of capitalism (Benjamin, 1986a), rationalisation (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002), postmodernity (Jameson, 1991), and pure simulation (Baudrillard, 1988a). The prospect of responding to such events in a responsible, ethical manner seems naïve. However, in the works of Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) this thesis makes the case that alternative, more inclusive approaches to events are not only possible but inevitable. In doing so this thesis particularly focuses attention upon Derrida's reflections on 'spectres' (2006).

The concept of the spectre presents considerable difficulties for undertaking research and formulating coherent responses to contemporary issues such as the crisis of 2008. However, I also assert that the troubling of theory also translates into a radical challenge to authority and power and can, as a result, be seen as opening up to considerable promise. I suggest that it helps to unpack questions about ideological *and* practical traditions, sites of political intervention, and ethico-political iterations of justice and affinity to pursue when responding not only to the afterlife of an event such as the crisis of 2008 but other contemporary issues more generally. I will begin here by briefly articulating Derrida's approach by way of an introductory comparison with critical and

cultural theories. First of all, I will begin with Critical Theory's establishment between the First and Second World Wars at the Frankfurt School in Germany.

1. 'We must begin somewhere, but there is no absolutely justified beginning'

Critical Theory focuses upon interrogating the alienation that derived from traditions and practices, responding to contemporary issues and problems and exploring new, more inclusive social, political, economic and cultural possibilities. Furthermore, I am interested here in how critical theorists have responded to the relationship between violence and catastrophe on the one hand, and representation and developments in the mass media on the other. For instance, the First World War and the aesthetics of Futurism (Benjamin, 1986a), and perhaps most significantly of all, Auschwitz as the most radical result of a society affected by reification and alienation (Adorno, 2005). Thus, Critical Theory focuses upon examining traditions, norms, and practices, arguing that there needs to be an examination and contestation in the area of ideas. However, as I explore in detail in the following chapters, while Derrida references Benjamin (see 1982a) and Adorno (see 2005a), his attempts to go 'beyond' the critical lead him to a very different approach to tradition. His engagement with theory emphasises the examination of texts, and he suggests that the notion of "context" risks overlooking such a task (1988).

That said, Derrida does not entirely neglect the importance of making connections between specific texts. By interrogating the notion of context Derrida questions explicitly the suggestion that there can be something like a *meta*-text (or metanarrative), for such a privileged text would necessarily relegate the significance of discrete texts and readings. In this respect, his work questions the emphasis upon the 'critical' that is to be found in Frankfurt Critical Theory. His emphasis upon implications leads him to take the argument

that a critical approach risks delimiting an investigative, deconstructive project. In addition, this is also to say that deconstruction is not only a commitment to implications but an identification of promise. No doubt this risks accusations of dilettantism and obscurantism, but Derrida responds that his approach 'is neither obscurantist nor antiscientific [since] it is more "scientific" to take this limit, if it is one, into account and to treat it as a point of departure for rethinking this or that received concept of "science" and of "objectivity" '(1988, p. 118). Moreover, for Derrida this task is unavoidable; in *Of Grammatology* he sets out a position that forms of "writing", from speech to traditional forms of orthography to more recent technologies, are always troubled by the 'trace' of non-presence, even if the form of writing is a privileged orthographic form (1997a).

For Derrida, the concept of logocentrism articulates how writing negotiates what he calls '*différance*' (1997a, p. 23). With writing, there is always an attribution of authority or 'weight' ('*grammè*'). However, this articulation of authority also involves an acknowledgement of its incompleteness (otherwise it would not require articulation). There is always a movement towards difference – a deferring to difference that makes up 'différance'. The task, then, is to consider the contours that the logocentric takes, and be aware that it offers both a chance of a deferral to difference and religious commitment to authority. It is in this way that he later investigates the deconstruction of logocentrism through the phantasmatic figures of the nation-state, nationalism, ideology, organised religion and religious fundamentalism, technology, science, scholarship, the media, and capitalism. Moreover, it is, I want to suggest here, why he undertakes an overtly "political turn" in his later works, from the late 1980s through to his death in 2004. My reading is that through the concept of the 'spectre' (2006) Derrida refocused his attention away

from the 'trace' to a concept that works to articulate the more sophisticated ways in which the trace can give a human form to sovereignty.

Where then does this leave my concern in this thesis with the global financial crisis of 2008? Derrida emphasises responsibility towards the transformation of logocentrism, and his later works respond to a variety of specific concerns, including the future of Marxism (2006), religious fundamentalism and Islamic fundamentalism (2002a), 9/11 (Borradori and Derrida, 2003), and US foreign policy (2005b) to name just a few. However, while his earlier works involve considerable textual analysis, his later works incorporate very little empirical evidence, to the point at which he often makes sweeping statements. In addition Derrida's work has a fragmentary quality in terms of its interventions (epitomised in the publications of collections such as *Negotiations* [2002b] and *Paper Machine* [2005c]), and he often interrogates the questions that are put before him (for instance, *Spectres of Marx* responds to a conference question *Whither Marxism*). To turn around an injunction that Derrida sets out, and which Geoffrey Bennington paraphrases from *Of Grammatology,* 'we must begin somewhere, but there is no absolutely justified beginning' (Bennington and Derrida, 1993, p. 15), I think we can also say that there is no absolutely justified beginning, but we must begin somewhere. In this sense, my approach to the global financial crisis has the intention of taking it as a point of departure on the basis that it is something like Mark Redfield's characterisation of 9/11 as a 'cultural knot' (2009, p. 2).

I attribute a particular degree of significance to the global financial crisis because of three particularly haunting concerns. Firstly, there are the parallels with the Wall Street Crash of 1929, the Great Depression, the rise of totalitarianism and WWII. While there are

undoubtedly a myriad array of very different economic, social, and political conditions – I am mindful here of Theodor Adorno's proposal in *The Authoritarian Personality* that it is not really the economic conditions that determined the rise of fascism but rather the proliferation of a persecution complex that developed through the culture (1982). This emphasis upon the role of the symbolic in forming political positions brings me to my second point. While the imagery of anxious stock exchange traders, unemployed bankers leaving gleaming skyscrapers with cardboard boxes of belongings, and numbers on screens seems hardly as significant as the far more visceral imagery of a mass media event like 9/11, Jean Baudrillard's work on the trajectory towards simulation and simulacra sets the basis for equivalence between the two (1988a). For he argues that the representations of catastrophes only feed into a 'hyperreality' that is at a remove from 'symbolic exchange', subsequently making society even more susceptible to catastrophes (and so on and so on).

Moreover, in response to the crisis of 2008 Douglas Kellner has written, in a Baudrillardian manner, of how the Presidential candidates both evoked the spectacle of the crisis for gain, albeit to varying degrees of subtlety (2009). Ultimately Kellner points here to how Obama's more nuanced narrative of the crisis was more attractive to voters, and that media spectacle is not entirely in the ascendancy. However, he warns that the proliferation of media spectacle will only reduce the room permitted for a more nuanced politics, and suggests that Obama certainly relied upon media spectacle (2009, p. 715). Moreover, his later work on the election victory of Donald Trump is even more pessimistic in this respect (2017). Finally, this in turn leads me to my third spectre that is associated with twentieth-century discussions associated with the Marxist project about the failure

of political and social change to take place in the wake of economic crises (Abbinnett, 2006, p. 3).

In *Spectres of Marx*, Derrida writes that:

> Marxism remains at once indispensable and structurally insufficient: it is still necessary but provided that it be transformed and adapted to new conditions and to a new thinking of the ideological, provided it be made to analyse the new articulation of techno-economic causalities and of religious ghosts, the dependent condition of the juridical at the service of socio-economic powers or states that are themselves never totally independent with regard to capital [but there is no longer, there never was just capital, nor capitalism in the singular, but capitalisms plural – whether state or private, real or symbolic, always linked to spectral forces – or rather *capitalisations* whose antagonisms are irreducible]. (2006, p. 73, italics in original)

My suggestion here is that attention should turn to Derrida's argument that despite Marx's materialist emphasis upon capital, his legacy remains essential because of how committed it has been to working at the margins of what is epistemologically acceptable, even if it has been dismissive of immateriality and the spectral. While this thesis ultimately looks beyond Derrida's engagement with Marx, Marxism, and capitalism for questions about credit and inheritance, it plays a crucial role in encouraging such an approach.

In this thesis the intention is to apply an approach to the question of the spectres and spectrality of the global financial crisis of 2008 that is similar to the approach that Derrida takes to the spectres and spectrality of Marx and Marxism. It is to take the crisis as a point of 'departure' for reflecting upon questions of ethics and politics. Essential here is how it examines the crisis in terms of the implications of its intersection with the inheritance of logocentrism and, more contemporaneously, the spectral effects of the media. It is out of a commitment to an engagement with these broader questions of inheritance that the title

of this thesis uses the indefinite article – spectres of *a* crisis – rather than spectres of *the* crisis. Furthermore, by undertaking a deconstructive examination of spectres I subsequently involve an examination of the concept and significance of the political. I suggest that the political is essential here because of how it articulates the role of the logocentric and spectral through its relationship with sovereignty. Moreover, I examine Derrida's argument that attention to politics is an important responsibility because of the demise of political sovereignty in its traditional conceptual form - the nation-state. For Derrida notes that developments in globalisation indicate the rise of a form of sovereignty that masks its politics (2005b, p. 158).

To examine the ethical sand political ramifications of the 2008 crisis this thesis deploys a modification of a template that Derrida articulates in *Spectres of Marx*. Although he recognises that such an approach owes a debt to Marxian theory of dominance, he suggests that it can be helpful to consider the relationship between spectres and politics from three locations that, while ultimately indissociable, operate in distinctive ways to organise and command 'public manifestation or testimony in the public space' (2006, p. 65). Firstly there is 'the culture called more or less properly political (the official discourses of parties and politicians in power in the world, virtually everywhere Western models prevail); secondly, there is 'what is rather confusedly qualified as mass-media culture'; and thirdly, there is 'scholarly or academic culture' (2006, p. 65). In my deployment of this tripartite division, I begin by examining politics in a 'properly political' sense. However, I then turn to his consideration of scholarship before his consideration of the media. I do so for two reasons. Firstly, because of how, in 'University without Condition' (2001a), a substantial piece by Derrida on scholarship, he argues that politics

is primarily deconstructed through its encounter with knowledge. Secondly, because this thesis makes the case that the media is the most constantly evolving, challenging, and discrete form of politics to consider. This thesis suggests that a concern not only with the politics of the spectres of the global financial crisis of 2008 but politics more generally would be best served by directing attention to the politics of the media.

2. Outline of Chapters

In Chapter One, I undertake a literature review that works to more thoroughly examine the location of this thesis in relation to Critical Theory and set up my argument for engagement with the deconstructive project of Derrida. However, before I examine texts from Critical Theory I begin by briefly outlining Marx's arguments about the need for the emancipation of the working classes by way of dialectic that focuses upon history and materiality rather than ideology, and how this sets up the dilemma of representation examined by Critical Theory. Turning then to the Frankfurt School critical theorists, I examine their arguments that the incursion of the capitalist mode of production into aesthetics and culture places new demands upon dialectics. After that, I examine Fredric Jameson's application of Critical Theory for the theorisation of late-twentieth-century phenomena of postmodernism and globalisation. In particular, I consider his argument that postmodernism and globalisation indicate that capitalism has invaded representation in ways that even Theodor Adorno did not anticipate. Finally, I explain that while Jameson retains faith in the role of historical dialectics, it is with Jean Baudrillard that I identify a benchmark for critical and cultural theory's claims about the limits of representation, by way of his conceptualisation of pure simulation. As a result, I argue that Baudrillard's writings provide an important theoretical platform from which to articulate the promise of Derrida's work.

In the remainder of Chapter One I then turn to a review of the work of Jacques Derrida. I begin by examining his seminal earlier works on logocentrism, writing, différance, and deconstruction, before turning attention to the political, the media, and interventions in (or departures from) specific issues and events. Finally, I reflect upon my readings of Derrida with reference to three notable texts of secondary literature: Geoffrey Bennington's experimental introduction to Derrida co-authored with Derrida (Bennington and Derrida, 1993); Richard Beardsworth's focus upon Derrida's relationship with the political (1996); and Michael Naas' emphasis upon Derrida's relationship with contemporary media (2008; 2012). In Chapter Two I redirect my readings of Derrida's works, and the debates in the secondary literature towards the construction of a theoretical framework for this thesis. After setting out the debates about the viability of a theoretical framework, as opposed to a methodology, and discuss the contribution of an emphasis upon inheritance as opposed to claims about the contemporary, I set out the theoretical approaches to the discrete spectralities of the 2008 global financial crisis that are specific to each of the themes of my substantive chapters.

With Chapter Three I begin my substantive chapters with an examination of politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state, governance, sovereignty, and the taking of decisions. I begin by assessing the significance of the nation-state from the perspective of its inheritances of faith and reason, despite how this might suggest a departure from more specific contemporary interventions. I use this emphasis upon the relationship between politics and faith and reason as a basis to open up a consideration of how the political is subject to Derrida's seminal concepts of deconstruction and différance. By doing so I work to consider his later arguments about about how the nation-state is subject to

'autoimmune' deconstruction, and how, in a 'hospitable' fashion, this pathes the way for the ascendency of new forms of sovereignty, and how spectres, such as those of the 2008 global financial crisis, play a role in further contributing to the nation-state's 'autoimmunity'. As a result I examine Derrida's additional argument that if we are to investigate the significance of the nation-state on its own terms and in relation to the specificity of the global financial crisis of 2008 there needs to continue to be a careful consideration of what constitutes the political. In following this argument this leads me to Derrida's conditional support of the institutions of liberal democracy and cosmopolitanism, of international institutions such as the UN, and of the legal institutions of human rights and international law.

In Chapter Four I turn to scholarship to address Derrida's argument that not only does a consideration of the nation-state require scholarly attention, but that the deconstructive conditions of 'autoimmunity' and 'hospitality' that have brought political conceptions of sovereignty and the nation-state into existence have only been made possible because of the hospitality offered by scholarship (2001a). After describing how scholarship facilitates sovereignty I argue that Derrida's engagement with Marxism develops a substantial framework for theorising the types of ways in which ideas can facilitate sovereignty, and that while there are limitations to Marx's work and Marxism for doing so, it at least points analysis in the direction of the relationship between scholarship and contemporary forms of technoscientific capitalism and sovereignty. After setting out these arguments I consider how this develops Derrida's argument that scholarship's abstract engagement with truth pits it against the far more socially acceptable activities of labour or 'work', a concept, Derrida argues, that owes an inheritance from the religious

concerns with the 'confessional' submission of the body. As a consequence, I argue that any consideration of the role of scholarship needs to acknowledge the sensitives around the prospect of a lack of work, and that the spectrality of the 2008 global financial crisis amplifies such an anxiety. Specifically, I work to supplement the attention upon the 2008 global financial crisis as a crisis of financial credit with an attention upon how the crisis can be understood as a crisis of credit in a much broader sense of inheritance, tradition, and memory.

In Chapter Five, I examine developments in the media directly. Firstly I begin by setting out Derrida's arguments about how the media involves political acts of selecting, filtering, and ordering (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, pp. 3-4), and how this involves a more discrete kind of politics or, perhaps instead, a secreted form of politics. However, I also examine how a certain contradiction marks this secretion of the political. For discretion hardly springs to mind when considering the phenomena of global spectacles, including the global spectacular transmission of events such as the global financial crisis, as well as global telecommunications. Here I examine Derrida's argument that there is a phenomena of radical 'dissimulation' that masks the conditioning of hospitality (Borradori and Derrida, 2003). Moreover, this emphasis upon dissimulation or secretion also provides the basis for my more sustained examination of the concept of the spectre and spectral effects. Here I work with Derrida's argument that while there are very sophisticated developments in media technologies, they nonetheless also involve new ways of returning to the logocentric, as suggested by the turns towards mobile, prosthetic, and digital technologies and archives. Finally, I suggest that more progressive alternatives to the global financial crisis of 2008 can be pursued by considering Derrida's argument that the

media is perhaps the most radical location of political dissonance, given that it is at the threshold of innovations about taking decisions and reorganising the 'secret'.

My substantive chapters are therefore heavily expository in their engagement with Derrida's works, preferencing a deconstructive ('more than critical') investigation into Derrida's complex examinations of inheritance between his considerable array of publications. In my final chapter, Chapter Six, I work to respond to how this can neglect the possibilities of critical reflection by discussing responses to his work that have either been critical or taken in a different direction to the interpretation that I put forward. Firstly, I examine Richard Beardsworth's argument, particularly in a more recent approach to Political Theory and its relationship with International Relations (2011), that Derrida's work is too idealistic and unrealistic, and that it neither recognises the demands of contemporary politics nor the promise of a commitment to cosmopolitanism (1996; 2011). Secondly, I examine Bernard Stiegler's argument that Derrida fails to acknowledge how contemporary technologies that can manipulate libido, attention, cognition, and memory have definitively undermined the capacity to register orthographic difference, and that there needs to be a more robust defence, through education, of competent intellectual, cultural, technical, and economic devices (or prosthetics). Finally, I engage with Michael Naas's far more sympathetic emphasis upon Derrida's engagement with the media (2012). My suggestion here is that while Naas undertakes extensive and interesting analyses of Derrida's relationship with the contemporary media he ultimately brings them together in a fashion that idealises onto-theological possibilities rather than encouraging deconstructive analysis of difference, the approach that I make a case for in this thesis.

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the introduction to this thesis, I have introduced Derrida's attention to spectres, the promise that he identifies in such an analysis for working in the name of justice, and how this can inform an approach to the impact of the 2008 global financial crisis. In doing so I located Derrida's work in relation to critical and cultural theory's examinations of traditions and assumptions, albeit also arguing that it marks a notable departure from critical and cultural theory by way of its deconstructive approach. While I articulate an interest in how critical and cultural theories have directed attention to questions about the relationship between capitalism, politics, and oppression to aesthetics and culture, I introduce my argument that Derrida's work indicates important limitations. Firstly, in their emphases upon taking specific critical and theoretical positions that neglect conditions of contingency and irreducibility. Secondly, that because of this emphasis upon the critical they are complicit with logocentrism. As a result, I introduce Derrida's suggestion that the deconstruction of the political involves an encounter with an alternative politics that is far more inclusive, given that such an approach involves a discussion about the forms in which the political can take, rather than taking a critical stance.

In this chapter I more go about making the case that Derrida's deconstructive approach is more inclusive in its approach to politics than those of critical and cultural theories by focusing upon how it takes a different approach to questions of tradition and practice. Thus, in my first section I undertake a more thorough examination of the critical and cultural theories that I refer to above with a view to setting up my argument that Derrida's

approach is distinctive and preferable for approaching the political and the politics of the 2008 crisis more specifcially. However, to further assist this approach I begin by briefly discussing the implications of Karl Marx's historical materialism, given its importance for critical theory, for Derrida's work (particularly in *Spectres of Marx*), and because of its significance as a theory of economic crisis and a more progressive society. After introducing the promise and limitations of Marx's work, I then turn to the critical and cultural theories. I consider how Marx's work was taken in new directions by Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, and Max Horkheimer, scholars associated with Frankfurt School Critical Theory. Specifically I explain that they maintain Marx's theory of crises of capitalist overproduction but suggest that the likelihood that social movements will develop as a result of such crises is troubled by how capitalism has invaded aesthetics, culture, and representation.

After setting out how their dialectics depart from a prognostic approach to the future of capitalism, I turn to two theorists of postmodernity: Fredric Jameson and Jean Baudrillard. While Jameson has updated the arguments of the Frankfurt Scholars and aligned himself with their legacy, Jean Baudrillard radically departed not only from Marxism and Critical Theory, but from the notion that representation or theory can play a role in constructing alternative political projects. After discussing Baudrillard as an incredibly troubling theorist for theories of emancipation I turn to an examination of the the works of Jacques Derrida. Here I divide my reading into three sections. Firstly, I examine the emphasis in Derrida's early works on the political economy of difference. Secondly, I examine his later emphasis upon politics and a politics of spectres. Thirdly, and finally, I undertake an examination of the secondary literature on Derrida's works in

order to reflect upon the readings that I put forward in my previous sections. Here I examine Geoffrey Bennington's emphasis upon the role of the 'idiomatic' in Derrida's work, Richard Beardsworth's (albeit critical) contribution to setting out the importance of the political in Derrida's work, and Michael Naas' emphasis upon Derrida's later turn to concepts of 'hospitality', 'autoimmunity', and the politics of the media.

1. Critical and Cultural Theory

To set out Marx and Engels' approach I will focus here on 'The German Ideology' (2000), a text provides a particularly clear argument for the materialist conception of history that would come to define the Marxist project. Specifically, it provides a selection of of claims that particularly capture their materialist approach, so I will quote these in full. Firstly, there is their argument that:

> Hitherto men have constantly made up for themselves false conceptions about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be. They have arranged their relationships according to their ideas of God, of normal man, etc. The phantoms of their brains have got out of their hands. They, the creators, have bowed down before their creations. (2000, pp. 175-176)

Secondly, there is their response to this scenario:

> Let us liberate them from the chimeras, the ideas, dogmas, imaginary beings under the yoke of which they are pining away. Let us revolt against the rule of thoughts. Let us teach men, says one, to exchange these imaginations for thoughts which correspond to the essence of man; says the second, to take up a critical attitude to them; says the third, to knock them out of their heads; and—existing reality will collapse (2000, p. 176)

And finally, in a pivotal articulation of their 'materialist method', there is their claim that:

> The premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. They are the real individuals, their activity and the material conditions under which they live, both those which they find already existing and those produced by their activity. (2000, p. 176)

As Derrida discusses in *Spectres of Marx* (2006), Marx and Engels are clearly concerned with articulating the importance of the material over anything as phantasmatic as spectres. And yet, as I will more thoroughly examine later, Derrida also argues in that text that there are numerous ways in which Marx's works open up reflections upon inheritance and inheritances that remain essential, and which even involve proto-deconstructive gestures (2006, pp. 94-95). For in 'The German Ideology' Marx and Engels articulate the importance of intervening in how the means of production, and specifically capitalism, have become not only increasingly sophisticated in their exploitative character, but alienating for oppressed and oppressors alike (2000, p. 178). They assert that there needs to be a consideration of how:

> The social structure and the state are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination, but as they really are, i.e. as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions, and conditions independent of their will. (2000, p. 180)

While Marx and Engels' initial claims to intellectual insight are rather immodest, they subsequently turn to what seems like a more sympathetic (and even humanistic) reflection on how specific modes of production like capitalism delimit material possibilities.

Moreover, Marx and Engels make a claim that is particularly prescient in the context of the 2008 global financial crisis. For they argue that this discrepancy between ideology and materiality that marks capitalism ultimately leads to periodic episodes of economic crisis (as Slavoj Žižek, for example has gleefully pointed out [2009]). More subtly though, Marx

and Engels argue that while the capitalist mode of production leads to the establishment of the brutally exploited proletariat, they also argue that the proletariat is in a privileged position because of the way in which they are a. unencumbered by bourgeois ideology through their sheer exploitation by capitalist industry, and b. given a far better understanding of capitalism works and does not work than the bourgeois can ever know. It is in this sense that Derrida asserts the significance of Marx as 'one of the rare thinkers of the past to have taken seriously, at least in its principle, the originary indissociability of technics and language, and thus of tele-technics' (if the suffix 'tele-' is to be understood as a means of articulating distance, and therefore the combination of 'tele' and 'technics' alluding to the negotiation of distance involved in writing) (2006, p. 66). However, while Marx and Engels direct attention to alternative intellectual and pedagogic experiences based upon tele-technics, they did not anticipate how these experiences could be managed by new forms of capitalism and oppression in the twentieth century that came to even operate in the name of Marx and communism.

Walter Benjamin opens 'Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' by stating that a key aspect of Marx's inability to foresee how capitalism could invade representation rested with how the capitalist mode of production 'was in its infancy' (1986a, p. 217). By contrast, Benjamin argues that capitalism has become 'manifest in all areas of culture', and as a consequence it has acquired the attention of the proletariat (1986a, p. 218). However, in making this case Benjamin retains the theory of overproduction and identifies new implications. On the one hand he argues that despite the invasion of culture by capital, the representational and media technologies that develop as a result of the demands of capitalism to negotiate overproduction are borne from a heightened

relationship with dialectics (1986a, p. 220). As a result these new technologies provide the means for a radical politics that can instigate a more inclusive social order. The problem is that capitalism, or rather the 'cult value' that Benjamin believes underpins capitalism, 'does not give way without resistance' (1986a, p. 225). It is in this context that Benjamin explains the rise of fascism.

In a sense Benjamin's essay is therefore a combination of a call to the possibilities of the role of mechanical reproduction in culture, through the development of printing presses, lithography, photography, radio, and film, with a pessimistic outlook on how reactionary forces have learnt to appropriate these new representational technologies. Moreover, Benjamin argues that the main feature of cult value is its 'retrenchment' into 'the human countenance' (1986a, pp. 225-226). As such, Benjamin sets out a series of phenomena that revolve around the issue of identity. He explains that portraiture dominates photography (1986a, p. 226), 'the cult of the movie star' (1986a, p. 231), but also the proliferation of 'stars' into everyday life with documentary film and correspondence from newspaper readers (1986a, pp. 231-232). Finally, Benjamin finishes the essay with a haunting epilogue that links the human countenance of cult value to the 'Führer cult' of fascism (1986a, p. 241).

Nonetheless, Benjamin insists through to the end of this essay that there is something rebellious about the distraction celebrated by the Dadaists and argues that cult value is disrupted by the absent-mindedness engendered by the spectacle found, for instance, in the cinema (1986a, pp. 240-241). The essay is therefore a call for a politics that intervenes in representation to support how these new techniques enable critical reflection. Furthermore I think it is worth noting his argument in the 'Theses on the Philosophy of

History' that even in the darkest of times there is always the presence of what he calls a '*weak* Messianic power' (1986b, p. 254). There is, he insists, always a messianic 'claim' of history over the present. History is a site of conflict. The problem he identifies is that the violence of reactionary forces circumscribes the possibility for critical reflection. However, Benjamin's colleague Theodor Adorno took a very different position on the implications of representational technologies.

In personal correspondence that responds to 'Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' Adorno writes to Benjamin that we should not celebrate the death of art and favour mechanical reproduction. Adorno argues that art is 'inherently dialectical' because it 'juxtaposes the magical and the mark of freedom' and that mechanical reproduction is complicit with an instrumentalist reason that involves a reductive, authoritarian gesture (1986a, pp. 127-129). Adorno, with Max Horkheimer, developed this theory in more detail in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (2002). Horkheimer and Adorno's work suggests that societies have become dominated by attempts to instrumentalise and industrialise life in as total fashion as possible. Charting the rise and development of the Enlightenment they identify instrumental reason within the representational frameworks of religion, philosophy, science, aesthetics, culture, and politics. Ultimately these coalesce in the everyday lifeworld through what they term the 'culture industry' (2002, p. 94). Furthermore, Horkheimer and Adorno argue that the instrumentalisation of reason, through the culture industry, has resulted in the development of totalitarianism.

Subsequently Horkheimer and Adorno supplement Marx and Engels' investigations into capital. They offer more substantial explanations for the origins of capitalisation. However, in contrast to Marx and Engels, and like Benjamin, they argue that there is

something that is intellectually and socially redemptive about culture. In particular they retain a concept like Benjamin's theory of weak messianic power and the claim of the past over the present by directing attention to works of art that register contradiction and suffering over resolution: 'the great artists were never those whose works embodied style in its least fractured, most perfect form but those who adopted style as a rigour to set against the chaotic expression of suffering, as a negative truth' (2002, p. 103).

Adorno develops this more thoroughly with the theory of the 'negative dialectic' (2007), but in one of his last pieces he argues that such a dialectics is not only a responsibility but an inevitable response to 'late capitalism' because of how this system has 'now reached its limits. It has now become fate and finds its expression in what Freud called ubiquitous, free-flowing anxiety; free-flowing because it is no longer able to attach itself to living beings, whether to individuals or classes' (2003, pp. 124-125). We might therefore argue here that in this context Adorno reiterates a prognostic approach that resembles Marx and Engels' writings more than Benjamin's. However, Adorno's project retains a commitment to redemption, even if it means involving a 'melancholy science' (2005, p. 15) that works through the most problematic of social phenomena, from the culture industry to anti-Semitism (2002, p. 137) and totalitarianism (2002, p. 152). However, in the work of Fredric Jameson and Jean Baudrillard the problems of contemporary society have been explored in more fatalistic terms with the ascendency of simulation and postmodern culture.

Jameson supplements Adorno and Horkheimer's culture industry thesis by arguing that they have become accustomed to responding to the challenges of overproduction and crisis with such sophistication and speed that they have become characterized by a

schizophrenic obsession with difference (1991, p. xii). Subsequently Jameson breaks down his arguments on postmodern culture via a series of sub-phenomena. There is: a prevalence of unsubstantial 'pastiche' (1991, p. 17); a mining of history for pastiche characterised by nostalgia, and a subsequent discarding of historicity and temporality (1991, p. 18); a focus on 'simulacra' (1991, pp. 25-26); and the sublimation of technological complexity ('technological sublime') (1991, p. 34). However, despite the extent of these phenomena Jameson also retains Adorno and Horkheimer's argument that instrumental culture and experience are dissonant. In particular he identifies dissonance between the globalising spatial effects of postmodern culture and experiences of the local. Furthermore, like Adorno, Jameson takes inspiration from aesthetics and culture. He argues that there is a burgeoning response to postmodern culture that he calls 'cognitive mapping' (1991, p. 54).

As a consequence Jameson's work proceeds by following a dialectic that distinguishes problematic postmodern culture from forms and content that are more favourable because they register a broader array of experiences. However, in doing so Jameson departs from Adorno's emphasis upon suffering towards a broader emphasis upon what is lost, with the suggestion that postmodern culture has rendered the recognition of suffering untenable. The following question that I think it is important to ask in the context of the disorientating power of postmodern culture is whether the registering of dissonance remains possible. Furthermore, even if it is possible, is it detrimental to focus on specific forms of dissonance, or does this constitute an attribution of privilege that only serves to feed postmodernity. This question is posed by Jean Baudrillard, a theorist to which Jameson explicitly acknowledges a debt towards in his theorisation of postmodern

culture and approach to simulacra (1991, p. 399), though he should perhaps more precisely be characterised as a cultural and media theorist.

Despite his debt to Baudrillard, Jameson ultimately departs from him because he insists that there needs to be a formulation of an alternative social or political project. It would be wrong to say that Baudrillard is unconcerned with oppression. He frequently refers to 'control' (1988b, p. 121) and 'social control' (1988c, p. 208). However, Baudrillard also significantly departs from the theorists I have been examining thus far because he claims that any attempt to construct an alternative political or social model ultimately results in complicity with the forms of postmodern culture that Jameson discusses. Indeed, Baudrillard targets Marx (along with Sigmund Freud) as a significant contributor to the proliferation of simulation through the privileging of work and the experiences of capitalism (the 'tele-technics' that I refer to above) (1988b, p. 119). In doing so Baudrillard suggests that both Marx and Freud have only contributed to the supplanting of the 'symbolic exchange' of suffering and mortality in 'primitive' societies by representational apparatuses that respond to spectre of being scared to death, to the point at which representational technologies have become autonomous.

As such any registration of suffering is likely a 'simulation' rather than a real act of symbolic exchange. What then is the contribution of Baudrillard's project to questions of social control? In a speculative formulation, he insists that the absorption of representation by simulation might be of long-term benefit to society. In a fashion that in some sense resembles the Marxian theory of capitalist crises of overproduction, to Adorno's notion of the limits of late capitalism, and to Jameson's arguments upon a dissonance between culture and locality, Baudrillard maintains that the abstraction that

underpins simulation will ultimately lead to real encounters with mortality, and subsequently a return to symbolic exchange. The task that Baudrillard therefore sets is to undertake what he calls a 'speculation to the death' (1988b, p. 124). Simulation is to be provoked into further complex forms until it bursts. As such the question that arises is where to undertake such provocations. Here Baudrillard turns his attention to massively and globally mediatised events such as 9/11. Here his works are particularly relevant for considering the implications of the 2008 global financial crisis.

On the one hand Baudrillard is of course famous for stating that *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place* (1995). Likely less well known is that he also argued that the 1987 Wall Street Crash, an event with obvious similarities to the 2008 global financial crisis, was not a real catastrophe but rather a '*virtual* catastrophe' (1993, p. 26). However, on the other hand Baudrillard argues that while AIDS has, like financial crashes, been subject to simulation in popular culture, it can at least still 'be experienced as a genuine catastrophe' (1993, p. 37). However, of particular significance is his reaction to 9/11. Unlike 'the death of Diana', 'the World Cup', or even 'violent, real events, from wars right through to genocides' 9/11 was a 'symbolic event' that represented 'a setback for globalization itself' because it involved a symbolic exchange between the westerners who had 'dreamt' and even '*wished*' for the event, and the terrorists who actually '*did* it' (2002, pp. 3-5).

Putting aside the crassness and insensitivity of these claims about AIDS and 9/11 (given less than two months after the attacks), my theoretical concern he is with how Baudrillard attributes something redemptive to them. More specifically my concern here is with how Baudrillard determines certain forms of meaning to these events, for I want to suggest that this forecloses an engagement with a more diverse range of experiences. More

specifically still, I want to suggest here that there is certain complicity between the specific meanings that Baudrillard attributes to these phenomena and the repetitions that have characterised the reduction of the experiences of these experiences. People with AIDS as AIDS victims, the 9/11 attacks as a singular event (rather than the collection of attacks that took place, not only in New York [Redfield, 2009]); the lives beyond the rhetoric and imagery. It is from a concern to consider the myriad of experiences that my attention subsequently turns to the work of Jacques Derrida and his epistemologically challenging notion of the spectre.

2. Derrida and the Political Economy of Difference

In 1993 Jacques Derrida delivered a lecture later published as *Spectres of Marx* (2006). The occasion of the lecture was a conference titled 'Wither Marxism?', examining, in the context of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the ascendency of the United States as the sole remaining superpower, whether Marxism retains a future as means of analysis or organising society. In his lecture Derrida argues that while Marxism is certainly not without its problems it still has important implications for such a political project. For Derrida Marxism continues to provide a platform for asking questions if we approach it by way of its 'spectres'. That is, the troubling spectral figures of Marx, Marxism, and Marxists in conservative rhetoric and narratives, the spectralization of whole populations by the catastrophic totalitarian projects inspired by Marxism, and the spectres within Marx's writings itself, from the spectre of communism haunting Europe, to the phantasmatic character of capital. However, Derrida's work with the figure of the spectre also works at the limits of Marxism. For Derrida describes how politics is becoming increasingly distorted by:

> So many *spectral* effects, the new speed of *apparition* (we understand this word in its ghostly sense) of the simulacrum, the synthetic or prosthetic image, and the virtual event, cyberspace and surveillance, the control, appropriations, and speculations. (2006, p. 63, italics in original)

We are therefore presented with a rather different take on the implications of contemporary technologies that I have described in section one. If Marxism is beneficial because of its diversity of spectres, this should subsequently suggest that the proliferation of '*spectral effects*' and the displacement of the political are also beneficial. However, Derrida's approach to spectres is far more nuanced than this, and he by no means approaches the displacement of the political without concern. In *Spectres of Marx* Derrida makes this case by subtly differentiating between spectres that dominate the spectral landscape and spectres that provide the basis for a more inclusive political project. However, before I examine Derrida's attempts to set out a politics of spectres it is important to come to terms with the theoretical framework that he employs for making his case. To do this it is important to consider his earlier work on writing. I want to suggest here that Derrida's earlier work on writing in texts such as Of Grammatology and Writing and Difference are significant for *Spectres of Marx* and his later, more explicit, references to politics because they set out a framework for understanding the kinds of limitations and possibilities that approaches to politics present.

Setting out the significance he attributes to writing at the beginning of *Of Grammatology*, Derrida claims that while a 'science of writing – *grammatology* – shows signs of liberation all over the world' he claims that its diversity is ultimately 'reined in by metaphor, metaphysics, and theology' (1997a, pp. 3-4, my italics). While writing has diversified in scope it is also, Derrida asserts, it will always be subject to certain limits that impose

'*closure*' (1997a, p. 4, italics in original). Subsequently he describes how closure has come about, focusing primarily upon the inheritance of the conception of the 'logos'; of the word of God or enlightened reason (1997a, p. 4). However, for Derrida there needs to be an understanding of how closure is to be found in the more formal aspects of writing, and not just specific conceptual frameworks. Through a 'meditation and painstaking investigation' into writing, exploring its characteristics and, furthermore, letting it develop its 'positivity', he suggests that there is a far more attentive approach to how writing instigates the event. The challenge is to make sure that the 'inadequacy' by which closure has been accompanied does not undermine this relationship between writing and the event. That said, he acknowledges that this challenge should certainly not be underestimated.

Indicative here is how the final paragraph of *Of Grammatology*'s exergue suggests that 'the future can only be anticipated in the form of an absolute danger' (1997a, p. 5). Derrida's claim here rests on the significance that he attributes to 'logos' because of his argument that logos is not just about faith and reason but also the manner in which faith and reason are intimately tied up with questions of being, life, and death. On the one hand Derrida undertakes an examination of how speech has been privileged over and distinguished from writing within the Western metaphysical tradition. On the other hand, he acknowledges how this privilege 'does not depend upon a choice that could have been avoided' (1997a, p. 7). He suggests that the privileging of speech is the understandable result of the underpinning emphasis upon the logocentric, for speech presents a more intimate relationship with the metaphysics of the ideal than the non-ideal, the transcendental than the empirical, the totality or 'worldly' than the disparate, and the

inside than the outside (1997a, p. 8). Meanwhile, Derrida argues that the distinction of speech from writing suggests that there has also been an attempt to erase the relationship between speech and the non-ideal, empirical, disparate, and outside. However, while writing may have become an accepted part of everyday life Derrida insists that the metaphysical economy that tends towards the phonocentric and delimits in grammatology is unavoidable. To make this case he examines the western metaphysical tradition by way of its relationship to metaphor, metaphysics, and theology introduced above.

To address this Derrida makes use of two broad legacies of Western metaphysics: the explicit privileging and distinction of speech from writing set out in philosophies from Plato 'to Hegel', and a more subtle privileging of the logocentric evident from the 'pre-Socratics to Heidegger' (1997a, p. 3). With the former Derrida sets out a tension between metaphor and metaphysics. Although Derrida insists that phonocentricity is largely indebted to Plato he opens with the somewhat clearer argument set out by Aristotle:

> "Spoken words" (*ta en tē phonē*) are the symbols of mental experience (pathēmata tes psychēs) and written words are the symbols of spoken words (...) because the voice, producer of the first symbols, has a relationship of essential and immediate proximity with the mind. (1997a, p. 11)

For Aristotle speech is therefore the 'first signifier' and, as such, no ordinary signifier: 'Written language would establish the conventions, interlinking other conventions with them' (1997a, p. 11). However, while such a proposition is premised in a metaphysical argument for Derrida there needs to be a consideration of how 'a metaphoric mediation has insinuated itself into the relationship and has simulated immediacy' (1997a, p. 15). There is, therefore, no metaphysics and no naming without recourse to the other.

This emphasis then subsequently encompasses medieval Christian theology. Although attention is directed from the logos of metaphysics to theology, medieval Christian texts make their claims based on its natural, eternal, and universal qualities (1997a, p. 15). Again, there is an emphasis on its relationship to the other. However, with Jean-Jacques Rousseau the 'Platonic gesture' undergoes a significant transformation. Rousseau certainly maintains the notion of metaphor – indeed he explicitly calls for a 'metaphoric' form of writing (1997a, p. 17). Moreover he maintains a theological basis that focuses upon 'divine law' (1997a, p. 17). The distinction of his work rests in his privileging of 'presence'. More specifically it is a 'self-presence in the senses, in the sensible cogito, which simultaneously carries in itself the inscription of divine law' (1997a, p. 17). Rousseau writes that: 'the Bible is the most sublime of all books (...), but it is after all a book (...) It is not at all in a few sparse pages that one should look for God's law, but in the human heart where His hand deigned to write' (Rousseau in Derrida, 1997a, p. 17). In so doing Rousseau opens up the capacity of the ideal from the texts of metaphysics and theology to experience.

But if Rousseau relocates the metaphoricity of classical Greek metaphysics and Medieval Christian in the text, for Derrida Martin Heidegger more profoundly transgresses this tradition. For Derrida examines how particularly after *The Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger works in a sustained manner to attack and denounce not just the heritage of writing but also the philosophical heritage of metaphysics and being. Moreover, in doing so raises a significant question about authority. For Derrida extrapolates from Heidegger's writings an argument that the 'difference between signified and signifier is *nothing*' (1997a, p. 23, italics in original). For Heidegger there is no original, authoritative

form of access to being such as speech because being is itself an artificial concept, and this in turn brings authority into question more generally. And yet, Derrida also notes that Heidegger undermines this moment of transgression with an implicit form of authority. For Heidegger's argument, while not based on the endorsement of a specific authority, repeatedly refers to "being" before crossing it out (1997a, p. 23). Heidegger's project is therefore indebted to the concept of being, even when it attacks it.

Derrida subsequently asserts that by repeatedly crossing out the concept of being Heidegger instigates a new 'metaphysics of presence and logocentrism', such that 'this last writing is also the first writing' (1997a, p. 23). Heidegger's crossing out of being remains 'legible' beneath the marks, and as a consequence he sets out a new paradigm for 'a transcendental signified' (1997a, p. 23), which is to say a new form of primordial authority. Nonetheless, Derrida maintains that it is important to engage with the transgressive possibilities of Heidegger's work. Derrida takes this notion of the arbitrariness of the relationship between the signifier and the signified even further. Rather than arguing that the signifier originating in a negative 'transcendental or trans-epochal signified' Derrida posits that what we have here is, purposefully ambiguously, 'a determined signifying trace' that determines that '*all is not to be thought at one go*' (1997a, p. 23, italics in original). Any decision is '*derivative* with regard to difference'. As such, Derrida insists that we should begin from the premise of an 'economy' of difference. More specifically, Derrida conceptualises this economy as a movement of '*différance*' (1997a, p. 23, my italics). Différance is therefore distinct from difference because it works to describe the production of difference – or of 'differing/deferring' (1997a, p. 23).

This is a subtle and difficult distinction between 'difference' and 'différance' that is no accident. This distinction is premised on not just the difficulty but *impossibility* of identifying the origins of the economy of differing and deferring. It refers to the 'necessity of passing through that erased determination, [how] the necessity of that trick of writing is irreducible' (1997a, pp. 23-24). Here it is worth briefly straying from *Of Grammatology* to Derrida's lecture itself titled 'Différance' (1982b). For in this lecture Derrida suggests, citing the inaudible distinction between difference and différance (in French) that this concept is intended to articulate difference but also, to refer to how an economy is always like a tomb, or 'Egyptian Pyramid', for the Greek word to which we inherit the concept of economy is 'oikesis' meaning both home *and* tomb (1982b, pp. 3-4, italics in original). Thus, an enshrinement of the economy of difference is also an '*economy of death*' (1982a, p. 4, italics in original). The intention behind the concept is that 'We will be able neither to do without the passage through a written text, nor to avoid the order of the disorder produced within it – and this, first of all, is what counts for me' (1982b, p. 4).

Derrida notes that while 'the detours, locutions, and syntax in which I will often have to take recourse will resemble those of negative theology' he insists that his approach, unlike Heidegger's, 'derives from no category of being, whether present or absent (1982b, p. 6). Returning to *Of Grammatology* we see that Derrida characterises Heidegger's negative engagement with being in terms of 'hesitation' or 'trembling' 1997a, p. 24). Derrida insists that such a trembling is not due to any theoretical "incoherence" (Derrida's inverted commas). Rather, it is because the more that Heidegger furthers his thesis the more it is subject to the economy of différance, and to its theoretical 'deconstruction' (1997a, p. 24). This is the case with all 'post-Hegelian' frameworks that pursue a total response to

metaphysics (1997a, p. 24). Heidegger's project continues and contributes to the Western tradition even when it is working to undermine it and even when it works to rein it in. Heidegger's framework does this conceptually, through the crossing out of being, but also formally through how it relies on certain concepts and acquires coherence by passing through writing. To examine the management of writing in closer detail Derrida turns to the linguistic and semiotic project of Ferdinand de Saussure.

In a sense Saussure also operates in a fashion that is 'true to the Western tradition' because he refuses to offer the concept of writing 'more than a narrow and derivative function' (1997a, p. 30). Like Aristotle, Saussure insists that written words are the symbols of spoken words, which are in turn symbols of mental words: 'Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second *exists for the sole purpose of representing* the first' (Saussure in Derrida, 1997a, p. 30, italics in original). However, Saussure takes Aristotle's framework further by arguing that the experience of the logos carries with it a science of *language*. There is a 'unity of the *phonè* [sound], the *glossa* [the linguistic measure], and the *logos* [truth]' (1997a, p. 29). Without a science of language speech would be merely a collection of abstract sounds. By contrast, writing only gives representation to language and does not have a direct link with the glossa or the logos. This distinction is, Derrida writes, 'at bottom justified (...) by the notion of the arbitrariness of the sign' (1997a, p. 32). For Saussure this affects writing more than speech because while it maintains the systematic quality of speech, there is also no "symbolic" or "figurative" quality (Saussure in Derrida, 1997a, p. 32).

In turn this leads to the rejection of an 'entire family of concepts inherited from metaphysics' (1997a, p. 33). It expands the primacy of nature over culture to *physis* over

nomos and techné. Furthermore this leads to rejection of 'the rights of history, production, institutions etc., except in the form of the arbitrary and in the substance of naturalism' (1997a, p. 33). Nonetheless, Saussure retains significance for writing: 'We cannot simply disregard it. We must be acquainted with its usefulness, shortcomings, and dangers' (Saussure in Derrida, 1997a, p. 34). Writing would therefore be 'an imperfect tool and a dangerous, almost maleficent, technique' (Derrida, 1997a, p. 34). Less an emphasis on setting out, protecting, or recuperating speech than protecting it from writing (1997a, p. 34). However, for Derrida, like the relationship with being and metaphysics in Heidegger, the 'outside bears with the inside a relationship that is, as usual, anything but simple exteriority' (1997a, p. 35). This "natural bond" that Saussure attributes to the phonic system is no more innocent that writing. It is for this reason that not only speech but 'language is first, in a sense (...), writing' (1997a, p. 35). Moreover, it indicates that the 'usurpation' that Saussure characterises the rise of writing as 'has always already begun' (1997a, p. 37).

Derrida appreciates Saussure's resistance to speech based on its relationship to heterogenous experience in the face of instrumentalisation; 'Saussure's reasons are good' (1997a, p. 39). Derrida actually therefore identifies problems with Saussure's arguments by working them against themselves: 'from the moment that one considers the totality of determined signs, spoken, and a fortiori written, as unmotivated institutions, one must exclude any relationship of natural subordination, any natural hierarchy among signifiers or orders of signifiers' (1997a, p. 44). As a result if we take writing to mean 'inscription', and in particular 'the durable institution of a sign', writing should cover 'the entire field of linguistic signs' (1997a, p. 44). Moreover, if we are focusing upon inscription and

institution this brings in to question the episteme and the logos. This link between signs, writing, knowledge, and logos is important because it presents a firm basis to approach 'all the Western methods of analysis, explication, reading, or interpretation' (1997a, pp. 45-46). Nonetheless, it remains that Derrida's attention is on the limits of these institutions. To do this he focuses upon the non-presence that is at work in his approach to metaphor from the outset, and more specifically upon the concept of the 'trace' that I briefly introduced above (1997a, p. 46).

For Derrida the trace helps to direct attention towards 'another here-and-now, of another transcendental present, of another origin of the world' (1997a, p. 47). As such the trace '*articulates its possibility in the entire field of the entity*' (1997a, p. 47, italics in original). But how can this destabilisation of meaning possibly engender a political project? Derrida's focus here is on the possibilities raised by responsibility and to the notion of reining in writing by metaphor, metaphysics, and theology at the beginning of *Of Grammatology*. To articulate this I want to refer here to the lecture 'Signature Event Context' (1982c). At the beginning of the piece Derrida addresses the negativity that his position suggests. In relation to communication he argues that while meaning, including communication, is indeterminable this does not give us 'authorization for neglecting *communication* as a word, or for impoverishing its polysemic aspects; indeed, this word opens up a semantic domain that precisely does not limit itself to semantics, semiotics, and even less to linguistics' (1982c, p. 309, italics in original). Derrida draws these possibilities out by directing attention to repeatability or 'iterability' of communication (1982c, p. 315).

On the one hand iterability conceptualises the possibility of repetition. However, applying the deconstructive practice that I outline above, Derrida states that with the possibility of iterability is inevitably bound up with the question of its *impossibility*. Iterability plays an important role in supplementing Derrida's concept of différance outlined above because it directs attention to how the written mark not only instigates the inscription of the event but instigates the conceptual possibility (and impossibility) of the event itself (1982c, pp. 325-326). To give an example of how this works, Derrida concludes his essay with an articulation of the signature as 'the place where both writing and presence are in question' (1982c, p. 327). On the one hand this means that the signature is a conceit, for it suggests that presence can be inscribed. However, on the other hand, this also means that the signature marks a singular, unique event of 'deconstruction' (1982c, p. 329). The responsibility that Derrida subsequently focuses upon through his earlier works is the consideration of iterability, différance, and deconstruction. In my next section I discuss how his later 'political' works can potentially help to do this.

3. Towards a Politics of Spectres

Derrida's works from the mid-1980s made particularly explicit reference to the concept of the political and to specific political issues, particularly from the 1990s, with texts such as *Spectres of Marx* (2006), *Politics of Friendship* (1997b), 'Faith and Knowledge' (2002a), 'Autoimmunity' (2003) and *Rogues* (2005b). But it has also been noted that Derrida was irritated by the notion that his work took a 'political turn' (see Peeters, 2013, p. 486). He was opposed to the idea of a turn on the more substantial basis that it suggests a moment of teleological revelation (see Cheah and Guerlac, 2009, pp. 3-4). And yet in this chapter I do examine such a distinction. I do this on the basis that Derrida's later 'political' works

offer important additional concepts for undertaking a deconstructive examination of the 2008 global financial crisis.

I think that Derrida's later works make specific contributions to examining contemporary politics. I focus my attention on the politics of culture and the media, the technologies that enable them, and how to approach them through an alternative, more inclusive political project. Specifically, I return to focus upon how his later works examine the figure of the 'spectre'. Derrida's concept of the spectre strongly resembles his characterisation of the trace. Like the trace, the spectre articulatees how notions of presence are undermined by the role of that which is not present (non-presence). The explanation that I wish to offer here for Derrida's turn to the concept of the spectre is that, on the one hand, it operates in relation to some specific discourses around Marx (in *Spectres of Marx*) and, on the other hand and in a more substantial way, it supplements his work on the trace with a conception of the role of logocentrism, to life, death, and the body, and to the political concern with sovereignty. The subsequent question we would need to ask is why Derrida thinks that it is important to question the presence of the body. In *Spectres of Marx* this question specifically relates to the body of Marx. This is principally because Derrida's text is an adaptation of lectures given in response to the question of the future of Marxism. However, in *Spectres of Marx* he also examines how questions of embodiment are developing, through the post-World War II rhetoric of human rights, liberal democracy, telecommunications and media (*teletechnologies*), and advances in prosthetic technologies.

Before I examine Derrida's engagement with particular spectral forms I will outline why Derrida argues that questions of life are important. Derrida writes at the beginning of

Spectres of Marx by insisting that nothing is more necessary than learning to live: 'it is ethics itself' (2006, p. xvii). Thus Derrida examines the concept of the spectre because while it directs attention to questions about life it retains a relationship with non-presence. Again, Derrida is not constituting an alternative metaphysical framework. Spectrality is inherent to questions of life. The articulation of life is only made possible by its encounter with its limitations and its otherness: 'To live, by definition, is not something one learns. Not from oneself, it is not learned from life, taught by life. Only from the other and by death. In any case from the other at the edge of life' (2006, p. xvii). Furthermore, as with the trace, the formation of spectrality holds within it a considerable promise for ethics because its articulation 'remains to be done, it can happen only between life and death' (2006, p. xvii).

As with the trace we are, however, faced with the issue of spectrality being reined in by metaphor, metaphysics, and theology. While Derrida begins by expressing the ethical implications of spectres the very first lines of the text state that 'Someone, you or me, comes forward and says: *I would like to learn to live finally*' (2006, p. xvi, italics in original). However, Derrida accepts that his attempts to pursue a project that is receptive to the margins of questions of life – a '*politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations' (2006, p. xviii, italics in original) – 'may be shocking to some' (2006, p. xx). After all, Derrida writes, 'To whom, finally, would an obligation of justice ever entail a commitment [and] to whom and to what if not to the life of a living being?' (2006, p. xx). His approach to spectres therefore brings into question a significant tradition in the politics of justice. More specifically, it brings into question eulogies to the oppressed, and in the context of Marxism in this piece, the proletariat, actors in the Marxist tradition, and Marx himself.

Derrida's argument is that the sublation of specific identities risks merely contributing to a political economy of memory and spectrality, undermining attempts to focus upon attention upon their implications (2006, p. xx).

Nonetheless *Spectres of Marx* does not simply reject Marx and Marxism. Indeed, *Spectres of Marx* argues that Marx and Marxism continue to be crucial for developing questions about justice. Admittedly Derrida includes the importance of recalling the catastrophic totalitarian incarnation of Marxism within this equation. However, Derrida also argues that Marxism is significant for four additional reasons. Firstly, there is a vast plurality of Marx and Marxism's inheritance (hence the plurality of 'spectres') (2006, pp. 1-2). Secondly:

> The [Marxist] tradition seems as lucid concerning the way in which the political is becoming worldwide, concerning the irreducibility of the technical and the media in the current of the most thinking thought-and this goes beyond the railroad and the newspapers of the time whose powers were analysed in such an incomparable way in the Manifesto. And few texts have shed so much light on law, international law, and nationalism. (2006, pp. 13-14)

Thirdly, this is possible because of his (albeit conflicted) exploration of spectres – 'The Communist Manifesto' famously beginning with the line 'A spectre is haunting Europe, the spectre of communism' (2006, p. 2). And fourthly, and perhaps most importantly, Derrida insists that Marxism helps to articulate that which haunts contemporary capitalism and authority.

For Derrida Marxism is important because it combines an examination of a host of questions about oppression with an articulation of the inadequacies and limitations of inheritances including religion, philosophy, nationalism and, ultimately, capitalism. For Derrida these ghosts – 'Marx's ghosts' – continue to be found in the 'tiresomeness [that]

comes across in the body of today's most phenomenal culture: what one hears, reads, and sees, what is most mediatized in Western capitals' (2006, pp. 16-17). To examine this culture in more detail Derrida reviews Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History*, a popular text in liberal and conservative theory in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. In this text Fukuyama celebrates the 'good news' of the ascendency of American-led liberal democratic politics and capitalist economics (neo-liberalism) while also combining it with the empirical claim that this should be conceptualised as an event that marks 'the end of history'. This is problematic for Derrida because he argues that it reduces the role of the empirical, the possibility of the 'event' (as that which is not anticipated), and therefore taking an antagonistic stance towards spectres and, as a result, democracy.

Thus, firstly Derrida argues that the end of history thesis essentially reduces empirical history to a vacuous conception. Fukuyama's thesis overlooks the roles that liberalism has played in the 'two world wars, the horrors of totalitarianism – Nazi, fascist, Stalinist – the massacres of Pol Pot' (2006, p. 71). More fundamentally, it reduces 'historical empiricity, however massive and catastrophic and global and multiple and recurrent it might be [to an] *anhistoric telos* of history' (2006, p. 71). Secondly, this 'anhistoric telos' refuses the possibility of alterity: 'these "events" or these "facts" would belong to empiricity, to the "empirical flow of events in the second half of the century" ' (2006, p. 73). Derrida identifies a messianic spectrality here in the 'evangelistic figure' of neoliberalism. Now, this is not a figuration or messiah in the conventional, human sense, but this is clearly not an issue for Derrida. He continues to extend this conception of figuration to 'the figure of the Promised Land' (2006, p. 72). However, Derrida also asserts that this 'seems to exceed

the simple rhetorical cliché' (2006, p. 72). It is also found in the putting to work (and to the test) 'the old concepts of state and nation-state, of international law, of tele-techno-medio-economic and scientifico-military forces' (2006, p. 72).

There is therefore a messianic figuration – a spectrality – in the form of the rhetoric, in the underpinning conventions and assumptions of law, in forms of teletechnologies, and knowledge, science, technology and faith. However, Derrida does not reject the messianic. Firstly this is because the messianic, like the figure of the grammé and the sign in my previous section, necessarily include the negotiation of the trace. However, secondly, Derrida also attributes a particular significance to the figure of the messianic. He claims that:

> What remains irreducible to any deconstruction, what remains as undeconstructible as the possibility itself of deconstruction is, perhaps, a certain experience of the emancipatory promise; it is perhaps even the formality of a structural messianism, a messianism without religion, even a messianic without messianism, *an idea of justice*-which we distinguish from law or right and even from human rights-*and an idea of democracy*. (2006, p. 74, my italics)

So, the messianic refers to a promise to that which we are not yet aware of, a radical openness to the event and to difference and it also directs attention to the more specific ethical and political questions of justice and democracy.

Dealing firstly with the event-ness of spectres, this is no doubt a break with the majority of theorists I outline above in section one, *bar* Walter Benjamin. Indeed Derrida makes specific reference to Benjamin's conception of a 'weak messianic force' (2006, p. 69), but this is also clear from Derrida's reciprocity to spectres and his identification of the eventness of 'the fantastic, ghostly, "synthetic", "prosthetic", virtual happenings in the scientific domain and therefore the domain of the techno-media and therefore the public

or political domain' (2006, p. 79). Now, this is not to say that Derrida approaches the virtual event without criticism. We are dealing with questions about the authority of spectres here; a politics of spectres. A virtual event is undoubtedly an event but it does not define the event, for this definition is provided by unforeseeability. However, Derrida is insistent that the spectral or 'virtual' event should not be reduced to the simulacra of the event (as with Jameson and Baudrillard). The spectre (and by extension the spectral event) is subject to disruption and it is this messianic promise that directs attention to questions of justice and subsequently democracy. This is because for Derrida democracy is characterised by 'diastema (failure, inadequation, disjunction, disadjustment, being "out of joint")' (2006, p. 81).

In this way Derrida's promise of democracy is specific to how democracy is '*to come*' (2006, p. 81, italics in original). This democracy certainly has an inevitability about it, but it contrasts with Fukuyama's idea of the inevitable perfection of liberal democracy by suggesting that democracy does not coalesce around an ideal form but, rather, articulates the inevitability of disruption. Moreover it suggests that politics is haunted by democracy. Thus Derrida's attention is upon the moment at which disruption is managed, and this is not limited to the decisions and policies of nation-state governments or liberal democracies. Rather, it is to be found in philosophy, religion, economics, technology, and teletechnologies, which should be no surprise given his attention to writing earlier in his earlier works. But how then to prioritise attention to these politics? How should we go about investigating spectres? To articulate this with more detail he draws attention to the emergency of a form of political affinity that he calls the 'New International', drawing upon the Marxist inheritance. To understand his faith in the emergency of such a project

of affinity it is helpful to consider how, in Chapter Three of *Spectres of Marx*, 'Wears and Tears', Derrida sets out ten 'plagues' (again evoking the body) that are particularly troubling within contemporary global politics.

These plagues are the issues that persisted after the end of the Cold War – such as famine, civil war, unemployment, and corruption. However, Derrida's intervention is really about how these plagues are approached. Firstly, we can approach them like Fukuyama, using them to substantiate an idealist, teleological model of liberal democracy, no matter their specificities, or even if they fundamentally undermine such a model. Or they could form the basis for 'a link of affinity, suffering, and hope' (2006, p. 106). Unlike the first interpretation it would welcome difference as 'an untimely link, without status, without title, and without name' (2006, p. 106). Moreover, there would be no real 'co-ordination', it would be 'without party, without country, without national community (International before, across, and beyond any national determination), without co-citizenship, without common belonging to a class' (2006, pp. 106-107). It is for this reason that Derrida ultimately celebrates Marx on the basis that his works present significant investigations into a host of political consequences. However, for Derrida there is undoubtedly also a need to be aware of the catastrophe of the institutions established in Marx's name. This feeds into a broader question about how suffering can be sublimated.

Derrida's discussion of how sublimation risks delimiting justice is an important component of his conceptualisation of 'hospitality'. Derrida briefly asserts the role of negotiating hospitality in the encounter with the spectre in *Spectres of Marx*, and how this encounter is conditioned by impossibility (2006, pp. 81-82). However, in *Of Hospitality* (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000) he examines this in more detail. Specifically he

argues that if we wish to offer hospitality, out of an ethico-political commitment, that is an 'absolute or unconditional hospitality', we need to recognise that this 'presupposes a break with hospitality in the ordinary sense, with *conditional hospitality*, with the right to or pact of hospitality' (2000, p. 25, my italics). For Derrida argues that with unconditional hospitality, of the sort that is being proposed:

> I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner (provided with a family name, with the social status of being a foreigner, etc.), but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I *give place* to them, that I let them come, that I let them arrive, and take place in the place I offer them, without asking of them either reciprocity (entering into a pact) or even their names. (2000, pp. 25-27, italics in original)

The last words 'or even their names' are particularly important since what encounter, Derrida poses, does not begin with the question, be it interrogative or welcoming: 'what is your name?' (2000, p. 27). Thus, however well-intentioned, any offer of hospitality is bound up with a certain restriction of political diversity.

And yet Derrida argues that unconditional hospitality does have an impact, and the consideration of this impact can provide the basis for a more inclusive politics. Asking whether we should not 'submit to a sort of holding back of the temptation to ask the other who he is, what her name is, where he comes from, etc.' he responds that 'keeping silent is already a modality of possible speaking' (2000, p. 135). As such he insists that we need to 'negotiate constantly between these two extensions of the concept of hospitality' (2000, p. 135). Thus, we need to negotiate between the conditionality of the 'hyperbole' of unconditional hospitality and the laws of 'conditional' hospitality, and this needs to constantly transform in order to respond to 'the new injunctions of unprecedented historical situations' (2000, p. 149). Subsequently any consideration of hospitality needs to have an awareness of what conditions it, and here Derrida returns us to what he sets

out at the beginning of the text, to how hospitality's relationship with the foreigner is really about 'a conjugal model, paternal and phallogocentric' (2000, p. 149). That is, the authorisation of 'the familial despot, the father, the spouse, and the boss, the master of the house who lays down the laws of hospitality' (2000, p. 149).

Thus *Of Hospitality* reflects on questions of affiliation, the foreigner, messianicity, and identity. However, Derrida further develops the question of self-identity ('ipseity') in 'Faith and Knowledge' (2002a) with the concept of 'autoimmunity'. With autoimmunity – a self-destructive attack *by* the self *for* the self *on* the self – Derrida asserts that there is an obsession with an 'excess above and beyond the living, whose life only has absolute value by being worth more than life, more than itself' (2002a, p. 87). However, this essentially articulates Derrida's concept of iterability – as the deconstruction of identity through repetition. Derrida articulates auto-immunity for its particular relationship with figuration in a manner that appears to be not too dissimilar to Baudrillard's. For Derrida argues that in addition to the auto-immunitary logic of identity there is a *spectre* of auto-immunity. For Derrida identity is, primarily, haunted by the threat of its demise at its own hands before that of the other (or foreigner). For this reason we see the reinforcement of messianic spectres of Christianity and reason, as well as contemporary advances in panoptic and prosthetic teletechnologies, digitisation, and gender and sexual violence.

So, while *Spectres of Marx* is crucial for theorising the implications of messianic figuration, and *Of Hospitality* examines the difficulties of intervening in this politics to bring about a more inclusive situation, Derrida's later work on auto-immunity, supplemented by its use in reflecting upon the 9/11 suicide terror attacks (Borradori and Derrida, 2003), the justifications for the invasion of Iraq (Derrida, 2005), and the characterisation of the other

in terms of their inhuman characteristics (Derrida, 2005; Derrida, 2009; Derrida, 2011), particularly indicates the importance of asking how the spectre of auto-immunity is influencing contemporary politics. Thus, in approaching the 2008 global financial crisis it is the fears of auto-immunity that I intend to examine in this thesis. This is not to discount the importance of setting out how the spectre of auto-immunity can be countered from within political or legal institutions or policy, but rather to focus on the project of examining the spectres that inform contemporary politics. Before I set out how I intend to do this I will consider how such a deployment of Derrida's works stands in relation to other ideas about how and why to read his work.

4. A Certain Spirit of Deconstruction

This final section considers how this reading of Derrida's work has been interpreted by secondary literature. In Richard Beardsworth's *Derrida and the Political* (1996), I identify a more critical approach to Derrida's work that calls for an engagement with it while identifying certain caveats in relation to its approach to the contemporary bond between capitalism and technoscience. Secondly, with Geoffrey Bennington's *Jacques Derrida* (1993) I focus attention upon an argument that troubles the notion of articulating a specific reading of Derrida's work while making this case through a reading of Derrida's work itself. In doing so I identify a liberating approach to Derrida's work that emphasises the strategic contribution that Derrida's work can make. Finally, I examine Michael Naas' *Derrida From Now On* (2008). This text is particularly helpful for reflecting on the concepts of hospitality and autoimmunity that I conclude my previous section with. However, Naas' text also raises Derrida's attribution of a redemptive role to Europe and European politics, a gesture that I argue distracts from Derrida's other contributions.

For Beardsworth there have been too many misconceptions about Derrida's 'failure' to adequately explore the 'increasing tension between internationalization and virtualization, on the one hand, and territorial difference and the corporal realities of human life, on the other' (1996, p. xii). This is not to say that Beardsworth sees little value in engaging with Derrida's work. Rather, he suggests that if we work through these problems we can find crucial contributions to the relationship between the metaphysics and violence, but also, how the commitment to this project comes with significant caveats (1996, p. xii). To explore this Beardsworth investigates Derrida's work through an intricate comparison with, firstly, the theoretical frameworks that he believes are fundamental to the tension in modernist political theory: the liberalism of Immanuel Kant and communitarianism of Georg Hegel; and secondly the theories that he suggests are fundamental to a tension in the postmodern turn in politics: the temporal critique of metaphysics by Martin Heidegger, and the spatial critique of law by Emmanuel Levinas.

Before I examine this comparison, I think it is worth setting out how Beardsworth frames his approach to Derrida by way of a focus upon the techno-political quality of Derrida's gestures, particularly in 'Force of Law' (2002c), to a pursuit of 'lesser violence' (1996: xiv). The problem for Beardsworth is that this commitment is ultimately undercut by how Derrida pays too much attention to the 'gift' of alterity (the 'unconditional', the 'arrivant'). Nonetheless, in examining Derrida's engagement with lesser violence, Beardsworth discerns three levels of violence (1996, p. 24). Firstly, there is the initial violence of 'identity' (1996, p. 24). Here Beardsworth notes Derrida's debt to Heidegger's theorisation of the violence caused by metaphysics to the 'remainder' (1996, p. 24). Secondly, Beardsworth identifies Derrida's work on how the violence of metaphysics is

supplemented through institutionalisation, such as in technologies, politics, and law. Finally there is the violence involved in reflecting upon these laws (1996, p. 24). Here Beardsworth tells us that while Derrida retains a negotiation of how the tertiary level of reflective violence retains violence it nonetheless constitutes an engagement with difference that would otherwise not take place (1996, p. 24).

As such Beardsworth discerns a case for an ethico-political project that can endure violence, and for Beardsworth this has to be a model that welcomes democracy. However, Beardsworth argues that Derrida's emphasis upon literature and the idiomatic as a site of a lesser violence, while original in terms of 'a serious engagement with the future of thinking and acting', ultimately neglects the stakes involved (1996, p. 1). Here the turn to Kant and Hegel becomes important. While he argues that 'Derrida's thinking of originary repetition and of the promise reveals the contradictions in modern democratic thought and thereby reinvents our relation to these contradictions according to the lesser violence' (1996, p. 46), he also argues that there should be a recognition of how both attempted to accommodate difference through explicit political theories and institutions. Firstly, Kant's work is significant for Beardsworth because Kant's cosmopolitan state accommodates both empirical knowledge (the 'phenomenal'), and faith, (the 'noumenal'). Thus, Kant intervenes in the authoritarianism of the religious, but also articulates the limits of metaphysics. As a consequence it lays the groundwork for the recognition of differences of opinion in a tolerant, cosmopolitan state (1996, p. 47).

However, the problem we might consider here, which Hegel argues, is that Kant's project neglects how faith and knowledge are established through specific historical conditions (Hegel in Beardsworth, 1996, p. 47). By contrast, Hegel proposes the pursuit of an *ethical*

life (*Sittlichkeit*) that undertakes, facilitated by dialectics, the recognition of difference (1996, p. 47). The problem that Derrida identifies in *Glas*, which Beardsworth paraphrases, is that while 'Hegel thinks he is talking about history, he is not; he is talking about history as he *desires it to be'* (1996, p. 59, italics in original). Instead he is talking about phantasms of history (1996, p. 59). For Derrida, Beardsworth suggests, this 'misrecognition' has grave consequences for encounters with difference, which Beardsworth elaborates upon by considering how the determination of what constitutes ethical life has been interwoven into capitalism, colonialism, and even totalitarianism. However, Beardsworth also argues that without some form of speculation upon the constitution of ethical life it is very difficult to conceive of a 'lesser violence' (1996, p. 96). This informs what Beardsworth calls his 'hesitation' that is of 'Hegelian inspiration' (1996, p. 96).

The task that Beardsworth subsequently pursues is to consider the justification for departing from such speculation, by way of a reading of Heidegger and Levinas proto-postmodern projects. Specifically, Beardsworth draws attention to how Derrida has appraised how Heidegger's work identifies the aporia (contradictions) of the metaphysics of time and history, and Levinas' work, in part in response to Heidegger, identifies the aporia of the metaphysics of law (1996: 98). That is, Heidegger's emphasis upon the irreducibility of spirit, and Levinas' emphasis upon the irreducibility of political difference. Subsequently, while Heidegger argues for the exposition or 'presentation' of metaphysical aporia, Levinas argues that the avoidance of the 'unpresentable' is politically dangerous. Derrida's response, Beardsworth explains, is that neither framework adequately articulates the limit between the presentable and the

unpresentable, or the impossible and the possible, which is essential to the distinction between identifying aporia and taking decisions in the name of lesser violence (1996, p. 104). Derrida makes this case based on how they both work to articulate the 'as' (and therefore the 'is') (1996, p. 134).

Beardsworth tells us that the novel way in which Derrida attempts to negotiate these limitations is by playing them off against each other, setting out that which haunts each writer, and how, in their different ways, and they both fall short by sublating difference (the heterogeneity of being in the case of Heidegger, the heterogeneity of subjectivity in the case of Levinas). Heidegger attempts to release a primordial 'being-with' time (*mittsein*) by working to dismantle the modern intellectual impediments of metaphysics, institutions, and technologies. However, Derrida also explains that Levinas has his own originary legality located in the significance of the other. However, while Derrida presents these theories as problematic in terms of the assumptions about humanity, Beardsworth supplements these insights by posing that Heidegger and Levinas have contributed to nationalist projects, albeit Heidegger's being far more problematic (Nazi Germany for Heidegger, Israel for Levinas). However, for Beardsworth this is simply not enough from a political perspective.

For Beardsworth this feeds into his argument that Derrida places too much emphasis upon the 'arrivant' and 'the gift' of difference. He asserts that there needs to be a much more forthright commitment to pursuing the lesser violence. Specifically, he suggests that while Derrida opens up interesting questions about violence in *Spectres of Marx* concerning developments in technoscientific capitalism, he does not go far enough (1996, p. 147). Furthermore, he argues that the spectralisation that Derrida writes of 'is

unthinkable without the technicization of the world and of the human. Indeed, the "spectral" is nothing less than a way of describing effects of technicization' (1996, p. 147). Moreover, Beardsworth identifies a far more significant problem with how close Derrida is willing to be to the work of Heidegger. Responding to Derrida's *Of Spirit*, Beardsworth argues that Derrida avoids a discussion about the hidden technical injunctions of Heidegger's work, and how this intersects not just with Nazism but the conception of 'the gift' and the 'promise' (1996, p. 155). Beardsworth's claim is that 'Derrida's thinking of time can appear formalist', and that, as a consequence, 'in the context of increasing technicization, the point is politically telling' (1996, p. 155).

So, Derrida's approach is important for Beardsworth because it helps to articulate the unavoidable violence of metaphysics, but he raises some very serious criticisms. However, his approach to Derrida is not without its concerns. This is articulated through an emphasis upon a relationship between the political and the technical. In his concluding chapter Beardsworth argues that in *Spectres of Marx* Derrida articulates how the advancement of teletechnologies – of spectres – means that democracy is haunting 'the community (family, nation, world, even (...) humanity)' in new ways (1996, p. 146). However, acknowledging a certain Hegelianism, Beardsworth argues that Derrida's approach is not sufficiently historical. The consequence of this can be found, he argues, in the way in which Derrida fails to take into account the capacity for cognitive violence and manipulation of contemporary technologies. For this reason Beardsworth argues that there is a validity to the argument that Derrida is, to some extent, complicit with 'right-wing' exploitation of difference (1996, p. 155). However, Beardsworth also suggests that while a 'left-wing' legacy can be discerned from Derrida's work, the choice between the

two is ultimately foreclosed by the demand to address more pressing concerns about contemporary society. We might therefore be left with the sense that for Beardsworth Derrida's work helps to constitute a warning about the risks of deconstruction.

For Geoffrey Bennington Beardsworth's reading involves a significant aporia of its own (2000). Firstly, Bennington argues that Beardsworth overlooks how Derrida's work 'liberates us from some of these pedagogical pressures [found in Kant and Hegel, Heidegger and Levinas]' that make it necessary to undertake certain interventions and actions (2000, p. 176). Secondly, Bennington argues that in relation to contemporary technologies Beardsworth's position risks:

> Closing off just the "political" opening it was designed to promote, by directing us all, rather religiously, towards a prophet of doom's "twenty-first century" the very religious-technological predictability of which is already blocking the arrivals it will also, necessarily, contingently, surprisingly enough bring. (2000, p. 179)

In this text Bennington continues to elaborate upon an approach to Derrida's work that involves a defence of its promise for exploring justice. For this chapter here (as well as my next chapter) this is perhaps most helpfully articulated in *Jacques Derrida* (1993), a text that works pedagogically to introduce the general principles of Derrida's work.

Bennington opens *Jacques Derrida* by stating that while this text has a pedagogic imperative to introduce the 'general system' of Derrida's thought it also derives from a 'friendly bet' between Bennington and Derrida himself as to whether such a project is possible (1993, p. 1). Bennington subsequently works to meet this ambition by separating the text into short sections that discretely address key concepts in Derrida's work to outline a theoretical system. However, Bennington's text, supplemented by a commentary by Derrida that is included at the bottom of each page, engages with Derrida's argument,

introduced in my second section above, that systemisation is impossible because it is always subject to deconstruction. Bennington adds that this is problematic for teaching Derrida and troubles the idea of methodology. As a result Bennington helps to articulate both the radical implications and the possibilities of Derrida's work for research. To explain this I think it is helpful to focus on Bennington's emphasis upon origins and beginnings. Specifically, the argument that the impossibility of determining where we begin is not the same as saying that we begin from nowhere.

For Bennington 'you always start somewhere, but that somewhere is never just anywhere[,] the somewhere where you always start is overdetermined by historical, political, philosophical, and phantasmatic structures that in principle can never be fully controlled or made explicit' (1993, pp. 20-22). As a result there is an obligation to 'find a new language' that can articulate these structures (1993, p. 35). However, there is a risk that we will just 'replace a few terms' and engender new metaphysical structures. 'The point is to shake up the system'. Moreover, it is impossible to create a new language 'ex nihilo by divine performative'. Instead we need to 'take up the terms which are already a problem for metaphysical thought (writing, trace), and accentuate their power of diversion – while knowing a priori that we shall never find anything but nicknames, fronts, pseudonyms' (1993, p. 36). This might seem like a thankless task and Bennington insists that 'a lot of time has been lost discussing [its complicity with metaphysics] as though it expressed an ethical or even political choice on Derrida's part' (1993, pp. 38-39). However, Bennington emphasises that the deconstructive nature of an engagement with metaphysics means that 'this complicity is not really a complicity' (1993, p. 39).

Bennington notes that Derrida's work has frequently been rejected on the basis that it 'takes an evil pleasure in mocking a whole metaphysical tradition, leading to a nihilism which paralyzes thought and action or, at best, to an "artistic" practice of philosophy and a literary aestheticism' (1993, p. 41). However, Bennington insists that 'these paradoxes are not imported into metaphysics by Derrida; on the contrary, they constitute metaphysics' (1993, p. 41). What should be shocking, for Bennington, is that 'this "truth" of metaphysical truth can no longer be thought of as truth' (1993, p. 42). Beginning with Derrida's seminal attention to writing in his early works, Bennington notes that 'deconstruction gets going by attempting to present as primary what metaphysics says is secondary' (1993, p. 42). That said, Bennington is attentive to the argument that Derrida overly emphasises attention to what can be found in writing, and the suggestion that the critique of origins leads to 'opening the door to the possibilities of arbitrary readings, of just anything at all' (1993, p. 97). Bennington insists that if it is not already evident that Derrida does not reject metaphysics but rather addresses its truth, we should focus on how 'the readings carried out by Derrida never give the impression of being arbitrary' (1993, p. 98).

For Bennington Derrida pays too much attention to implications to be unconcerned with a political project. He agrees that a political project may not be particularly obvious, and that we cannot simply rely upon Derrida's frequent calls for 'responsibility' (1993, p. 101). However, if we take responsibility apart we can find a modest yet extensive project in Derrida's commitment to close readings of 'texts' and his paying attention to 'signatures'. Transposing this onto the question of the political, Derrida's approach brings into question the idea that progressive change is to be brought about by choosing between one

side or the other. Instead it offers, in a pedagogic manner, a rigorous examination of the implications and possibilities of politics and of issues such as entitlement, institutions, genealogy, and reflects on broader questions about divine authority, closure, identity and otherness, technological apparatuses, and dissemination. Moreover, for Bennington Derrida indicates that it is a problem to begin with the political since it risks overlooking the broader issue of the limitations and possibilities of metaphysics. Concerning the 2008 global financial crisis this is interesting because it challenges the idea that failure, aporia, and *crisis* lead to meaninglessness.

To examine this further I will finish this chapter by considering Michael Naas' attention to Derrida's later works and their emphasis upon spectrality. Leading with Derrida's work on hospitality Naas argues in *Derrida From Now On* (2008) that this concept was at the core not only of Derrida's work but his life. Conceptually it articulates what Naas considers to be Derrida's concern with the boundaries between self-identity and otherness, from his work on phonocentrism, logocentrism, writing, and différance to the political (2008, p. 37). Hospitality brings together, Naas argues, 'the policy of nation-states [and] our most everyday practices and relations – from greeting another to asking his or her name' (2008, p. 27). Despite the risk that unconditional hospitality presents 'to ourselves, our families, and our nations, as well as to the very principle of identity that first defines these', it nonetheless exposes us to difference, and as such provides the basis for an alternative political project (2008, p. 32). As such Naas draws out a relationship between hospitality and Derrida's concept of autoimmunity articulated in 'Faith and Knowledge'. He argues that hospitality always incorporates 'autoimmune pervertibility', while autoimmunity, as an encounter with the other 'is always a kind of hospitality' (2008,

pp. 32-33). Furthermore Naas emphasises how problematic the politics of hospitality, ipseity, and autoimmunity are through the neoliberal emphasis on various 'autos', such as autonomy and autarky, and particularly in the United States.

Naas explains that it is not just significant that a focus upon America helps to direct attention to the development of the role of spectres, images, sounds, and 'digital imprints' (2008, p. 160). Rather, it is how these developments have been interwoven with a particularly reductive heritage. This heritage is not just articulated in the rhetoric of American politicians but rather the ritualistic nature of these repetitions, and how the spectres, images, sounds, and digital imprints are created with the promise of outliving 'the things they purport to represent' (2008, p. 160). Naas examines Derrida's arguments in 'Autoimmunity' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003) of how this promise of a life through spectrality was the intention of the suicide attacks of 9/11 as well as intention of the media institutions and politicians in the subsequent representation of 9/11 and the Global War on Terror. In doing so Naas directs attention to the messianic figures emanating from America and how globalization is dominated by American spectral politics. However, Naas also pays attention to a component of Derrida's work that I think is difficult to negotiate and easy to misinterpret. Namely Derrida's inclination in his later works towards the redemptive possibilities of Europe.

For Naas focuses upon how, with *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe* (1991), 'Autoimmunity', *Rogues*, and the lecture shortly before his death titled 'Enlightenment Past and To Come' that Derrida made a case for a European political project. Derrida argues that there is a secular promise in European politics that is absent from American politics or elsewhere in the world. Moreover, there is the economic, technological, legal,

political, and cultural potential for a more secular, cosmopolitan, tolerant, and hospitable form of globalization emanating from Europe. Naas notes Derrida's acknowledgement of how this could be viewed as a form of Eurocentrism. However, Naas also cites Derrida's argument, which he seconds, that Derrida has such a history of criticising Europe, and of criticising the Christian legacies from which American politics draws from, that he has 'earned the right' to say that Europe offers hope (2008, p. 91).

Now, in 'Autoimmunity' Derrida says of European redemption that 'I hope for it, but I do not see it' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 118), and he notes the servile nature in which Europe supported George W. Bush's declaration of a Global War on Terror. Derrida's hope rests, instead, in the link between a powerful economy, the centre of culture, media, and political and legal influence, and a particular inheritance of the Enlightenment. However, with France and Germany's refusal to endorse the invasion of Iraq Derrida started to suggest that this inheritance was indeed at work in Europe. And Naas supports this. He argues that unlike American governments, European governments have been capable of countering the policies of the United States without failing to denounce 'the horrors of the regime of Saddam Hussein' (2008, p. 93). Without wanting to diminish the idea that there should be speculations about whether institutions can be more hospitable (and more hospitable than others), I am not convinced that this avoids sublimating the idea of Europe. By contrast, I suspect that this risks overlooking the problematic policies of European governments (and the EU) and, most importantly, that it overlooks what I think is the most vital aspect of Derrida's contribution to politics – his project of exploring and examining inheritance. Derrida does hint that attention should be placed upon the lessons of European history: 'without forsaking [Europe's] own memory, by drawing upon it, in

fact, as an indispensable resource' (2003, p. 116), something he seems to elaborate upon in one of his last papers, referring to both the need to remember 'our Enlightenment heritage, and also [retain] an awareness and regretful acceptance of the totalitarian, genocidal and colonialist crimes of the past' (2004a, online). However, I think that there this should not lead us to be uncritical about the promise of European political institutions.

This final section has examined some of the responses to Derrida's work. It has examined Geoffrey Bennington's suggestion that Derrida's work can liberate approaches to signification – and as a consequence politics – from the authority of certain narratives. In particular I have focused upon Bennington's argument that deconstruction works to dismantle assumptions about authority by interrogating their origins, and it has argued that Bennington's approach competes with Richard Beardsworth's argument that if Derrida's work is important it is because it tells us something about the teletechnological apparatuses that shape our society. Ultimately I side with Bennington in this argument, but not because of the implications of Beardsworth's argument that there must be an engagement with teletechnologies to further an ethico-political project. Instead, I do so by considering Derrida's work on hospitality, autoimmunity, and the American cultural landscape and its examination by Michael Naas. I argue that contemporary teletechnologies remain subject to iterability. However, I also use Naas' text as a basis to express a reservation about a tendency in Derrida's later works to place a particular hope in European politics. Ultimately. I place particular emphasis upon Derrida's examination of writing and how he modifies this into an emphasis on spectres.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have worked to set out the relationship between the project of this thesis and critical and cultural theories, and more specifically, the contribution of the works of Jacques Derrida. I have worked to set out the precedents for speculating upon and intervening in traditions, norms, and inheritances, before considering how Derrida's deconstructive works mark a distinctive break from approaches that emphasise critique. Furthermore, I have examined the notion that Derrida's works, in their theorisation of the negotiation of 'différance', go beyond a malaise about the limitations of representation that often characterises critical theories, as well as the totalising claims that have accompanied theories of postmodernity. Focusing upon his theorisation of spectrality, I identify an openness to justice that is not idealistic, but rooted in an acknowledgement of the insecurities that haunt sovereignty. Moreover, I have also suggested that this theorisation of how sovereignty is haunted poses issues that we might otherwise be unaware of. That is, that sovereignty, subject as it is to spectrality, can be extremely paranoid, reactionary, and dangerous.

However, I have also situated my examination of Derrida's work in relation to his broader project and his seminal earlier texts on language and writing, as well as to interpretations of his work in secondary literature. While my emphasis has been largely upon his conception of the spectre, I have examined how it owes a debt to and develops his earlier concepts of logocentrism, différance, and trace. For the logos relates to the spectre through its articulation of the role of the body, différance relates to the spectre through its articulation of the other and of difference (figural or otherwise), and the trace relates to the spectral by way of the conception of an ambiguity about that which comes before

and which is threatened with erasure. I have suggested that these earlier concepts help inform an understanding of Derrida's resistance to articulating ideal forms of resistance or identities, and conception of the impossibility of offering, in the political domain, 'unconditional hospitality'.

Finally, in this chapter I have begun the process of situating my engagement in this thesis with the secondary literature on Derrida's work. Beginning with Richard Beardsworth's *Derrida and the Political* I have worked to address a particularly thorough critique of Derrida's political significance, and by extension the project of examining inheritance that is central to this thesis. My suggestion is, after reading the work of Geoffrey Bennington and Michael Naas, that an attention to inheritance can indeed provide the basis for an engagement with very specific critiques of political sovereignty, and that it is receptive to the significance of developments in media technologies. I have suggested that this is particularly the case in Geoffrey Bennington's *Jacques Derrida*, where he frequently opens up speculations about the significance of Derrida's work for the political. Finally, with Michael Naas' *Derrida From Now On*, I have considered how Derrida scholarship has explored Derrida's implications for examining the spectral effects of contemporary media technologies.

CHAPTER TWO: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In my previous chapter I examined the significance of Jacques Derrida's work. Firstly I located Derrida's writings in relation to an inheritance that threads together Marxism, Frankfurt Critical Theory, and the cultural theory of Jean Baudrillard; the concern with that which delimits agency. After setting up this debate via a reading of Marx and Engels' 'The German Ideology', I turn to the Frankfurt scholars Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno to discuss their arguments that the capitalisation of representation, aesthetics, and culture is responsible for why the brutality and contradictions of the capitalist mode of production failed to result in the type of emancipatory communist society that Marx anticipated. I then examine how these debates are further developed by Fredric Jameson and Jean Baudrillard in relation the phenomena of postmodernity at the end of the twentieth century. In particular I focus upon Baudrillard's provocative argument that there is no mode of theoretical explanation that can possibly extract us from the grip of simulation and simulacra. Here I suggest that Derrida's project, with its emphasis upon the negotiation of difference, offers the possibility of a less fatalistic endeavour.

In the second half of my last chapter I subsequently work to set out how Derrida's work opens up examinations of difference through an attentiveness to the specificities of language. Moreover, I discuss how Derrida developed his approach to examine the significance of transformations in the dissemination of language through media technologies; how the 'trace' of difference inscribed in language combines with 'logocentrism' and the power of media technologies in ways that suggest the haunting of society by 'spectres'. After setting out interpretation of Derrida's writings I consider how

these have been contested in secondary literature, and how they help to specify a reading of Derrida's work that emphasises an attention to inheritance, even when faced by the urgency demanded of responding to contemporary issues. In this chapter I subsequently translate the significance of Derrida's work for examining the events of the global financial crisis into a framework to put this into practice. That said, Derrida's approach presents some significant challenges for devising such a framework.

In addition to pursuing an attention to the epistemologically troubling concept of the spectre, Derrida's writings often bring into question the limitations of"methodology". In the first section of this thesis I will examine this issue in more detail. To do this I will begin by returning to the work of Richard Beardsworth, Geoffrey Bennington, and Michael Naas that I discuss in my previous chapter because of how they have addressed this specific question of how to *apply* Derrida's work. Although complex and open to debate, I suggest that a 'theoretical framework' can be discerned from Derrida's works that focuses upon identifying specific locations of intervention. After discussing the secondary literature on how to apply Derrida's work, I set out the framework that I use in this thesis in detail, and in ways that correspond with my subsequent substantive chapters. Specifically, I focus upon how my attention to the political implications of the crisis of 2008 can be examined by employing an expositional framework inspired by brief comments by Derrida in *Spectres of Marx* about the global dominance of three places of culture: the political in the traditional sense of government and the nation-state, scholarship, and the mass-media.

The significance that I attribute to this tripartite relationship is that it presents a moment of structural confluence between Derrida's work and the tradition of critical and cultural theory that I situate this thesis in relation to. For with this framework I suggest that we

can capture how Derrida unpacks the political from its traditional location in political science and political theory, through its relationship with difference – through scholarship, and ultimately arriving at the site where the politics take place in the most discrete and sophisticated ways – through the discrete decision-making processes involved in media technologies. After setting out these expositional chapter I then set out how I reflect upon my findings in my final chapter. I describe how I turn again to the work of Richard Beardsworth and Michael Naas, but this time to supplement their proposals with work by Bernard Stiegler.

1. Approaching Spectres

Of the three secondary texts I discuss in Chapter One Richard Beardsworth's *Derrida and the Political* presents an approach that is one of the most unconventional. While so much of Derrida's own writing, and that of Bennington and Naas for instance, articulates the problems and limitations of methodology, Beardsworth is far more comfortable with the notion of a Derridean or deconstructive 'method'. That said, I think that Beardsworth's comfort with a Derridean method raises some valuable questions. In particular, I am interested in Beardsworth's approach to Derrida's work with the concept of 'khôra' and how, for Beardsworth, it articulates a 'middle ground' that is derived from deconstruction's methodological 'reorganisation of the empirico-transcendental difference' (Beardsworth, 1996, p. 19). In the coming pages I will make a case for an engagement with the concept of khôra in terms of how it helps to articulate the limitations of metaphysics.

As I discuss in Chapter One previously Beardsworth takes up Derrida's emphasis upon an originary tension between empirical reality and transcendental questions about

metaphysics. Beardsworth's particular articulation of this tension places an emphasis upon the aporetic condition that results from this. However, I also noted that Beardsworth ultimately calls for a particular emphasis upon the violent implications of contemporary technoscientific capitalism and that Derrida's attention to the possibilities of empirico-transcendental difference risks losing sight of this pressing concern. For Beardsworth it is simply not enough to focus on the 'promise' or 'gift' of difference (1996, p. 1). So, whether it is intended or not, Derrida's notion of an economy of difference lends itself to a *methodological* framework. To support his claim he argues that Derrida's concern to avoid method, so as to avoid already deciding how to proceed, was common in the broader French philosophical milieu of the 1960s and 70s, such that it established its own norms of analysis, and as such a methodological logic (1996, p. 4).

For Beardsworth French philosophers shared an emphasis upon the tension between the empirical and the philosophical, by which, 'on the one hand', philosophical constructs are integral to empirically-heavy academic disciplines such as 'anthropology, linguistics, literary studies and psychoanalysis', and, 'on the other hand', how 'empiricity and factiticy' are necessary for substantiating the role of philosophy (1996, pp. 4-5). Beardsworth acknowledges that Derrida's approach during this period is distinct in terms of its particular attention to language and writing, but he also argues that it discourages a consideration of how the aporetic tension is reinscribed through 'instances of history, the body, technics, [and] politics' (1996, p. 5). As a consequence, Beardsworth works with method to apply Derrida's attention to the aporia in relation to these concerns that are, for Beardsworth, of far greater 'strategic' importance (1996, p. 5). At this point, therefore, Beardsworth makes a strong case for assessing the most significant locations of empirico-

transcendental difference. In a moment I will refer to Bennington's text in order to reflect upon this argument, but I think it is worth considering in more detail how Beardsworth makes this claim through his discussion of Derrida's examination of language, via Saussure, in *Of Grammatology*, and literature, via 'Before the Law', an essay by Derrida on Kafka's short story of the same name.

In Chapter One I presented Derrida's reading of Saussure *against* Saussure. I explained that Derrida takes Saussure's proposals on the arbitrariness of the sign to argue that this applies to speech as much as writing. However, as I have indicated above, Beardsworth, in turn, reads Derrida *against* Derrida. He argues that Derrida's work on Saussure in *Of Grammatology* opens up questions about the privilege that should be afforded to the analysis of language. It is here that Beardsworth argues that Derrida's approach, if it is to be fully realised, should focus on questions of law and judgement. At this point, Beardsworth is more sympathetic to Derrida's *Spectres of Marx* for its examination of spectres, by way of politics, science, technology, and media, as well as Derrida's proposals on 'democracy to come'. Moreover, Beardsworth is sympathetic to Derrida's argument that there can be no 'politics of deconstruction', for he argues that it is important to recognize that deconstruction is by its nature characterized by contingency and the taking of responsibility and decisions (1996, p. 19). Nonetheless, he also argues that there needs to be a distinctive political project that works in the service of a more inclusive politics of affiliation, and that resists the excesses of technoscientific capitalism (1996, p. 20).

The subsequent question for Beardsworth is how best to explore the possibilities of judgement, and here he supports Derrida's attention to literature, as an activity that attempts to engage with 'impossible experience' (1996, p. 25). However, Beardsworth

identifies a tension between the questions that literature raises and a prioritisation of it. Yet again, for Beardsworth 'this relation exercises judgement' (1996, p. 26). Furthermore, Beardsworth argues that while in 'Before the law', Derrida distances himself from the concept of judgement there is nonetheless an extensive "exercise" of its practice (1996, p. 26). For Beardsworth Derrida does a disservice to his examination of law in Kafka's text (and to Kafka's text as a whole) by emphasizing the possibilities of literature rather than judgment (1996, p. 35). Thus, for Beardsworth language and writing (or literature) can provide worthwhile starting points but, ultimately, attention needs to be directed towards the political. After finishing his chapter on language and literature he turns to examine a Derridean approach to political theory. In turn, this leads Beardsworth to establish the importance of his 'left-wing' Derridean project that emphasizes the contemporary alliance of technology, science, and capitalism.

In summary, Beardsworth argues that there is an irresponsibility in Derrida's reluctance to accommodate methodology (as well as in other Derridean literature). This suggests that an approach to the relationship between the question of a more inclusive politics of affiliation and the global financial crisis would focus upon how these topics relate to their middle-ground, or khôra, and in turn what conditions this, i.e. contemporary techno-scientific capitalism. In the following paragraphs, I will argue, by way of Bennington's work in the text *Jacques Derrida*, that methodology restricts a consideration of authorial responsibility, and that it is literature's relationship with the 'idiomatic' which helps to highlight these limitations (Bennington, 1993, p. 180). Nonetheless, I think that Beardsworth's questions relating to how and where to locate priorities, and his argument that khôra helps to do so, are important. For while it is one thing to identify relationships

between writing and the trace, or messianic identities and spectres, it is another to be able to identify which spectres should be given priority.

I have already outlined Bennington's argument that while it is worthwhile to consider how best to pedagogically disseminate Derrida's work, any such project is faced with the issue that Derrida's work questions the integrity of systems, and as a result any notion that a work can be neatly summarised and subsequently disseminated. The first half of Bennington's book examines how Derrida makes this case with his seminal works from the 1960s. As I have described above, for Beardsworth the question of Derrida's relationship to method is integral to the question of Derrida's relationship to politics. Moreover, integral to examining Derrida's relationship to method and the political is a reappraisal of his relationship with language and literature. While Bennington does not make method integral to his reading of Derrida's work, he does link questions of method to questions of Derrida's relationship to language and literature. Bennington describes a tension between, on the one hand, a desire to articulate 'idiomatic' experience, and on the other hand the necessity of translation inherent to such an articulation.

For Bennington literature is significant in relation to the aporia of metaphysics because it has a particularly intimate relationship with questions of metaphysics. In a similar manner to the way in which the integrity of metaphysics is compromised by the empirical, the idiomatic quality of literature is compromised by translation: 'my desire to write like no one else is thus immediately compromised in the desire that my inimitability be recognized' (1993, p. 180). For Bennington responsibility is to be found in the acknowledgement of this tension between the idiomatic and translation. Bennington notes that literature has been subject to so many forms of authority – it has been

'overdetermined by all sorts of things', and 'has no noninstitutional definition' (1993, p. 180). At the very least it can lead to 'narcissism and megalomania'. However, Bennington maintains that there have at least been writers that have been willing to work with a contradiction between idiomaticity and translation, such as Francis Ponge and Jean Genet. To set this out Bennington discusses Derrida's engagement with the poetry of Ponge and Genet and how they idiosyncratically play with anagrams of their own names (1993, pp. 180-181).

For Bennington, this shows that Derrida is committed to disrupting the idea of 'proper names', and departing from any notion of 'method' (1993, p. 182). It indicates how 'literature can give an idea of a probity or frankness in the negotiation of this singularity and the letting-be of the other thing in its alterity, which will guide us in our discussion of more immediately "ethical" or even "political" questions' (1993, p. 187). So, even if a writing is as idiosyncratic as that of Ponge and Genet it 'can nonetheless better open out to the singularity of the thing and the coming of the other than all the apparently more serious and referential writings that sometimes would like to condemn Derrida in the name of ethics and politics' (1993, p. 187). But how can this possibly be used to confront the authority of technoscientific capital? The attention is less upon 'literature' than literature's strategic relationship with the aporetic. To further develop this argument Bennington turns to Derrida's writing on the 'gift', the concept that Beardsworth takes such an issue with.

Bennington outlines the argument about the limitations of the gift in the following manner: if 'the law, given, demands that one say "yes" to it, and if one says "yes" even when saying "no", then how could one resist or rise up against an iniquitous law?' (1993,

p. 194). More specifically, Bennington asks what this means for confronting oppression, highlighting how the de Mann and Heidegger "affairs" involved an accusation that Derrida was at best ill-prepared to confront Nazism, and at worst complicit (1993, p. 195). Bennington notes that political agency is often articulated in terms of a capacity to refuse subjection – of saying "no". However, Bennington insists that Derrida is directing attention to a more essential yes, and that Derrida by no means rejects the practical importance of saying no. This essential yes accommodates restriction to the extent that it sees the importance of working through it in order to understand and respond to its implications – and take responsibility. It means saying yes, and asserting yes, into a political space that is faced by the negativity that characterizes restriction. Moreover, Bennington emphasizes that Derrida is highly attentive to the variety of forms of restriction. To put this into practice Bennington notes that it is vital to identify specific, strategic, approaches to examining political responsibility.

While Bennington's text begins from the premise of the systematization of Derrida's work, and concludes with an emphasis upon the implications of techné and the machine, therefore resembling with Beardsworth's later emphasis upon technoscientific capitalism, I will focus here on Bennington's writing on Derrida's interventions on the politics of sexual difference. This is because in relation to sexual difference Bennington introduces his own approach to Derrida's concept of khôra. In addition to the role that khôra plays in deconstruction (as articulated by Beardsworth), Bennington argues that it should acquire greater attention, as a ' "place" of a "third kind", before the distinction between the real (illusory) world and the world of the (real) ideas' (1993, p. 209). Thus, for Bennington, the concept of khôra articulates 'a thinking of the originarity of the trace'

(1993, p. 209). However, Bennington also notes Derrida's argument that Plato, through whom Derrida traces the development of the concept, only conceptualizes khôra by way of an 'unfurling of metaphors' (1993, p. 209); specifically, through the metaphors of the 'nurse, matrix, receptacle, mother' (1993, p. 209). This relationship with the figure of the trace, therefore, explains the significance of sexual difference in relation to some essential aspects of Derrida's work. But it also raises some difficult questions about how to approach the politics of sexual difference.

Since Derrida presents sexual difference – and feminine figuration – in terms of a thinking of the trace, feminine figures are from the outset constituted in terms of a difference to the logocentric inscriptions within masculinity, patriarchy and the 'phallogocentric'. Here Bennington articulates a complex scenario. Firstly, the figure of the maternal troubles the identity and authority of the paternal. Through the figure of the maternal, the integrity of the paternal is deconstructed. Secondly, this indicates that the concept of the paternal involves within it a deconstructive tendency, albeit one that is characterized by privilege and restriction. Thirdly, there is a risk that the maternal figure is given a patriarchal power. Fourthly, that the concept of khôra indicates that attention needs to be placed upon figures that are disruptive, and here Derrida and Bennington wager that sexual difference and femininity retain such a significance. Returning to the Beardsworth's approach to technoscientific capitalism, we can see why Bennington would come to argue in a later text (2000) that the identification of the importance of this topic needs to be tempered by a consideration of how to examine its transformation and its limitations as a focus of attention. Michael Naas' offers just such an approach, though not, I argue, without its own limitations.

As discussed above, Naas argues that the phantasm is as originary as the question of metaphysics, and that the figure of the spectre conceptualizes the manner in which the phantasm is transformed as a result of its iterability, in much the same way as the trace conceptualizes the deconstruction of metaphysics. I examined Naas' argument that this transformation can be identified in 'hearing one-self speak'. In so doing Naas works to emphasise and supplement Derrida's later writing on 'what is happening today in our bodies, our culture, our cities, our states' (Naas, 2008, p. 150). I focused upon Naas' identification, through his reading of Don DeLillo's novel *Cosmopolis*, of nine phantasmatic forms – or 'autos' – that are particularly significant within contemporary globalised societies, culminating in 'autoimmunity'. I argued that this is helpful for exploring justice on the premise that it explores the link of suffering that Derrida articulates under the 'New International' in *Spectres of Marx*. That said, I also expressed reservations about how Naas examines the spectral aspects of these concepts with regards to his approach to the political.

Naas puts forward the argument that the deconstruction of these phantasmatic entities is evident through spectres. Here, his particular take on the figure of khôra is introduced. For Naas argues that the phantasmatic can only be made manifest in relation to khôra. Referring, like Bennington, to the politics of sexual difference, Naas notes Derrida's emphasis in 'Faith and Knowledge' upon the relationship between extremism and sexual violence, but also how Derrida focuses upon two classic feminine figures, rather than specific contemporary examples: 'one Greek and one Roman, Persephone and Gradiva' (2008, p. 202). The argument is that these figures demand attention because while they have been brought into existence by forces of patriarchy they nonetheless expose a

certain weakness in patriarchy's phantasmatic constitution: 'while opening up the space for all phantasm, for the phenomena of the phantasm, [khôra] constantly eludes and interrupts the phantasm of phenomena, including every anthropomorphic or theological phantasm' (2008, p. 202). However, while Naas refers to khôra and spectres he repeatedly returns attention to the phantasmatic, and ultimately the underpinning of the phantasmatic in messianic religiosity. In Chapter One I argued that this is unhelpful if we consider the deconstructive possibilities of metaphysics. Here I want to set out the implications that this has for examining spectres, and for a more inclusive politics of affiliation.

While Naas refers to these two feminine spectralities he ultimately focuses upon the implications of the phantasmatic. But if the phantasmatic is informed by its relationship with spectres there therefore needs to be a consideration of the spectres themselves, and how they enable and disrupt phantasmatic figures. Referring again to the strategic element of deconstruction it can be understood why certain limits should be placed upon the possibilities of the deconstruction of the phantasmatic. It is understandable why there should be an emphasis upon intervening in certain political situations, and in considering whether there are certain political institutions that should be supported, albeit critically, such as international law, human rights, and Europe. Yet coupled with the notion that the phantasm is originary, there is a risk that taking a stance could marginalise the examination of spectres, the implications of technoscientific capitalism, its effects on the body, the specific implications of events such as 9/11 (which Naas focuses upon) or the 2008 global financial crisis. In this sense, I identify a reductive tendency in Naas' approach that I wish to depart from. My suggestion is, therefore, to approach the question of a

politics of spectres, sovereignty, and affiliation by investigating their implications, rather than by articulating and debating the primary significance of the phantasm.

So, to focus upon the implications of a politics of spectres, sovereignty, and affiliation in relation to the global financial crisis of 2008, my suggestion is to focus upon a tension between a commitment to empirical claims about the event of 2008 – indeed why I focus upon that event – and the transcendental legacies that we inherit. So, my question here is what the 'middle-ground' (or 'khôra') might be that locates the facilitation of such a project. Given that my attention is upon the political it would likely suggest a turn to the nation-state. However, bearing in mind that I have argued that the political should not be confined to that sphere, the question subsequently becomes that of where we might alternatively organise such a project. Here I turn to Derrida's albeit brief claims in *Spectres of Marx* that if we wish to examine contemporary politics we should consider the interactions between three discrete yet 'indissociable' domains of politics, the mass-media, and scholarship (2006, p. 65). In the rest of this chapter I will set out the possibilities of this framework in detail. This framework, I suggest, provides a means of exploring a more inclusive approach to responding to the spectrality of an event such as the crisis of 2008.

2. The Politics of the Nation-State

2.1. The Significance of Politics

I begin my examination of how Derrida's work can provide a framework for investigating the implications of the global financial crisis by considering the specific ways in which he makes a case for the significance of the political. If my approach to his work engages

closely with the tension between making interventions in contemporary phenomena and exploring questions of inheritance, my approach to the politics of the nation-state begins with the consideration of how this plays out in this specific domain, and how it ultimately brings into view the importance of considering the role of the political beyond this area. I argue that this tension is also important to consider when approaching the political in the traditional sense of questions about sovereignty and the nation-state, and of the impact and implications of state policies. To do this I work between a text that is particularly explicit with its interventions in contemporary politics and suggests about how to respond to politics, 'Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003), a response to 9/11 and the declaration by the Bush of administration of the Global War on Terror; and 'Force of Law' (2002c), a text that focuses more upon the conceptual deconstruction of the concepts of the political, sovereignty, and law.

While 'Force of Law' more clearly examines questions of the relationship between inheritance and deconstruction, 'Autoimmunity' deconstructs inheritance through synonymous concepts such as belief and, concepts particularly resonant with the global financial crisis, concepts of 'credit' and 'debt'. I discuss how, in doing so, Derrida considers the implications of the 'credit' attributed to the United States, both in terms of its particular power over international relations, as well as its globally hegemonic power 'on every level' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, pp. 92-93). Focusing upon the political in the traditional sense, Derrida subsequently warns of the impact of US military interventions in Afghanistan, and given the scope of the Global War on Terror, likely elsewhere. However, I also discuss how a limit of such an emphasis upon identifying and emphasising specific forms of credit appears when we are faced with elaborating upon how it is

constituted. Here I turn to Derrida's emphasis upon the inheritances of the political. First of all, this leads me to consider Derrida's suggestions in 'Autoimmunity' that attention be given to how credit in politics has been interwoven with sovereignty, and how sovereignty has in turn been interwoven with inheritances of terror.

Through a consideration of Derrida's deconstruction of inheritances of sovereignty and terror I focus upon how he interrogates how articulations of terror have played an integral role in justifying sovereignty both in political theory and political history, and how articulations of terror have been highly selective and conditioned, and how the concept of terror need not and should not be viewed as something that is purely hyperbolic. For I discuss Derrida's argument that it is hardly ever recognised how Western nation-states undertake the state-terror foreign military interventions or, even more discrete, their role in the retention of third world debt and therefore global poverty. Thus, I argue that it can hardly be suggested that Derrida is ambivalent to the significance of politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state, and I suggest that an emphasis upon inheritance, as open to obscurantism as such a strategy might seem, provides a means of exploring its significance. However, I also explain how, in a more conceptual discussion such as that in 'Force of Law', Derrida argues that it is not only a significant task to intervene in the politics of the nation-state, but a task that offers a promise of an alternative. For he suggests that the political, particularly through its inscription in law, offers a means of examining and intervening in the deconstruction of ethics.

2.2. Inheritance and the Phantasm of the Sovereign

After setting out the importance of inheritance to examining the political I subsequently turn to consider how Derrida suggests that for all the power and significance of the

nation-state, this needs to be accompanied by a consideration of how it is subject to deconstructive transformation. Specifically. I focus upon how the nation-state, in consideration of developments in globalisation, economically, ideologically, and in the media, faces an uncertain future. Moreover, by focusing upon the relationship between inheritance and the phantasmatic nature of the nation-state I examine how they have, in a certain hospitable fashion, been complicit with these developments. Thus, while the deconstruction and hospitality of the nation-state might be viewed in terms of promise, I examine Derrida's arguments that it can also be accompanied by developments that negate the possibility of deconstruction by turning to new relationships between the nation-state and spectres. Here I link up some of the more radical inheritances that nation-states solicit, derived from ancient concepts of affiliation, with specific policies intended to protect the body-politic of the nation-state, including a return to economic protectionism and the intensification of anti-immigration and anti-asylum policies.

Firstly. I work to set out Derrida's discussion of the troubled future of the nation-state. Here I examine his proposals, particularly in *Rogues*, that the dominance of the United States and its allies over international politics means that there are no more rogue states, as the Bush administration had previously put it (2005b, pp. 95-96). I discuss how, in so doing, Derrida elaborates in much more detail upon an argument articulated in *Spectres of Marx* that there is no longer a distinction between international war and civil war (2006, p. 98; 2005, p. 156). But this also means that the very notion of the nation-state, as a discrete political body alongside others within an international, cosmopolitical constellation, is brought into question. Secondly, there is the autoimmunity of the nation-state's contribution to capital, science and technology, the media, ideas, and religiosity. I

argue that the contribution of the nation-state to these alternative forms of sovereignty is based upon a speculation that they will come to support the nation-state. However, I also counter this with the argument that there needs to be a consideration of how actors and institutions of the nation-state have adapted, or at the least been complicit to the spectral political landscape.

Here I suggest that an attention to the spectres of an event such as the 2008 global financial crisis is important if we consider how the event can instigate the conditioning of hospitality that ultimately leads to a demarcation between certain conceptions of logos identity on the one hand, and the other and the foreign on the other hand. On the one hand this means considering how the nation-state can be give up ground to pressure from ethno-nationalist, racial, religious, fraternal communities, as evidenced for Derrida in the Rwandan genocide, the wars of the former Yugoslavia, the persistence of the far right in France (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 4), to the rise of Islamist fundamentalism (2002a). Ultimately this therefore means asking questions about new forms of sovereignty. However, I also pay attention to how the subtleties of autoimmunity can set up the oppression and marginalisation of minorities in ways that reinscribe the role of the nation-state, albeit in new and different forms. Following Derrida's argument in *Of Hospitality* I consider how spectres of the crisis of 2008 provoke questions about sovereignty that can lead to both its destabilisation and reconstitution. That it would be best not to announce the death of the nation-state to soon.

2.3. Hospitality and Autoimmunity's Spectrality

As I discuss in my literature review Derrida argues that a commitment to justice should be attentive to how identities and politics of difference can be sublimated, to the

detriment of a commitment to justice. I explain that Derrida instead argues that attention needs to be placed upon the conditioning of hospitality. Exploring this approach in relation to the 2008 crisis I work to consider the forms in which sovereignty can take. This means heading beyond the usual conceptions of what are considered to be sovereign entities. But it also means directing attention from the autoimmune deconstruction of the nation-state through new spectral phenomena to the manner in which the autoimmune is itself a type of spectrality. That is, how questions of hospitality generated by a spectre of something like the 2008 crisis can pave the way forspectres of insecurity. In this sense the autoimmunity politics of the nation-state can be the result of reactions to the spectre of autoimmunity. To approach this scenario, I therefore return to questions of hospitality that I discuss in Chapter One and consider how this condition can come about.

But I also examine Derrida's emphasis upon the less explicit implications of the articulation of the event. Earlier I considered how the articulation of the event can contribute to the inscription of sovereignty, and here I examine how the articulation of the event, something which, again, seems removed from questions of politics and being, contributes to injustice. Derrida argues that there is always a certain restriction of violence with metaphysics, but this should not stop us from examining how this is articulated. The repetition and reduction of events to a singular event or articulation such as 'the crisis' restricts the inscription of difference, and this is supplemented by the way in which the rhythm by which the crisis is communicated through contemporary media restricts the time needed to interpret it and formulate a response, and for a global audience. Furthermore, this restriction of the encounter with difference also indicates and generates a spectre of autoimmunity. In relation to the repetition of the 'name-date'

'9/11', Derrida suggests that there is a fear of a 'powerlessness to comprehend, recognize, cognize, identify, name, describe, foresee' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 94).

Here we go back to the issue of the intersection of politics and the media, to the dissemination of a spectre of autoimmunity. But is this not just an intellectual problem? For Derrida any 'repression (…) in both its psychoanalytical sense and its political sense', in order to address the autoimmunitary, 'ends up producing, reproducing, and regenerating the very thing it seeks to disarm' (2003, p. 99). Here he refers to the post-colonial legacies in Algeria, and the Cold War and Mutually Assured Deconstruction ('the Cold War in the head' [2003, p. 94]). How French colonial apparatuses have been retained in political and socio-economic divisions, and how the fear of nuclear destruction has been sustained by the continued development of weapons of mass destruction. So, I examine the suggestion that the spectre of autoimmunity is inscribed in approaches to ontology, place, animality, and environment. But I also think that care needs to be taken in response to the suggestion that violence is a result of the spectre of autoimmunity. I would rather focus on the implications of the spectre of autoimmunity, and how it supplements the conditioning of hospitality, than suggest that it actually makes this likely. The the latter, I suggest, risks closing down the possibility of considering alternative political conditions.

2.4. Defending the Nation-state (in certain conditions)

Chapter Three therefore examines the argument that the value of Derrida's work for addressing the question of a more inclusive politics of affiliation – the commitment to a 'New International', or 'democracy to come' – predominantly rests with its examination of sovereignty and its implications. Derrida warns that attempts to articulate the figures

of the marginalised, dispossessed, and oppressed risk restricting the capacity to welcome the 'to come', or the 'arrivant'. In *Spectres of Marx* he describes his proposal of a 'New International' as an 'alliance of a rejoining without conjoined mate, without organization, without party, without nation, without State, without property' (2006, p. 35). Furthermore, this departure from political apparatuses extends into critique of the political philosophies of cosmopolitanism and tolerance. And yet, Derrida makes claims in support of political institutions, cosmopolitanism, and specific political actors, including within *Spectres of Marx*. In his later texts he makes more calls to support the nation-state and mass political movements under certain conditions (2003; 2005b). Thus, I assess these proposals in light of the events of the global financial crisis. To do so I again begin with the nation-state as the most explicit expression of sovereignty.

In contrast to 'certain international powers, certain ideological, religious, or capitalist, indeed linguistic, hegemonies' Derrida argues that nation-state sovereignty can retain, by way of the international multiplicities of sovereignty that it implies, 'an indispensable bulwark' 2005b, p. 158). Thus, he insists that we cannot 'combat, head-on, all sovereignty, sovereignty in general without threatening at the same time, beyond the nation-state figure of sovereignty, the classical principles of freedom and self-determination' (2005b, p. 158). Here international institutions become important – of international law and human rights most notably. There needs to be a 'reasonable transaction between two antinomic rationalities' (2005b, p. 158). But this emphasis upon reason also indicates that his approach to politics is sustained by an emphasis upon a project that goes beyond political institutions and incorporates a broader ethico-philosophical project. This leads me to Derrida's complicated relationship with cosmopolitanism and tolerance, both terms

which Derrida takes to task. And yet, in distinction from the ideology of the 9/11 terrorists, he insists that 'a limited tolerance is clearly preferable to an absolute intolerance' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 128), and cosmopolitanism, like the nation-state, articulates some form of shared sovereignty (2003, 131).

To reflect upon Derrida's conditional support for cosmopolitanism I focus upon his identification of a distinction between the secular, enlightened cosmopolitanism of European politics and the theocratic tendencies in American politics, articulated for instance in 'Autoimmunity' (2003, p. 117). He suggests that Europe has a stronger relationship with the Enlightenment, and as such he hopes 'that there will be, "in Europe", "philosophers" able to measure up to the task', which is not to privilege political actors within Europe, Europeans, or those traditionally associated with philosophy, but rather those exposed to its institutions and political discourse. And this leads me, finally, to the limits of Derrida's work on politics. For in 'The University Without Condition' (2001a) he takes up the means of establishing an alternative, more ethical political project within the territory of the university. He argues that if any institution should have 'unconditional sovereignty' it should be the university, 'sovereignly autonomous, unconditionally free in its institution, sovereign in its speech, in its writing, in its thinking' (2001a, p. 35). This resonates with Derrida's concluding lines in *Spectres of Marx* that we need scholars that do not just articulate the existence of spectres, but allow them to talk 'even if they do not exist, even if they are no longer, even if they are not yet' (2006, p. 221).

3. Scholarship

3.1. Sovereignty and Scholarship

In *Counter-Institutions* (2006) Simon Morgan Wortham sets out an exposition of Derrida's complicated and often conflictual relationship with scholarship and the university. This is understandable given how the critique of the Western tradition is essential to Derrida's early works. However, in 'The University Without Condition' Derrida articulates two additional gestures that complicate this characterisation. Firstly, the text opens with an enthusiastic 'profession of faith' in the university, premised on the manner in which, as an institution, it 'declares and promises an unlimited commitment to the truth' (2001a, p. 24). Derrida is not naïve about the state of the university. He notes that the 'university without conditions does not, in fact, exist, as we know only too well' (2001a, p. 25). However, secondly, he also claims that, at somewhat of a distance from the actual iterations of the university, its mere conception indicates the relationship between sovereignty and the 'unconditional' – therefore extending his claims about the significance of the trace and différance. Moreover, Derrida places a particular emphasis upon the existence within scholarship upon the humanities, a site of reflection on the human that not only provides the basis for ideas about human rights but about the concept and conditions of the human more generally.

So, Derrida's approach to scholarship is somewhat different to his approach to the politics in that it takes a more positive tone. That said, his examination of scholarship is not without concerns or reservations. Specifically, Derrida's examines how the hospitality of the university is restricted by the 'acceleration of the rhythm, the extent and powers of capitalization of (...) virtuality' that manifests through the 'computerization, digitalization,

virtually immediate worldwide-ization of readability, tele-work, and so forth' (2001a, p. 31). Derrida is not opposed to virtualization *per se*. On the contrary, he contests the notion that a concern with the virtual, or with the 'politics of the virtual', means that we are 'abandoning ourselves to the arbitrary, to dream, to imagination, to utopia, to hypothesis' (2001a, p. 32). Rather, it is the fragility of the scholarship (so committed to the unconditional) for being exploited by capitalization that he is concerned with. More specifically he is concerned with how this ultimately takes place through the exploitation and restriction of the body through 'work', but also how it can lead to an exacerbation of the distance between the ivory tower of scholarship and everyday life that can ultimately manifests in the development of ideological and religious extremisms.

However, before I examine these issues I begin by discussing the progressive elements of the university that Derrida identifies in more detail. Principally I begin with the further deconstruction of the orthographic legality of sovereignty that Derrida describes in 'Force of Law' (2002c). Specifically I focus upon Derrida's exposition that scholarship, even when it seems so obscure and 'virtual', always 'takes place', and therefore always has ramifications (2001, p. 53). Here I turn to his work on the 'professional' performativity of scholars. That is, how scholars have emerged as actors who make singular claims (as opposed to *con*-fessing the condition of one's spirituality). So, this leads Derrida to the suggestion that there is a fragmentation and troubling of sovereignty at the very moment at which it is being reconstituted. It is through this emphasis upon sovereignty that a progressive development can be identified in the ways in which confession, despite its secular legacy in work, has transformed from a focus upon a concern with the soul to a concern with the body.

3.2. Talking with Ghosts

Before considering further how these the sovereignties play out through new 'spectral effects' I take a step back to discuss the possibilities of opening up a scholarship of spectres. To do this I consider Derrida's work on Marx's exploratory if conflicted scholarship of spectres in *Spectres of Marx,* and how this contrasts with the implications for scholarship of Martin Heidegger's avoidance of the spectral. After setting out the importance that Derrida attributes to responding (and exploring responsibility) to spectres, I discuss how, for Derrida, Marx, despite ultimately rejecting the spectral in favour of the material, contributes to the consideration of spectres and spectral effects through his persistence with the material. That is, despite emphasising the material, Marx, in a paradoxical fashion, contributes to the assessment of the limits (and liminality) of traditional epistemological frameworks. Of particular importance for Derrida here being how Marx opened up questions about the role of the social, economic, and technological, as well as their international conditions.

By discussing Derrida's appreciation of Marx, I suggest that we are therefore presented with locations that can inform more specific approaches to scholarship. But an attention to the manner in which Marx has, as a scholar, been given a certain logocentric character also provides Derrida with a basis from which to discuss how to address the contours of the spectre, and therefore the means of examining it. I discuss how he does this by turning to the ghost in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Specifically, the manner in which we can break down the conjuring of spectres into acts of *mourning*, of *language*, and of *work*. Thus, Derrida suggests that there is a risk of catastrophic, even apocalyptic discourse at work in Marxism, and particularly so after the collapse of the Soviet Union. That Marxism can

contribute to the articulation of crisis, or what Prince Hamlet refers to as a situation in which 'The Time is Out of Joint' (Hamlet in Derrida, 2006, p. xxi). Here I consider how Derrida turns to Heidegger's argument that the articulation of crises generates justifies a metaphysics of rationalisation. However, while Derrida draws from this proposal he ultimately suggest that this risks avoiding the role of the phantasm, and therefore contributing to hidden forms of sovereignty.

Furthermore, Derrida argues elsewhere, in *Of Spirit* (1989) that the significance of the avoidance of the spectral is particularly laid bare by Heidegger's infamous support of Nazism. Thus, if Derrida's engagements with Marx and Heidegger both explore some of the possibilities that arise from engaging with the limits of the epistemological, I describe how Derrida ultimately warns of some very serious consequences of dismissing the spectral altogether. Focusing on Derrida's examination of Heidegger's 'Rectorship Address', Derrida works past the overt references to the need for an authoritarian organisation of the university and to German ethnic superiority, to argue that an even more problematic gesture is to be found in Heidegger's emphasis upon erasing metaphysical, legal, political, and economic legacies that do not preserve the possibility of spiritual heterogeneity. Derrida's suggestion being that Heidegger privileges the authority of spirit in a manner that evades any appraisals of its implications. Thus, despite how the Marxist project delimits the engagement with spectres through its emphasis upon the material, it nonetheless works to explore implications, while the Heideggerian project risks taking away the means for doing so. The latter project risks repressing the deconstruction of sovereignty.

3.3. Scholarship and Contemporary Spectral Effects

Having set out the possibilities of a scholarship of speaking with ghosts I then suggest taking up this up by examining the particular ways in which scholarship intersects with contemporary spectral effects. Here my attention turns to how, in 'The University Without Condition', Derrida makes references to the conditions that we earlier see in *Spectres of Marx* in relation to the indissociability of scholarship with politics and the media. We see his references to 'research institutions that are in the service of economic goals' (2001a, p. 27), how research and teaching have come 'to be supported, that is, directly or indirectly controlled, let us say euphemistically "sponsored", by commercial and industrial interests' (2001a, p. 28), and how 'the Humanities are often held hostage to departments of pure or applied science in which are concentrated the supposedly profitable investments of capital foreign to the academic world' (2001a, p. 28). Thus, the university plays a crucial role in constituting the 'phantasm of indivisible sovereignty' (2001a, p. 26). I discuss how, in this essay Derrida focuses upon how industries are allowed to exploit the humanities create what Derrida refers to as new forms of 'tele-work' (2001a, p. 31) or 'virtual work' (2001a, p. 42).

However, I also include his comments about the phantasm of indivisible sovereignty with his work in 'Faith and Knowledge' on the role played by sophisticated technologies and the hypercritical in the constitution of the hyperreal formations of nationalism and religious fundamentalism. By doing so I suggest that the significance of his comments on the role of virtual work become even more pronounced. On the one hand we might focus upon Derrida's comments in 'The University Without Condition' about how, firstly, scholarship intersects with inheritances about the conception of the role of the body from

Christianity – from conceptions of sin, suffering, sacrifice, and confession; and secondly, how this intersection can contribute to the development of virtual forms of work through its contribution to the intellectual transformation of the conception of the body (be it through the humanities, the social sciences, or the natural sciences). However, I also suggest that the impetus for this movement towards virtual work acquires further significance if we consider his comments in 'Faith and Knowledge' about the spectre of marginalisation. That is, that such a spectre amplifies the imperative to register one's value to the economy.

So, while there is a facilitation of new phantasms of sovereignty there is also a contradiction in that they can give credibility to phantasms that in many ways are the antipathy of scholarship – indeed that they can contribute, in both radical Islamist but also Christian evangelical forms, to explicitly anti-intellectual and anti-academic gestures. Here the significance of the new virtual forms of work is again important. For if scholarship can, largely in inadvertent ways, lead to the establishment of new forms of sovereignty, the incongruence can be more acutely articulated by focusing upon how there is a disruption to the inheritance of the role of confession. Now, as I will elaborate upon in my next paragraphs, Derrida argues that promise is to be located in a certain type of interdisciplinary activity that manages to avoid 'dissolving the specificity of each discipline into what is called, often in a very confused way, interdisciplinarity' (2001a, p. 50). He calls for an engagement between the humanities and the 'departments of genetics, natural science, medicine, and even mathematics', suggesting that they no doubt take seriously their ethical implications already (2001a, p. 50). However, I suggest that the

singular complexity of scholarship also opens up questions about an incongruence with traditions of work that should not be underestimated.

3.4. A New Humanities (and Cultural Studies)

As I state above, unlike his approach to the politics and sovereignty of the nation-state, Derrida's approach to the university is framed by his faith in its progressive ethico-political possibilities and that are in turn made possible by the manner in which it plays out the relationship between sovereignty and the unconditional. However, here I argue that while Derrida's emphasis upon the machinations of a 'new humanities' is important to engage with, it can also benefit from an intersection with a deconstructive cultural studies. However, in doing so I run up against an explicit claim by Derrida that cultural studies is a problematic project. For not only does he argue that the interdisciplinary project that he encourages should not dissolve 'the specificity of each discipline', but that it should not be 'lumped with another good-for-everything concept, "cultural studies" ' (2001a, p. 50). Thus, having already set out the importance of addressing the relationship between contemporary spectral effects and scholarship through an interdisciplinary project, I focus here upon making the case for a deconstructive cultural studies that can supplement his proposals. To do this I discuss arguments that have taken place around the possibility of a deconstructive cultural studies, as well as those that have responded directly to Derrida's remarks.

To take this argument forward I begin by elaborating upon Derrida's claims by way of two additional writers, Peggy Kamuf (2004) and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (2000). I do so because of the way in which Derrida does not unpack his opposition to cultural studies to any degree, despite being so assertive with his criticism. Beginning with Kamuf I discuss

her arguments that cultural studies involves an 'alibi' that deconstruction has no need for – that cultural studies attempts to be socially relevant in a manner that ultimately lends credibility towards an anti-intellectual gesture. For Kamuf Derrida's call for a 'new humanities' (from which the interdisciplinary project is to be disseminated from) retains its significance because of how it works within the traditions of reflecting upon the sovereignty of the human. She suggests that cultural studies is simply too focused upon resistance. With Spivak's work I discuss a somewhat less hostile approach to cultural studies. On the one hand Spivak extends her critique of a Gramscian emphasis upon 'counter-hegemony' and 'organic intellectuals' to its adoption within cultural studies that she pursues in relation to its adoption by subaltern studies in her seminal text in postcolonial theory, 'Can the Subaltern Speak' (1988). However, on the other hand she presents sympathy for how these projects have worked to register the articulation of the 'improper' by power (2000, p. 14).

Finally, I turn to far more enthusiastic supporters of a deconstructive cultural studies with texts by Gary Hall (2004) and Simon Morgan Wortham (2006). Here I discuss how Hall, focusing upon Derrida's emphasis upon the practicality of intervening in the humanities, suggests that if anything Cultural Studies has evolved to the point at which it involves the most sustained reflection on the question of the role of authority in scholarship without standing in total opposition to it, on broadening the subject of the political beyond political science and political theory, and on reflecting on ethical questions by way of its incorporation of critical theories and philosophy (including Derrida). However, while I acknowledge these empirical claims, my focus turns to Wortham's suggestions about the relationship between Cultural Studies and the examination of the symbolic. With a

discussion of Derrida's text *Given Time*, and the relationship that Derrida sets out between the gift and the symbolic, Wortham suggests that Derrida points towards how the consideration of the symbolic provokes questions about giving, inheritance, and responsibility. Thus, I examine Wortham's argument that as a site of the examination of the symbolic it could be reasoned that it is the most radical site of consideration of ethics.

4. The Media

4.1. Filtering, Selecting, Privileging

With my attention turning to the symbolic I therefore lead to an examination of the media. In so doing I suggest, in a manner that maintains the concern of the critical and cultural theorists that I discuss earlier in this thesis, that the examination of the media is of vital importance for considering contemporary politics. To do this I begin by unpacking why the media has political significance. Specifically I focus upon Derrida's proposals that the media articulates new forms of sovereignty through its processes of producing, sifting, investing, performing, ordering, and selecting 'actuality' (*being*), and that, as such, the media is a site of far more discrete and invasive forms of sovereignty (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 3). And yet, I also argue that to consider how the media goes about selecting and filtering it is necessary to consider the inheritances that Derrida articulates elsewhere, from the nation-state and the humanities, and more generally, to sexual difference, colonialism, the Western tradition, ethnocentrism, and ultimately logocentrism. I approach the selection and filtering of the events of 2008 through media apparatuses by integrating a consideration of these inheritances.

Thus, to begin with I consider the history and development of the media. Derrida considers that despite 'internationalization' (what we might otherwise call "globalization"), the relationship between selection and the conditioning of hospitality that articulates sovereignty means that there is an 'ineradicable privilege of the national, the regional, the provincial or the Western' (2002, p. 4). He insists that 'in the news, "actuality" is spontaneously ethnocentric. It excludes the foreigner, at times inside the country, quite apart from any nationalist passion, doctrine, or declaration, and even when this news speaks of "human rights" ' (2002, p. 4). However, more specifically the West is privileged because of its particular relationship with and attempts at the 'appropriation and concentration of information and broadcast capital' (2002, p. 5). If we wish to identify particular examples, we would therefore do well, as I have already set out earlier, to start with the media of the United States (2003, pp. 92-93). So, Derrida's arguments about the condition of the media are interwoven with his arguments about global politics and globalization. But they are also interwoven with his arguments on messianicity and sovereignty more generally, and with his arguments in the earlier texts of his career on speech and logocentrism.

This emphasis upon messianicity, sovereignty, and logocentrism plays a vital role in Derrida's attention to developments in "live" broadcast media. This is because of the manner in which it is linked to attempts to appropriate discrete articulations of being. Thus, for Derrida this emphasis upon live media indicates that the logic of sovereignty can in new ways be serviced by the production and performance of 'actuality', through what he calls 'artifactuality' (a portmanteau of 'artefact' and 'actuality'), and even the production of reality, through 'actuvirtuality' (a portmanteau of 'actuality' and 'virtuality'

(2002, pp. 3-6). In relation to the events of 2008 I subsequently engage with Derrida's arguments by investigating how live media have evolved, paying attention to developments in live broadcast television, the internet, the digital archive, culture, film, aesthetics, and literature. But I also continue to maintain the argument that a focus on the events of 2008 can only get us so far, and that we need to consider broader 'advances in the domain of "live" communication: to the photographic image, live television, tele-communications, and video' (2002, p. 5).

4.2. *Tele-technology, the Good News, and the Secret*

To follow this deconstruction, I focus attention upon the manner in which the political is *secreted* through the media through the discrete acts of decision-making that are involved, and therefore the role of the 'secret'. In particular I focus upon how Derrida locates this secretion of the political through the media in 'Above All, No Journalists' (2001b). In this text Derrida states, in this case in specific relation to television, that 'television always involves a protest against television; television pretends to efface itself, to deny television. It is expected to show you the thing itself, "live", directly' (2001b, p. 62). Derrida references 'pretends', but he emphasises that this tension between the technological apparatuses of live broadcast and the content is not to be dismissed. For he argues that the technologies of the media are presented as an uncomfortable appendage to the commitment to live broadcast. The aim is the capitalization of pure mediation, pure "live" being, rather than explication of the means of production. To examine this tension, I turn here to a closer examination of the inheritance of speech and logocentrism.

In *Of Hospitality* Derrida argues that in contrast to the body and the voice contemporary media forms, including television, are limited because of the fragmented and dislocated

condition of their teletechnology: 'in order to use the fax or the "cellular" phone, I have to be carrying on me, with me, in me, as me, the most mobile of telephones, called a language, a mouth, and an ear, which make it possible to hear yourself-speaking' (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 91). As such, my emphasis here is upon the tensions within the mediation of the events of 2008 that suggest that the body as opposed to media forms in the more traditional sense of advanced technological mechanisms of selection and filtering. However, *Of Grammatology* also suggests that logocentrism is not just about the importance of voice alone. Rather, it alludes to the Christian inheritance of the voice of God. For Derrida it is imperative to consider that this restriction of the media to the logocentric is also a restriction of critical thinking inherited from Christianity.

So, how does the restriction of critical thinking translate into the reinforcement of the hegemony of Western states, and particularly of the United States? Picking up with 'Above All, No Journalists', Derrida states that if we refer to the significance of Christianity, live media resembles a miracle (specifically, 'the "transubstantiation" or the "Eucharist" ') (2001b , p. 62). Thus, Derrida's theory of the influence of Christianity is further qualified by this correlation, suggesting that the media is subject to the constraints of the sovereignty of Christianity. Even the concept of media suggests that the acts of production are masked (2001b , p. 74). Thus, 'media' and 'mediatisation' suggest a similar implication to 'representation' that Derrida articulates in 'Signature Event Context' (1982c). Why Christianity specifically? Are there not similar ideas in the other religions? Are the other religions not also obsessed with spreading the word of their significance? For Derrida, of all the Abrahamic religions it is Christianity that has a particular relationship with evangelism (by contrast Judaism and Islam, Derrida insists, have traditionally asserted

the importance of the discrete message, symbolized by the 'secret of Abraham'). Thus, the development of global telecommunications and teletechnologies derives from a Christian legacy, and after all, as I mention above, he pointedly refers to globalization as globalatinization.

4.3. *Tele-technological Filiation*

To examine the implications of the media my approach focuses upon the way in which it involves a proliferation of sovereignties within what Derrida calls 'private space' (within the home for example) (2006, p. 33). In chapters three and four I set out how the casting of certain actors as the other of acceptable politics informs the constitution of sovereignty. The first implication of the media that I examine is its complicity with and contribution to the violence of, for instance, ethnocentrism, sectarianism, nationalism, racism, sexism, and ableism. In *Echographies of Television* Derrida develops his argument about the ethnocentric by claiming that the 'old nationalisms are taking on unprecedented forms by exploiting the most "advanced" media techniques', and in particular he focuses upon the role of 'the official radio and television networks' in the wars of the former-Yugoslavia underway at the time of the publication of this text (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 4). Thus, if this emphasis upon the national is indicative of a broader emphasis upon the logocentric (and therefore the patriarchal voice of God), my suggestion is to consider the implications of the media for questions relating to the body.

On the one hand the creation of new sovereignties feeds in to the inheritance of the theocratic, capitalization, and globalization, and more specifically the 'credit' of the United States (a point worth asserting, I believe, since this complicates the argument that these entities have been undermined by the events of 2008). Furthermore, the reaffirmation of

media that promises the real (what Derrida calls 'artifactuality') contributes to a universal framework which, as I have indicated in relation to cosmopolitanism, places limitations upon the possibilities of hospitality. But on the other hand, I examine the argument that through the proliferation of media forms there has been a transformation of the nature of hospitality, sovereignty, and the political. Derrida argues that with developments in the media – and particularly television – there has been an intensification of the disruption of the boundary between the public and the private. Ultimately this completely disrupts the notion of the 'at-home' but, at the same time, while there remains an inheritance of ethnocentrism we need to consider that we are left with an intensification of the return to the home, to the religious, to some form of identity associated with territory (2002, p. 79). It is in this relationship with the political concept of territory that Derrida argues that we need to consider a politics of spectres (2006, p. 63).

Thus, Derrida argues that with the deconstructive transformation of the concept of the nation-state there needs to be a consideration of how this does not mean that it disappears altogetherHe argues that the more that the media contributes to spectralization, the more complicated the integrity of the originary force becomes, and this must include dissemination. As such Derrida identifies an autoimmune process. This autoimmune process presents the rise of sovereignty that are far more inflected by technoscientific, therefore setting up a question of technoscientific filiation. Nonetheless, Derrida insists that the phenomena of the return of nationalism and the return of religion, and their particular violence, indicates the stakes involved in their deconstruction, and why these need to be approached carefully. In relation to the events of 2008 this provokes questions about the credibility of inheritances. Irrespective of any narrative about the

viability of financial systems or the United States, the spectacular nature of the event demands a reorganisation of the symbolic order. At this moment new sovereignties form, but not before negotiating difference. Not before navigating a profound sense of dissonance.

4.4. *Teletechnological Dissonance*

I work to unpack how new forms of sovereignty have been produced by the media, and with them new ways in which hospitality is conditioned. And yet, if I return to the premise of my engagement with Derrida's work that I set out at the beginning of my thesis, Derrida argues for an engagement with spectres 'in the name of justice' (2006, p. xviii). To reconcile this tension, I focus here on his arguments in *Echographies of Television* that the audience or 'receiver' is never passive (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, pp. 54-55). Rather, Derrida argues, the audience is always involved in the production of spectres. For instance, while Derrida argues that the return of religion is made possible in part by the globalization of the media, he also argues that the role of the receiver can be identified within their discretely topological and sectarian elements. This rather stretches the notion of the promise of the media, but it nonetheless indicates the dependency of even violent political movements to the discretion of its 'audience'. The subsequent question we need to therefore ask is how this movement towards the discrete can be retrieved in a progressive manner.

For Derrida 'we must learn (...) how to discriminate, compose, paste, edit' (2002, p. 59). By doing so we can explore the possibilities of the media for a new world, or more specifically another origin of the world (2002, p. 123). When we are presented with media technologies we are presented with the question of the being of difference, which is where

the role of spectres becomes important. We can never be quite sure of the identity of the other that haunts us, setting up a provocation to think difference (what Derrida more specifically calls the 'visor effect' [Derrida, 2006, p. 6; Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 120]). As a result developments in the media contribute to the breaking down of communities, be they religious, local, regional, or national, and even the concept of the political itself (2002, pp. 66-67). Thus, despite the return of religion, he insists, even if it is a long way off, that religion and nationalism are on the way to 'extinction' (2002, p. 81). Derrida actually makes a case for the progressive role that can be played by the nation-state, but there is an overall promise here in the manner in which the media generates questions about alterity. Moreover, Derrida supports his theoretical commitment to the media with specific examples, as well as the differences between various forms of media.

After arguing in *Echographies of Television* that the emphasis upon live broadcast restricts the notion of lived experience, Derrida goes on to make counter-arguments in its favour. There is the communication of justice. He argues that developments in telecommunications and teletechnologies played a vital role in undermining Soviet totalitarianism (2002, p. 72), and he points to the dissemination of the Rodney King video (2002, p. 90). More substantially however he argues that if we consider how live broadcast media masks its production we can surmise that it undermines the autonomy attributed to these technologies. As a result, he argues that live broadcast media contributes to the dissemination of spectres, even if it is in a far more limited way than the idiomaticity of other forms (for instance archives, literature, film, photography, and art). I therefore examine some of the creative ways in which the events of 2008 and their aftermath have been articulated, and situate them in relation to practices more generally.

But I do so by beginning with how the more restrictive media forms such as the live broadcast media start to fall apart at the seams.

5. Reflections

I have outlined above the theoretical framework that I use to approach the three case study chapters in this thesis, a framework firmly rooted in Derrida's work as well as critiques of it. I end here with a brief survey of the key texts which inform my final chapter on alternative and counter approaches to the events of 2008. In relation to politics, I return to Richard Beardsworth and examine *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory* (2011). In relation to the university, I examine Bernard Stiegler's *States of Shock: Stupidity and Knowledge in the 21st Century* (2015). And in relation to the media, I examine Michael Naas' *Miracle and Machine: Jacques Derrida and the Two Sources of Religion, Science, and the Media* (2012).

5.1. Richard Beardsworth: Hospitality and Cosmopolitanism

Earlier in this thesis I work with Richard Beardsworth's *Derrida and the Political* (1996) to assess Derrida's political contribution. In doing so I reach a critical assessment of Beardsworth's proposals. Nonetheless, I also argue that Beardsworth's text is helpful for considering the political contribution of Derrida's work. Here I want to return to Richard Beardsworth's approach to examine a final appraisal of Derrida's work on the nation-state. Specifically, I want to focus Beardsworth's 2011 book *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory*. This text focuses on articulating a cosmopolitan political project and engagement with International Relations, but in doing so it places a particular emphasis upon Derrida's work in one of its chapters. Here Beardsworth further develops

his argument in *Derrida and the Political* (1996) that Derrida's political contribution of work is hampered by its emphasis upon the unknown (the 'Gift'). He argues that Derrida's critique of cosmopolitanism and approaches to the legal apparatuses of the nation-state and hospitality (Derrida in Beardsworth, 2011, p. 221) are more appropriate to philosophy and aesthetics than politics, which for Beardsworth demands a consideration of the 'differently weighted, mobile forces' and 'immanence of this force-field to the terms of invention' (2011, p. 221).

Beardsworth's text therefore provides a platform for appraising Derrida's particular articulation of the significance of the nation-state for a more inclusive politics of affiliation. However, it also offers some more specific questions that are of relevance to appraising my approach to Derrida's work. Firstly, Beardsworth's critique of Derrida is incorporated within a chapter that constitutes an appraisal of 'postmodern theory'. Here Beardsworth affirms the contributions of postmodern theorists, including Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben alongside Derrida, provide 'telling critiques' of the ideas underpinning international relations, but fail to provide substantial political projects (2011, p. 10). From this I extrapolate an implicit contradiction with the cultural studies that I set out in my Introduction to this thesis. For, without glibly dismissing the analytical contributions of Beardsworth's text, there is, nonetheless, an emphasis upon action over the kind of close textual analysis that is particular to cultural studies and cultural theory. As such, Beardsworth examines International Relations for its empirical contributions, and particularly the International Relations theory of Realism. He argues that an encounter between the normative concern of cosmopolitanism and the empirical concern of International Relations Realism leads to questions about 'international security,

international human rights, financial and economic regulation, climate change mitigation, development, health and sustainability, and intercultural dialogue' (2011, p. 2).

This is particularly important for Beardsworth because he argues that the 'distinction between the normative and the empirical (...) is becoming blurred' (2011, p. 2) – a distinction that, for him, postmodernism and cultural studies are no doubt contributing to. This question of empiricity is important for my thesis more generally because of the manner in which it situates my concern to investigate questions of affiliation via an engagement with experiences of suffering. But if IR Realism provides the basis for this question, Beardsworth explores an encounter between cosmopolitanism and Marxism to take this further. For Beardsworth acknowledges that cosmopolitanism is susceptible to a certain 'unevenness' (2011, p. 4). For while he maintains that cosmopolitanism predates liberalism, he argues that it is with liberalism that cosmopolitanism has gained traction. As a result, there is for Beardsworth a complicity between cosmopolitanism and liberal (and more recently neoliberal) economics; capitalism. For Beardsworth there is a difference between the cosmopolitan inscription of alterity and liberalism's use of diversity as a point from which to justify irresponsibility. Moreover, Beardsworth emphasises the importance of economics for power relations; the systemic inequalities of capitalism; and the material limitations of neoliberalism, both domestically and internationally (2011, pp. 8-9).

Moreover, a Marxist-informed critique of capitalism is all the more important for Beardsworth 'in the context of the present financial and economic global crisis' (2011, p. 8). Beardsworth works to set out cosmopolitan responsibilities and the importance of international relations by way of a set of empirical claims about the state of the world.

Beardsworth would surely not be naïve about his use of the word 'context' (a concept that Derrida deconstructs in 'Signature Event Context'). So here I again refer to Geoffrey Bennington's critique of Beardsworth's earlier text – that Beardsworth's emphasis upon describing conditions (technological, economic, social, political, and economic) is at odds with an investigative project, which in turn limits the empirical emphasis that Beardsworth emphasises. In doing so my suggestion is that Beardsworth overlooks the role of knowledge and the humanities in a way that risks an unresponsive approach to theorising an inclusive political project. Indeed, Beardsworth criticises what he calls Benard Stiegler's 'unmediated politics of education' as a type of technological determinism (2010, p. 182). While this critique is specifically a critique of Stiegler's work, I want to suggest here that this opens up questions about Derrida's commitment to the university as a counterbalance to the nation-state, and Beardsworth's critique of Derrida's refusal to privilege politics over ethics.

5.2. *Bernard Stiegler: Scholarship and Education*

A student of Derrida during the writing of his doctoral thesis, Bernard Stiegler's work also deploys a deconstructive approach. Nonetheless, Stiegler's approach is also a substantial departure from Derrida's works. In a familiar way to Derrida's work, *Technics and Time: I* (1998) assesses the significance of Aristotle, Rousseau, Husserl, and Heidegger, but it also does so in relation to a consideration of anthropology and hominid evolution. As such Stiegler's work encompasses far more than a focus on the university. Through this schema Stiegler presents approaches to politics, economy, technology, culture, and the media that are very much distinct from those of Derrida. As such I am doing somewhat of a disservice to focus only on Stiegler's approach to the university in this section. Nonetheless, I claim

that Stiegler's approach to the university is indicative of a primary concern in his later works to articulate a political project that focuses upon the titular concern in *Taking Care of Youth and the Generations* (2010a). Namely the establishment of a more responsible 'intergenerational' transmission of knowledge (2010a, p. 8).

While Stiegler's 2008 text develops the importance of an intergenerational project to a political project, *States of Shock* (2015) explores the specific role that the university needs to play. For Stiegler it is universities, and particularly graduate schools, where the reason that underpins education is formed and re-formed (2015, p. 152). Here we find an explicitly different approach to the importance of the university from that of Derrida:

> While it may seem obvious that for "academics" (...) the function of the university and of its professors is above all to "profess the truth", as Derrida wrote, for mere mortals, for those who are not "professionals of the profession", those who are not professors, the first function of the university is to form and train young people. (2015, p. 153)

As such, Stiegler is concerned with developing a scholarship that reconstitutes knowledge in a more progressive manner. To articulate what this is Stiegler returns to his broader intellectual project set out in *Technics and Time: I*. That is, the argument that we need to consider how the advent of 'attention-capturing psycho-technologies (...) has literally ruined the very possibility of any formation of attention whatsoever' (2015, p. 154).

For Stiegler these 'psycho-technologies' (or 'mnemotechnics' [2015, p. 157]) come into ascendance on the basis of a pharmacological condition that has faced humanity. Pyscho-technologies are the logical extension of attempts to improve the efficiency of technologies. They have been implemented as therapeutics. The problem for Stiegler is that they are have had certain 'toxic' side-effects for politics, society, economics, technology, psychology, and ecology. Likewise, the university has been integrated into

this knowledge-based global economy, such that knowledge is sold as a commodity, and academics have given up on thinking alternatives or acknowledging the history of idealism and materialist dialectics (2015, pp. 168-169). We have arrived at a state of 'systemic stupidity' (2015, p. 174). And yet Stiegler does not argue that the situation is completely irretrievable. While this 'short-circuiting of the very possibility of a therapeutic moment now *seems* inevitable' he argues that this would constitute an 'anti-critical internalization of the ultra-liberal dogma proclaiming "there is no alternative" ' (2015, p. 174). The basis for this claim rests with his particular take on deconstruction that focuses upon the question of the pharmakon.

For Stiegler it is essential to consider how human existence is conditioned by the pharmacological. It is a fundamental aporia. It tells us a great deal about how technologies evolve, and how capitalism, power, nationalism, religious fanaticism, and consumerism are subject to a fundamental aporia that manifests in deep-seated anxieties. But in this aporia rests the question or 'spirit' of an alternative. Moreover, he identifies examples in which this has taken place – critical considerations of digital humanities, computer science, the proliferation of editing techniques, youth brought up to adeptly manipulate the digital as digital natives, social media and Wikipedia. Thus, there are not just possibilities but indications of the pharmacological nature of knowledge and scholarship. Thus, Stiegler argues that it is not enough to take Derrida's approach, also pursued in this thesis, that questions about a more inclusive politics can be explored through the examination of how spectres are treated. Stiegler instead suggests that scholarship should work through the limitations and possibilities of knowledge, and reach out to the 'extra-academic' (2015, p. 170). Here I examine two questions. One, whether Stiegler is a little

unfair to Derrida's new humanities and university to come; I wonder whether there is more continuity between Derrida's emphasis upon interdisciplinarity and Stiegler's emphasis upon engaging with research than he allows. And two, a much more substantial question: whether Stiegler's emphasis upon the therapeutic privileges the self in way that Derrida raises significant questions about via the concept of autoimmunity.

5.3. *Michael Naas: Underworlds*

I focus on Michael Naas' discussion of the relationship between Derrida and the media in *Miracle and Machine: Jacques Derrida and the Two Sources of Religion, Science, and the Media* (2012). However, if Beardsworth and Stiegler make sustained cases for engaging with, respectively, politics and the university, Naas' approach to the media is explicit but rather less so. Thus, why would it be best to turn to Naas' text? My suggestion is that this is an inherent issue when approaching Derrida's work, and which has important implications for this thesis. For while I identify Derrida's focus on the media in this thesis – most notably in *Spectres of Marx*, *Echographies of Television*, and 'Faith and Knowledge' – I argue that Derrida's comments on the media are where I find his most innovative interventions and these are not particularly explored in the literature on Derrida. Here Naas is one of the exceptions.

An issue for focusing on Naas' engagement with Derrida's work on the media is that the text has a rather complex and specialised set of aims. These are, in the order he sets out, p. 1) an introduction specifically to 'Faith and Knowledge', an 'essay that condenses a great deal of Derrida's prior work and anticipates much of his work in the decade to follow'; 2) an introduction to Derrida's work in general; 3) the setting out of Naas' own 'philosophical claims or theses regarding the relationship between religion, science, and

the media'; 4) an exploration of the structure and form of Derrida's work; 5) an emphasis upon technical 'revealability' as opposed to 'revelation'; and finally 6), how the emphasis upon revealability is expressed most significantly in the 'autoimmune' conditions of the rise of 'so-called extremist or fundamentalist religious groups' (2012, pp. 2-3). However, while Naas articulates the role of the media within the autoimmune processes of these groups, his emphasis is ultimately directed towards the 'underworld' of the two sources of religion that Derrida articulates in 'Faith and Knowledge'. Thus, while Naas places an emphasis on the media, he does so from the perspective of articulating a particular intervention into engaging with Derrida's works, and further a philosophical project.

Thus, Naas does not place the media at the forefront of his text. That said, I think there is a tension in Naas' text that, if worked through, raises possibilities for appraising Derrida's approach to the media. For while Naas somewhat reduces his explicit engagement with the question of the media to only one of his ten chapters, it seems to me that Naas' broader emphasis upon 'revealability' and the (albeit autoimmune) reliance on contemporary teletechnologies of various extremisms, and ultimately the manner in which Naas returns to Derrida's early work on writing, indicates that the question of the media is far more important than he gives credit for. However, my intention is not to call out Naas' text here. Rather, my aim is to work with what I consider to be his promising contributions to the consideration of the media, and suggest that they provide the basis for a project of considering the media as a site of a more inclusive politics.

In this text Naas continues to apply the same emphasis upon the originarity of phantomaticity that he sets out in *From Now On* (2008) discussed above, and I continue to maintain my reservation about this approach. Nonetheless, I also examine how Naas

develops an approach to the media by way of how he situates it in relation to the symbolic significance of advances in technology, of religious fundamentalism, and then in relation to the spectral 'underworld' of inheritances of religiosity. More specifically I focus on the attention that Naas places on the mass mediatised event, and his argument that this is influenced by an inheritance of messianic and apocalyptic religiosity. But, the main reason for examining Naas' work on the media is that he addresses the efficacy of assessing specific examples from the media, as opposed to the underworld that he alludes to. And this frames the question that I end my last chapter with; whether a focus on a mass-mediatised event such as the 2008 global financial crisis is really that beneficial, or whether attention should instead by focused upon the broader questions of the 'underworld' of spectral inheritance.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have turned my readings of Derrida's works towards a theoretical framework for this thesis. In doing so I have addressed the challenging issue that Derrida's work does not present a methodology but rather a collection of questions about inheritance. I have discussed how these incorporate a fundamental question about spectrality, and how the spectre of inadequacy haunts sovereignty in all its guises, towards more specific inheritances that ultimately culminate with the apparatuses of the nation-state, the university, and media technologies. Derrida's work is undoubtedly complex, both theoretically and epistemologically, but then in its complexity it is, I suggest, perhaps far more open and attuned to the subtleties of everyday life than methodologies permit. While Richard Beardsworth puts a provocative and compelling case forward for a systematic examination of the middle-ground, or 'khôra', I argue in

favour of Geoffrey Bennington's argument that the vitality of Derrida's work is to be found in its willingness to be experimental in considering the differences set out between the proper and the improper, and how this is articulated by an attentiveness to inheritances.

I then supplement this approach by considering, by way of a reading of Michael Naas' approach to applying Derrida, how an attention to inheritance is articulated through the spectre and, and most radically, spectres. in mind, the framework that I have set out in this chapter involves a speculation about the locations where a project of responding to the crisis of 2008 can take place. However, I argue that Naas' approach overemphasises the messianic promise of spectres, to the detriment of speculating upon the types of inheritances that should acquire particular attention. In the rest of this chapter I have subsequently set out the types of speculations in relation to the spectral that I think are particularly important, and how they take me on a trajectory that follows the secretion of the political ultimately through media technologies.

CHAPTER THREE: THE POLITICS OF THE NATION-STATE

Introduction

In my previous chapters, I have set out the basis for reading Derrida after the global financial crisis of 2008. In Chapter One I set out the tradition in which this thesis works in order to articulate the significance that I identify in Derrida's work, and I assess my reading of Derrida by way of three seminal texts of secondary literature to help reflect upon my interpretation and the contribution that a reading of Derrida's work can make. In Chapter Two, I reorient my reading of Derrida, accompanied by a re-reading of secondary literature, towards the production of a theoretical framework that can facilitate this research project. In addition, I set out how I deconstruct my approach through three thematic analytical chapters and a fourth appraisal chapter that works to assess the conclusions that I reach by way of texts that have, to varying degrees, adopted and departed from Derrida's ideas. Through these chapters, I have worked to articulate a particular reading of Derrida and adaptation of his work to my project that focuses upon the idiomatic as it is emphasised by Geoffrey Bennington (1993).

In this chapter, I begin my substantive element of this thesis by focusing upon the significance of the politics of the nation-state. As I set out in Chapter Two, I do so for a number of reasons: the significance of the nation-state in terms of its involvement in the politics of spectres (the policies and inactivity of the nation-state, its involvement in facilitating a politics of traditions, industry, and so on); because of the possibilities of intervening in the politics of the nation-state for an examination of justice and because of the limitations of the nation-state, and how these limitations direct attention to the politics of other places. But by examining the role of the nation-state in this chapter I

ultimately focus my attention upon a question of insecurity and terror that the history and concept of the political are intimately interwoven with. I discuss Derrida's argument that terror has been referred to in political history, from the English Civil War to the French Revolution, the Nazi occupation of France to the Global War on Terror; and how political theory, including Thomas Hobbes, Carl Schmitt, and Walter Benjamin has referred to its existence to justify their particular approaches to sovereignty and the political. But I also argue that this insecurity is integral to the figure of the spectre, and the intellectual, 'ontotheological' inheritance that underpins it, that is secreted into everyday experiences, such as the reception of economy, technology, media, culture, and ideas.

To go about this, I begin by rearticulating why and how my approach takes as its starting point the spectrality of the global financial crisis of 2008. That is, why and how I examine the *question* of the spectrality of these events in relation to politics (as opposed to a documentation and examination of different, specific spectres). I focus upon examining and theorising the inheritances that make politics possible and condition its implications. I emphasise the theoretical and idiomatic in order to further emphasise the manner in which I work between a tension between the empirical and inheritance. That is, something like Michael Naas' reference, via Don DeLillo, to an 'underworld' (a term I argue in my final chapter to be tempting but somewhat problematic) (2012). In Section One I set out the specific ways in which this tension plays out in relation to the politics of the nation-state. In Section Two I discuss how this tension emphasis opens up questions about the fate of the nation-state, while in Section Three I discuss how this translates into specific effects; a politics of insecurity that can be approached by way of the corporeally-

inflected concept of 'autoimmunity'. Finally, in Section Four I work to emphasise the possibilities, despite the problems they are faced by, and risks of Eurocentrism, of the European Enlightenment inheritances within the cosmopolitan politics of liberal democracy.

1. The Significance of Politics

In my previous chapters I have discussed the tension in Derrida's work between, on the one hand, his attention to specific empirical examples, and on the other hand, his attention to much more philosophical discussions of inheritance. In this chapter I work with this tension in relation to the political. I work with how Derrida often made very timely interventions in contemporary political issues, including on the nation-state, international politics, human rights, and international law (2006; 2002a; 2005b; Borradori and Derrida, 2003). Yet, on the other hand, his works are often sparse and general in terms of empirical evidence, and redirect attention to examinations to long term inheritances and very arcane, complex analyses of classical texts from the Western canon. Yet my intention is not to merely repeat an exposition of this tension and come down on the side of Derrida's emphasis upon inheritance. Rather, I suggest it is vital to his particular approach to politics and the nation-state. Specifically, I focus upon how Derrida links up questions about inheritance with questions about sovereignty, politics, and the nation-state, by way of questions about 'credit'.

By referring to credit I am therefore referring to a concept that is readily associable with the crisis of 2008. However, while this is certainly helpful my focus here is upon how Derrida refers to credit within contemporary politics to move towards the question of inheritance. To examine and unpack these approaches to the political and the nation-state

and focus my attention in this section upon an interview given by Derrida that responds to the 9/11 attacks: 'Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides' (2003). While there are texts that more thoroughly examine questions about the relationship between inheritance, credit, and politics (see 2006; 1997b; 2002a, 2005b), my suggestion here is that 'Autoimmunity' is significant because of the timeliness with which it applies deconstruction to an empirical issue in contemporary politics. The text is a publication of an interview given only five weeks after 9/11 that responds in a thorough manner to the attacks, to the implications of the declaration of Global War on Terror, and poses questions about the spectral significance of a mass global event.

At the beginning of 'Autoimmunity' Giovanna Borradori, Derrida's interviewer, asks Derrida whether the attacks constituted a 'major event' (2003, p. 85). In response to this suggestion, Derrida focuses upon what this suggests about the contemporary nature of sovereignty and how this relates to the state of contemporary international politics. He argues the classification of the attacks as a 'major event', along with the reduction of the events to the name-dates of '9/11' and 'September 11th', could only come about as a result of the form of inheritance of '*credit*' attributed to the United States 'on every level: economic, technical, military, in the media, even on the level of discursive logic, of the axiomatic that supports juridical and diplomatic rhetoric worldwide, and thus international law' (2003, pp. 92-93). He even suggests that credit is even attributed to the United States by 'those who are trying to ruin it' (2003, pp. 94-95). I will consider the implications that Derrida sets out in a moment, but for now my intention is to focus on what this means for the relationship between questions of the empirical and inheritance.

Principally, what the implications are of maintaining an assumption about the hegemony of the United States.

Derrida's proposal that the 'credit' of the United States was, paradoxically, both undermined and, in certain ways, maintained and even rejuvenated by the attacks of 9/11 raises an interesting question about the implications of the 2008 global financial crisis, again in terms of the credit of the United States, but also of the West and global capitalism. Referring to Nietzsche and Benjamin in *Spectres of Marx*, Derrida warns of how complacency can creep into claims about how and what are dominant (2006, p. 68). More specifically, I am concerned that this generalization risks limiting the analysis of, and intervention in, specific political, legal, and institutional decisions. And yet Derrida's generalization about US hegemony is accompanied by a circular deconstruction that returns to consider its different discrete aspects. He raises a series of provocative questions about the implications of US influence over politics, law, and sovereignty. In this regard it is perhaps helpful to refer back to a difference between the approaches of Derrida and Jean Baudrillard that I discuss in Chapter One.

It is very easy to focus solely upon how the reduction of the events of 2008 to 'the global financial crisis ' is problematic because of the manner in which it reduces complex financial, economic, political technological, and social issues to a 'name-date', in much the same way as '9/11'. That is, in a similar manner to how Baudrillard characterises the virtuality of the crisis of 1987 and its contribution to the 'inflation' of the symbolic economy. In addition, here I am thinking of Baudrillard's *America* (2010), where he and Derrida's lament about a 'French speciality' for making comments about faraway lands after brief visits (2006, pp. 88-89). How certain can we be about the nature of US power

in its relationship with the media? More specifically, I think it is worth emphasising that when Derrida refers to the 'credit' of the United States, he refers to discrete forms of credit that play an accumulative role in building up the credit of the United States more generally. As I point out above, he claims that the United States has credit 'on every level', including legal and political apparatuses. However, Derrida subsequently works to pick about the force of these levels of credit.

However, in addition to discussing discrete forms of 'credit', Derrida also suggests how he works with the limits of the symbolic, despite being famous (or infamous) for his emphasis upon writing;

> I believe always in the necessity of being attentive first of all to this phenomenon of language, naming, and dating, to this repetition compulsion (at once rhetorical, magical, and poetic). To what this compulsion signifies, translates, or betrays. Not in order to isolate ourselves in language, as people in too much of a rush would like us to believe, but on the contrary, in order to try to understand what is going on precisely *beyond* language and what is pushing us to repeat endlessly and without knowing what we are talking about, precisely there where language and the concept come up against their limits. (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, pp. 87-88, italics in original)

As such he directs attention towards the empirical by way of a deconstruction of inheritance within writing and the symbolic. He does not just deconstruct the empirical through a consideration of inheritance. He maintains a tension and relationship between the two. Of particular interest for an analysis of politics, in 'Autoimmunity' Derrida examines links between the reductive language of the name-date of '9/11' with the political through its relationship with terror.

For Derrida we need to be attentive to the visceral and corporeal impact and complications of the deployment of US military power, out of a commitment to justice but also geopolitical perspective:

> The "bombs" will never be "smart" enough to prevent the victims (military and or civilian, another distinction that has become less and less reliable) from responding, either in person or by proxy, with what it will then be easy for them to present as legitimate reprisals or as counterterrorism. And so on ad infinitum… . (2003, p. 100)

However, he also argues that the conjuring of an event always, necessarily, involves a condition of lack of knowledge that is disorientating and, as such, potentially terrifying (2003, p. 90). But this is even more the case when the event is reduced to something like a 'ritual incantation', as with '9/11' (2003, p. 86). Repeating the emphasis upon justice in relation to 9/11, Derrida refers to inheritance by calling for 'compassion for the victims', while he refers to geopolitics by calling for a reassessment of the concept of terror.

In examining the concept and rhetoric of terror as it has been conjured in political history Derrida argues that it while it is riven by hypocrisy this should not mean that we jettison its analysis. From the Great Terror during the French Revolution to the Nazi occupation's depiction of French Resistance fighters as terrorists and the Allied bombings of Germany and Japan during World War II, he argues that we need to consider how nation-states have also deployed terror. However, he also interrogates the concept of terror by asking whether we can consider it in terms of something beyond violence that is 'voluntary, conscious, organized, deliberate, intentionally calculated', to whether it also includes 'letting die' [of] hundreds of millions of human beings, from hunger, AIDS, lack of medical treatment, and so on', and whether this can 'also be part of a "more or less" conscious and deliberate terrorist strategy' (2003, pp. 107-108) (I am reminded here of arguments that government policies of austerity in response to the global financial crisis of 2008 have resulted in reduced quality of life and lower mortality [see Stuckler and Basu, 2013]).

Thus, Derrida is attentive to how the nation-state has taken up responsibility for that which is perhaps most terrifying: the control of life and death.

Involved in marginalisation, from the reduction of the symbolism of the events of 9/11 to '9/11', to reduction of enemies to terrorists, and the terrifying condition of socio-economic deprivation. However, he also supplements these arguments derived from political history with some additional arguments developed from an engagement with political theory. For from a consultation of political theorists from Thomas Hobbes to Carl Schmitt and to Benjamin he notes that the concept of terror – elaborated by either despotic politicians, external forces, internal conflict, anarchy (or, more recently, spectral international, non-state actors) – has played a fundamental role in understanding politics by way of an articulation of sovereignty, on the basis that for violence to be limited there is a need for a less-violent force of law (2003, p. 102). Particularly in the case of Hobbes and Schmitt, terror has been referred to in order or justify sovereign monopoly over violence. That is, the justification for the deployment of terror by nation-states. Here Derrida opens up more fundamental questions about the political than attention to 9/11 can provide. In addition, it suggests the limits of 'Autoimmunity' as a text in terms of its contribution to discussing the tension between the empirical and inheritance, and why I finish this section by referring to 'Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority' (2002c).

In Chapter Two I discuss Richard Beardsworth's argument that Force of Law is a text where Derrida sets out most convincingly the contribution of deconstruction to political theory. In so doing I refer to Beardsworth's explication of Derrida's agreement with Hobbes, Schmitt, and Benjamin that violence is inevitable in any act of politics, law, or

writing, and that, as a consequence, we need to make pragmatic choices on the basis that they are less violent than others. And yet 'Force of Law' begins with Derrida interrogating the imposition of 'choice, the "either/or:" "yes or no" [that] would be virtually violent, polemical, inquisitorial', even going as far as to say that it involves 'some instrument of torture' (2002c , p. 231) (in specific relation to the question given to him by the conference organisers at which the paper was delivered: 'Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice'). Derrida is more concerned to consider the violence of inheritances. For Beardsworth this refusal to impose choices undermines the credentials of Derrida's commitment to the political. For Derrida it is important to foster active, responsible readership, and to respond to empiricity in a much more flexible and contingent manner.

Derrida therefore acknowledges that justice, ethics, and politics have not been at the foreground of deconstruction but insists that, as a project, it has nonetheless had the intention of:

> Destabilizing, complicating, or recalling the paradoxes of values like those of the proper and of property in all their registers, of the subject, and thus of the responsible subject, of the subject of right, the subject of law, and the subject of morality, of the juridical or moral person, of intentionality. (2002c, p. 235)

So, Derrida suggests that it is out of a concern for the empirical concerns of the political that he looks to deconstruct it by considering inheritance. This raises two distinctive possibilities. Firstly, it directs attention towards an assessment of the violence that we have inherited, how sovereignty is established, and therefore how marginalisation is imposed. Secondly, it provides a chance for what Derrida calls 'perfectibility' (2002c, p. 271). Despite the 'enforceability of the law or contract' (2002c, p. 233), he insists that law, politics, credit, and inheritance are both characterised by deconstruction, and always, as a result, reinscribe 'the *possibility* of deconstruction' (2002c, p. 243, my italics).

Ultimately however I think it is worth pointing to the way in which Derrida links up an approach to politics with his proposals about writing, language, meaning and origins found in earlier texts like *Of Grammatology* (2002c, p. 241). Derrida insists that the tension between the empirical and inheritance is woven into the 'very moment of foundation or institution' of political conditions (2002c, p. 241). This question of inheritance, therefore, destabilises any attempt to focus on empirical issues. And yet an emphasis upon the question of inheritance opens up subsequent questions about how a *politics* of inheritance is at play in ways that help to inform the implications of contemporary politics. It suggests how inheritance plays a role in justifying sovereignty because of the significance of intellectual uncertainty. This is important if we consider that the spectres of the global financial crisis of 2008 has contributed to such uncertainty. Might we suggest that the conjuration of these spectres involves intellectual disruption? However, we might also note that the articulation of the significance of the crisis largely comes from commentators and academics (with this thesis being complicit). The real problem is that while political responses such as austerity continue, the spectres of 2008, have been relied upon less and less. The spectres of the crisis have become increasingly ephemeral. Here a justification for considering inheritance becomes even more compelling, for it provides a basis for exploring the implications of spectres that are otherwise indiscernible.

2. Inheritance and the Phantasm of the Sovereign

In this section I look to further deconstruct the relationship between inheritance and the political. However, in doing so I come across the question of the uncertain future of the nation-state. For Derrida argues that the nation-state is being rendered increasingly

outdated by developments in globalization. While I argue that it is not possible to completely untie the relationship between politics, knowledge, and teletechnology, I nonetheless set out how I leave these considerations to Chapters Four and Five, and how, in this section, I focus specifically upon Derrida's arguments about how the manner in which the nation-state, its institutions, and the ideals that underpin them have, in an autoimmune fashion, been complicit with these developments. I set out Derrida's arguments about the problems with liberal democracy, state institutions, ethnic, nationalist and religious extremisms, and theological inheritances at work in contemporary politics. And in addition to doing this I argue that certain responses to the global financial crisis have contributed to this autoimmune trajectory with problematic repercussions. Specifically, I consider the significance of how responses have neglected democratic dialogue in favour of a reinscription of faith in the financial industry, capitalism, and the contemporary institutions, technologies, and industries that they rely upon.

On the future of the contemporary nation-state, Derrida argues in *Spectres of Marx*, for instance, that the withering away of the nation-state (to borrow Marxist language) is indicated by the increasing difficulty with distinguishing between civil war and international war (2006, p. 100). His point here is that nation-states only exist in distinction from each other, and once there is a sole superpower, as there is in the aftermath of the Cold War in the form of the United States, there can no longer be any real international war, any military conflict involving the United States will only ever lead to its victory. We are therefore discussing some form of global civil war rather than an international war with contrasting powers vying for supremacy. However, he also

suggests that to focus upon the end of the cold war is also to overlook the implications of 'a great number of socio-economic mechanisms' that, long before the end of the cold war, have dominated political space (2006, p. 100).

Instead of 'international or civil-international war' there are therefore various 'economic wars, national wars, wars among minorities, [and] the unleashing of racisms and xenophobia, ethnic conflicts, conflicts of culture and religion' (2006, p. 100). However, these phenomena that suggest that the nation-state is in trouble also indicate something more profound - that 'entire regiments of ghosts have returned, armies from every age' (2006, p. 100). Derrida's suggestion here is that both specific nation-states and the concept of the nation-state itself are being undermined by state actors that summon these ghosts. This is an argument that he argues later texts as well (2002a; 2005a; Borradori and Derrida, 2003). And yet, while Derrida argues that nation-states have contributed to their own demise in an autoimmune fashion, he does not systematically examine the empirical ways in which this has happened, opting instead to only occasionally supplement his theoretical work on autoimmunity with examples. On the one hand we might argue that this brings into question the significance of this approach for exploring political responses to the events of 2008. However, on the other hand Derrida's approach to contemporary politics, by stepping back and examining the fundamentals of how they came into existence, provide a basis for reassessing the kinds of contemporary politics to focus upon, as well as their implications.

Before considering how the nation-state has become susceptible to developments in globalization, I think it is worth paying more attention to the relationship between politics and deconstruction that I allude to in section one. In 'Force of Law' he argues that:

> [Force] is always a matter of differential force, of difference as difference of force, of force as *différance* or force of *différance* (*différance* is a force *différée-différante*); it is always a matter of the relation between force and form, between force and signification, of "performative" force, illocutionary or perlocutionary force, of persuasive force and of rhetoric, of affirmation of signature, but also and above all, of all the paradoxical situations in which the greatest force and the greatest weakness strangely exchange places. (Derrida, 2002b, pp. 234-235, italics in original)

Thus, Derrida argues that sovereignty is, from the outset, never really a matter of objects that are unchanging, but rather subject to a certain contingent credibility. As such attention needs to turn to how credibility is attributed, and in turn constituted. Here it is perhaps helpful to again refer again to the credit of the United States as an example.

In section one I refer to Derrida's claim that the United States holds 'credit (...) on every level' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, pp. 92-93). On the one hand, the financial crisis of 2008 has been presented in terms of an event that has reduced the financial and economic credibility of the United States. But on the other hand, if we broaden the concept of credit to include inheritance, as Derrida suggests, and consider how the rhetoric and policies of the politicians and institutions of the United States have called upon inheritances associated with the national identity of the United States, I think we might do well to consider that the events have provoked the continuation, albeit reformulation of the United States' credibility. In 'Force of Law' Derrida cites Montaigne thus: 'Lawes are now maintained in credit, not because they are just, but because they are lawes. It is the mystical foundation of their authority; they have none other (...) Whosoever obeyeth them because they are just, obeyes them not justly the way as he ought' (Montaigne in Derrida, 2002c, pp. 239-240). As such Derrida emphasises the symbiosis of sovereign force and the organisation of inheritance. But what might these inheritances be specifically characterised by?

In *The Politics of Friendship* (1997b) Derrida argues that 'the concept of politics rarely announces itself without some sort of adherence of the State to the family, without what we will call a *schematic* of filiation: stock, genus or species, sex, blood, birth, nature, nation - autochthonal or not, tellurian or not' (1997b, p. viii, italics in original). But Derrida does not begin with the schematic of filiation in order to provide a historical narrative. Rather, he suggests that this schematic is vital to understanding the contemporary phenomena of the deconstruction of the nation-state through nationalism and religious extremism. So, filial bonds both contribute to the formation of the institutions of the nation-state *and outlive it*. Nonetheless, this should not prevent us from considering how there are certain significant elements of the return to these archaisms that are dependent upon developments in contemporary global telecommunications, teletechnologies, and simulacra. Here then I intend emphasise the role of Derrida's argument that the contemporary phenomena of the return of the religious should be completely explained by way of the inhertiances that have informed the constitution of politics and state institutions. To do this I return to the concept of hospitality that I set out in my earlier chapters, and touch upon the deconstructive promise that this entails.

However, for the moment I will focus upon what the filial concept of hospitality suggests for the fate of politics. So, if we recall my exposition of Derrida's concept of hospitality in my earlier chapters, we can note that sovereignty is made possible by spectres, be it the explicit spectres of the foreigner or the event, or the implicit spectre of mortality. As such this suggests that the absolute identity, or what Derrida prefers to call 'ipseity', of sovereignty is never really possible. I have set this out already, in relation to *différance*. I am more interested here in why Derrida focuses upon the specific phenomena of the

family. The family is important because it provides the basis for a consideration of how difference is engaged with through embodied, social, and spatial frameworks. On the one hand, the question of affiliation operates on a small scale. However, on the other hand, they indicate a movement that requires reassessment about their relevance today. For while deconstruction determines that the ipseity of sovereignty is ultimately destabilized by its dependence upon difference, there is, nonetheless, an attempt to consolidate difference through a restrictive return. For instance, through logocentrism, the return to the authority of the Father-figure of God.

In these terms, the nation-state and state institutions constitute specific restrictive economies of difference. The importance of the return thus helps to consider how, despite globalization, there is a proliferation of 'phantasm of community, the nation-state, sovereignty, borders, native soil and blood' (2006, p. 102). For deconstruction, and particularly deconstruction through increasingly sophisticated forms of writing and teletechnology, should otherwise indicate that they are 'more outdated than ever' (2006, p. 102). To consider this I think it is helpful to refer to his arguments about why the return is such a dogged political dynamic. For as I mention above, Derrida argues that deconstruction is impossible without writing and law. There has to be a return for deconstruction to take place. Thus, while the return to the archaic can manifest in restrictive phenomena, the return is not in itself problematic, 'it doubtless keeps some irreducible resource' (2006, p. 102). Without the return there can be no encounter with the irreducibility of difference. A return to begin again (2002a, p. 57). What we therefore need to do is give consideration to the types of return that are problematic, the types that

hold promise, and how these can be determined in relation to the political responses to the events of 2008.

The problem with extremist nationalisms, and why they have manifested so violently, is that they constitute a withdrawal from a range of political encounters. While the nation-state continues to take place through the apparatuses of social care and healthcare, education, policing, the military, and representative democracy, the interconnections between diverse regions, cities, and communities, they are increasingly rendered virtually insufficient when contrasted with the capacity of contemporary rhetoric, imagery, and teletechnologies to convey the nation in all its purity. But if we pursue this notion of a purer articulation of origins we might therefore suggest that an even more problematic dynamic is, therefore, to be found in the return of religion. Again, this return of the religious has been presented as something surprising, bearing in mind global advances in science, technology, and the media. And yet, Derrida suggests that the return of the religious should not come as a surprise. Firstly, this is because concepts such as sovereignty, tolerance, and even democracy have theological origins (all three involve redemption). However, more subtly, Derrida identifies a particularly close resemblance between religion and the return (and more specifically the return to origins).

The theological conditions of politics and the state and are not just characterised by a return to the religious, they also involve a theological turn to questions of what is to come – of messianicity. Thus, while Derrida suggests that the return of the religious is particularly indicative of the relationship between politics and theologism, he also argues that there is always a negotiation of ontology. Most explicitly in 'Faith and Knowledge', Derrida argues that 'religion and reason develop in tandem, drawing from this common

resource: the testimonial pledge of every performative, committing it to respond as much before the other as for the high-performance performativity of technoscience' (2002a, p. 66). To this end, he suggests that as tempting as it is to focus upon the return of the religious or the religiosity of the politics of United States, we need to consider a more subtle combination that manifests in the sovereignty attributed to scientific, technological, industrial, economic, and philosophical rationalities. It is in this sense that he responds, in a robust manner, to the assumption of his interviewer in 'What Does It Mean to Be a French Philosopher Today?', that Europe is secular, exclaiming that the theocratic is integral to European politics today, and not just the United States: 'in Europe too!' (2005c, p. 116).

Specifically, Derrida focuses here upon the suggestion that sovereignty can be located in the mechanicity and automaticity of these rationalities. It is in this manner that the return of the religious is in large part made possible by these developments, or rather the deconstruction of these developments. With the deconstructive phenomena of *différance* and the requirement to return to begin again, the turn to the logocentric makes sense. But Derrida's emphasis upon the ontotheological interweaving of faith and reason suggests that we need to consider the possibility of a fragmentation of forms of sovereignty that are not often associated with the concept. Up to this point I have focused upon the inheritance of the political and how its credit is being eroded by the dynamic of the return and its demand to reconsider inheritance. This subsequently leads us to the question of what inheritances of politics have more or less violent implications, and what inheritances provide the possibility of what Derrida calls their 'perfectibility' (see 2003, p. 114). It is in this scenario that a further attention to the figure of the spectre is helpful

since the particular form that the spectre takes gives articulation to the form of sovereignty.

Before I move on to my section examining spectres and where the events of 2008 fit into this framework I think it is worth emphasizing two things. In Chapter Two of *Spectres of Marx* – 'Conjuring Marx' – Derrida sets out the manner in which the spectre of Marx is being conjured anew by conservative politics after the Cold War, paradoxically, as an 'enemy to be conjured away', and an indication of the deconstruction of ontology through 'hauntology' (2006, pp. 62-63). And yet, Derrida's later works such as *Rogues* and *The Beast and the Sovereign* do not articulate the identities in question as spectres (to 'Rogue States', global terrorism) (2005b; 2009; 2011). Rather, the spectre is something far more liminal that haunts the ipseity of sovereignty, and which opens up the possibility of difference, or the 'democracy to come' (2006, p. 81; Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 53). Here I suggest that we need to turn to the emphasis upon the idiomatic quality of Derrida's work. In section three I examine the urgency of intervening in responses to the spectres.

3. Hospitality and Autoimmunity's Spectrality

This section turns from the spectral irreducibility of sovereignty to the question of going beyond politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state and traditional conceptions of sovereignty. To approach this transformation I therefore wish to refer to Derrida's conception of hospitality, touched upon in relation to spectres in *Spectres of Marx* (2006, p. 81-82), and more thoroughly explored in *Of Hospit*ality (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000). With the concept of hospitality Derrida adapts the fundamental deconstructive framework of différance to the political. Thus, hospitality conceptualises a negotiation of the inevitable insecurity of sovereignty, in much the same way as différance articulates

the destabilisation of the logocentric by the 'trace'. As a consequence, we can view the spectre of something like the crisis of 2008, when articulated by the nation-state, as an articulation of the negotiation of its limitations, and its deconstruction through new articulations of sovereignty, with accompanying conceptions of political subjects and citizens, and foreigners. However, to consider how this negotiation sets up a solicitation of inheritances that inform sovereignty, citizenry, and the foreign, my focus begins here with the way in which hospitality is negotiated by way of autoimmunity's spectrality. Specifically, I focus here upon Derrida's suggestion in 'Faith and Knowledge' that 'the autoimmunitary haunts the community and its system of immunitary survival' (2002a, p. 82).

Thus, Derrida continues by arguing that for all the 'hyperbole' of sovereignty there is:

> Nothing in *common*, nothing immune, safe and sound, *heilig* and holy, nothing unscathed in the most autonomous living present without a risk of autoimmunity. As always, the risk charges itself twice, the same finite risk. Two times rather than one: with a menace and with a chance. In two words, it must take charge of-one could also say: take in trust – the *possibility* of that **radical evil** without which good would be for nothing. (2002a, p. 82, italics and bold in original)

In this sense Derrida further elaborates upon his concern in *Spectres of Marx* about the obsession with 'living-on', in which 'a survival whose possibility in advance comes to disjoin or dis-adjust the identity to itself of the living present as well as of any effectivity, of the body' (2006, p. xx) (indeed Derrida refers to auto-immunity very briefly when arguing that Marx and Max Stirner refuse to acknowledge the encroachment of spectres upon the ego [2006, p. 177]). The suggestion being that any suggestions about sovereign bodies are necessarily accompanied by spectres of their limitations and inadequacies. In

this this sense we might say that any sovereign spectral entities of the crisis of 2008 are in turn haunted by a spectre of autoimmunity.

It is through the emphasis upon autoimmunity that I subsequently want to emphasise here that I believe that 'Faith and Knowledge' (2002a) provides some of Derrida's most urgent interventions in contemporary politics. Derrida undertakes a meditation on the inheritance of the ontotheological through religion, philosophy, reason, science, technology, and the media, as well as an exposition of the dual roles of western religion and reason on globalization. On the one hand, 'Faith and Knowledge' can be viewed as a response to questions about the significance of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism that would come to dominate US politics after 9/11. But on the other hand he examines how this phenomena has been made possible by what he calls 'globalatinization', a portmanteau concept that combines globalization with the 'Latin' in order to refer to the manner in which contemporary politics are dominated by the Western tradition (2002a, p. 67). In so doing he suggests that if the shocking corporeal violence of religious and nationalist extremisms is to truly be confronted there needs to be an appraisal of the responsibilities involved in the global dissemination of Western messianicity through more or less discrete 'wars of religion' (2002a, p. 61).

Derrida argues that 'like others before, the new "wars of religion" are unleashed over the human earth', but this time they take place through means that are much more closely tied to the symbolic (2002a, p. 61). They are prosecuted through technologies that 'control the sky with finger and eye: digital systems and virtually immediate panoptical visualization, "air space", telecommunications' satellites, information highways, concentration of capitalistic-mediatic-power – in three words, digital culture, jet and TV'

(2002a, pp. 61-62). While for some it might seem obscene to equate these phenomena with the gruesome, so-called "medieval" violence of extremism, Derrida argues that we need to consider how, at root, they both 'have no stakes other than this determination of the "world", of "history", of the "day" and of the "present" ' (2002a, p. 62). That is, they both operate with the means that they have at hand for eschatological reaction, be they sophisticated technologies of mass destruction, or more archaic forms of violence. But these ideas would not be possible if it were not for the manner in which they are secreted into everyday life through the symbolic forces in large part dominated by the West. Derrida consequently suggests that we need to focus on responsibility.

Now, for Derrida, the religiosity that is secreted is not problematic in itself. As with writing, metaphysics, law, and politics, he suggests that they provide the possibility of deconstruction. What is problematic is the manner in which the religiosity of the West is secreted, and responsibility with it. The religious 'does not always speak its name' (2002a, p. 63). On the one hand, it is important to consider who and what secretes religiosity, to whom, in order to consider how it is disseminated. But on the other hand, this masking also masks an inscription of a dual inheritance that has a significant contribution to the conceptual underpinnings of the spectre of autoimmunity. Derrida argues that with the inheritance of the religious we also inherit the ontological. We inherit the 'ontotheological'; the 'two sources' of religion and reason (2002a, p. 66). We have the theological, that refers to the act of faith, belief, and the attribution of *credit*, but we also have the role of the ontological – of the object of being that faith is directed towards (2002a, p. 67). But if faith, belief and credit are required, this object of being is not as secure as might otherwise be suggested.

As such this relationship between the ontological and theological also suggests something that is rather less certain. No matter how strong or autonomous religion, reason, science, technology, or, specifically, globalization might seem, for Derrida they always feel like they are 'running out of breath' (2002a, p. 67). This running out of breath resonates with the narrative, put forward by Neo-Marxist analyses, that the crisis of 2008 was a crisis of capitalist overproduction that has revealed the fundamental contradictions of capitalism (see Žižek, 2009). However, when Derrida speaks of how 'this expiring breath is blasting the ether of the world', he does so with keen attention to how this has asymmetrical social, economic, technological, and political implications. He insists that we need to consider how 'some breathe there better than others, some are stifled' (2002a, p. 67). His response is that this stifling can exacerbate the very conditions that bring it into existence. He argues that when faith in the ontological is disturbed by contingency there can be even more idiosyncratic explorations of faith, and faith involves more idiosyncratic explorations of that which is attributed sanctity. It is as if 'what is involved is a *machine, a tele-machine*' (2002a, p. 78, my italics).

The spectres of 2008 therefore make it possible for the pursuit of new forms of ontotheological expression. In terms of the political, this means that we might be faced with an increasing condition of depoliticization, or 'pacification' (2002a, p. 79). To reiterate his approach to politics, Derrida argues that the law, the political, metaphysics, and writing always involve pacification. However, in 'Faith and Knowledge' he refers to something slightly different, and which the spectrality of 2008 has the potential to exacerbate. He argues that despite how a certain part of the world is relatively wealthy and safe, they are still linked, in a manner that is 'immediate and potentially without limit,

to the same world market' (2002a, p. 79). As such they 'are at the same time producers, actors and sought-after consumers, at times exploiters, at times victims' (2002a, p. 79). As a consequence, everyone is haunted by the spectre of exclusion, and with the increasing secretion of this spectre of autoimmunity, there is the possibility for an intensification of a 'struggle [for] access to world (transnational or trans-state) networks of telecommunication and of tele-technoscience' (2002a, p. 79). The spectrality of 2008, therefore, has the possibility of being another object of knowledge that is up for acquisition.

Beyond any explicit attempts to shut down alternative narratives of the events of 2008 on ideological grounds, there is, therefore, necessarily, a pacification that derives from a certain spectre that these events will be used by others (even if the reasons are not set out). However, Derrida is more specific still about the consequences of this pacifying tendency within the ontotheological inheritance. Here his concept of 'autoimmunity' becomes particularly important. In section two I refer to this concept to articulate Derrida's theory of the political. Here I want to focus on the autonomy of this condition. On the one hand, this spectre of autoimmunity is counterintuitive. The ontotheological 'secretes its own antidote' (2002a, p. 79). But it should not be forgotten how it secretes 'its own *power* of auto-immunity' (2002a, p. 79, my italics). By power, Derrida refers here to the autonomy that auto-immunity acquires. Translating autoimmunity into politics through what he refers to as '*auto-co-immunity*' (2002a, p. 87, italics in original), explaining how we are faced by the overwhelming inequalities and exploitations of sophisticated techno-scientific globalization and how it makes possible the new

articulations of sexual and archaic violence found with various contemporary extremisms.

To examine this politics of auto-co-immunity Derrida sets out a 'demographic calculation' (of which the history of antisemitism is for Derrida a vital example): 'when they feel themselves threatened by an expropriative and delocalizing tele-technoscience, "peoples" also fear new forms of invasion. They are terrified by alien "populations", whose growth as well as presence, indirect or virtual-but as such, all the more oppressive becomes incalculable' (2002a, p. 90). And yet, Derrida emphasises that intervention in these issues can be substantially supplemented by considering the exclusion, both corporeal and virtual, of the contemporary world. That: 'never in the history of humanity, it would seem, has the disproportion between scientific incompetence and manipulatory competence been as serious' (2002a, p. 92). The technologies of today have become so complicated that they require significant expertise with which to understand how they operate, and yet these are phenomena that people 'strive to live in daily familiarity' with (2002a, p. 92). If the spectrality of 2008 exacerbates a desire to possess, we might therefore ask whether it is possible to intervene and manage it's the possibility for the competition for possession to lead to conflict.

That is, there needs to be a consideration of whether institutions such as the state are committed to not only intervening in the spectres of autoimmunity that are engendered an event such as the global financial crisis, but whether they are committed to addressing the spectres of autoimmunity that existed before, and which are generated by the complexities of contemporary global and techno-scientific capitalism. The problem here being, as I set out in section two, that the institution of the nation-state is under threat

from the very same phenomena, and is always under threat from the ontotheological inheritance of credit, faith, belief. The problem is not autoimmunity itself – it is as inevitable as deconstruction and mortality. The problem is how autoimmunity is responded to. The ways in which responses can take the form of rejections of democracy, of the marginalisation of difference, and intellectual terror that provide the basis for more corporeal forms of violence. Furthermore, this also overlooks how autoimmunity can also itself be seen as a promise, despite its inscription of mortality and finitude: 'without autoimmunity, with absolute immunity, nothing would ever happen or arrive; we would no longer wait, await, or expect, no longer expect one another, or expect any event' (2005b, p. 152).

Here I want to return, very briefly, to the concept of hospitality with which I open this section. If the spectre of autoimmunity haunts the political but also makes it possible, this further elaborates upon the manner in which there can never be an offer of absolute or unconditional hospitality, and that an alternative political project that seeks to push at the limits of hospitality will always be conditioned by the spectrality of autoimmune insufficiency. Indeed, I think it should be emphasized here how Derrida states that we must not avoid taking decisions about hospitality and negotiating the spectre of autoimmunity. In *Of Hospitality* he asserts that 'keeping silent is already a modality of possible speaking' (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 135), and we can see much earlier in 'White Mythology' about the unavoidability of decision (1982d). So, why would we wish to refer to the haunting of the political by autoimmunity rather than the spectre of unconditional hospitality? My suggestion is that a reference to the spectre of autoimmunity helps to articulate the role of threat that involves the body and, ultimately,

the logocentric. By contrast, an emphasis upon hospitality helps to articulate a question about the possibilities of the political, and avoids the connotations of autoimmunity that suggest that what is unconditional is necessarily troubling. Autoimmunity need not be troubling, but hospitality is perhaps more helpful in making this case. By extension, hospitality helps to examine the hospitality of a given political framework, such as the nation-state.

In this section, I have worked to set out what I consider to be the pressing concern for responding to the spectrality of the events of 2008. In doing so I have set out to further deconstruct the question of why it is important to look beyond the nation-state to consider inheritance that precedes and may well outlast it. If we are to respond to spectres there needs to be a consideration of how the turn to inheritance can be intensified through contemporary events, to the point at which it seems autonomous. And yet I also examine Derrida's argument that by overemphasising the autonomy of contemporary religion, technology, science, and politics we can be complicit with the secretion of responsibilities. Instead, we need to focus on the insecurity of these phenomena, and the insecurity that traces back through their developments to the tension inherent to the relationship between the 'two sources' of inheritance that he articulates by way of the ontotheological. In my final section I will focus upon this tension can be managed, and the role that the nation-state might have in doing so.

4. Defending the Nation-state (in certain conditions)

In the first three sections of this chapter I have worked to discuss the significance of politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state and governments. In doing so I have argued that while it is ultimately important to consider the limitations of examining

politics, given the importance of considering the onto-theological inheritances that inform the political and contemporary developments in the media, the broader concept of the political, the nation-state no doubt retains significance in the broader sense of the political. Specifically I direct attention to policy decisions such as those of the austerity inaugurated after the global financial crisis, the withdrawal of responsibility that can result in the 'terror' of 'letting die', the complicities of actors and institutions of the nation-state with emphasising certain phantasms, and its complicity with short-term approach to hospitality and the spectre of autoimmunity. In articulating Derrida's approach to an ethico-political project my suggestion here is subsequently that this is facilitated largely through a commitment to setting out the impact and implications of politics. However, in this section I consider how his ethico-political project takes on certain forms that work to facilitate such an approach. I do this by focusing upon his defence of institutions that he otherwise works to identify the limits of and deconstruct, such as the liberal democratic institutions of the nation-state, international law, human rights, cosmopolitanism, tolerance, and even European politics. I engage with his proposals that despite the limitations of these institutions they nonetheless have a relationship with perfectibility that would otherwise be lacking in their absence.

The purpose of this final section is therefore to consider the role of a political project in response to the spectres of 2008. To do this it suggests working with a tension that Derrida identifies within contemporary liberal democracies; that they might somehow be 'perfectible', and facilitate a more inclusive, radical politics. In doing so I return to work with the concept of the spectre. Earlier I raise the question of how it can be justified to focus on the inheritance of the Western tradition when there are what appear to be more

pressing concerns about austerity, the dismantling of the nation-state, and the resurgence of the far right, and when they are those among us who are engaged in fighting these injustices, within healthcare, social care, or education, within the media, as human rights lawyers, with charities, or in mass movements. In response, I set out Derrida's argument that the consideration of inheritance is vital for guiding consideration of the implications of contemporary politics. In the following pages, I focus upon the manner in which Derrida articulates this negotiation between inheritance and intervention.

To set up such a negotiation I think it is helpful to recap the role played by Derrida's more abstract political gestures of the 'New International' and 'democracy to come'. In a sense Derrida's commitment to these projects is misleading. They articulate how deconstruction takes place in relation to the political. They refer to the manner in which the international and democratic have been integral to the deconstruction of the political. There is then a certain promise in the political that it will always be disrupted by difference. However, if this hope is linked so intimately with deconstruction, what then is the purpose of any responsibility towards investigating it or intervening in it? And why should – or *need* - specific apparatuses of the political be defended 'in certain conditions' (2005, p. 158)? To consider this I continue with the discussion of responsibility that I undertake in section three. For, to recall, Derrida argues that one of the most troubling possibilities of contemporary politics is that of ignoring the role of responsibility. Difference will always disrupt the illusion of the indivisibility of identity and sovereignty, but, on the one hand, engagement with responsibility provides a basis for making the most of this possibility, while ignoring this possibility hands it over to others that are not so reluctant.

In this sense we can therefore identify two reasons as to why Derrida is willing to engage with the apparatuses of the nation-state or liberal democracy. Firstly there is what he often refers to as 'perfectibility' the liberal national and international institutions (the nation-state, international law, universal human rights). As imperfect as these institutions are, with how they are interwoven with capitalism, dominated by certain nation-states, substantially undermined by the hypocricies of those nation-states, and at a more fundamental level resonant with a certain universalising tendency ('cosmopolitical democracy perhaps presupposes a theocosmogony, a cosmology, and a vision of the world determined by the spherical roundness of the globe' [2005b, p. 18]), for Derrida they still make at least some reference to political heterogeneity. As I have said, at the end of *Rogues* Derrida argues that the nation-state can be 'an indispensable bulwark' against extremism, capital, exploitation (2005b, p. 158). Furthermore, he argues, at the more conceptual level, that we cannot have the concept of conditions, responsibility, freedoms, and agency ('self-determination') without some framework of sovereignty (2005b, p. 158). To investigate this further we might therefore focus upon his comments on liberal democracy in some more detail. To do this I turn here to Derrida's short essay *On Cosmopolitanism* (2001c). I suggest that *On Cosmopolitanism* is helpful here because it sets out, rather pragmatically, forms of 'conditional hospitality' offered by nation-states that Derrida considers to be favourable, and which might be developed to be even more favourable.

A key theme in *On Cosmopolitanism* is the distinction Derrida articulates between the City and the State – 'the two forms of the metropolis' (2001c, p. 3). He discusses their discrete differences as sites of interaction, and asks, with a sense of urgency, 'whether we can still

make a legitimate distinction between the two forms of the metropolis – the City and the State' (2001c, p. 3). Why is the city important? Of particular interest to Derrida is the history of the relationship between the city and refugees that can be traced back through Kant's cosmopolitanism to that of Saint Paul. This liberal inheritance is viable to the extent that Derrida would ask for 'new cities of refuge to reorient the politics of the state' (2001c, p. 4). He proposes that an attention to the city in its difference from the nation-state evokes 'an original concept of hospitality, of the duty of hospitality, and of the right to hospitality' (2001c, p. 5). The promise of an attention to the city, to its specific relationship with territory, is that it offers a certain visibility, and this is vital if we consider, as Derrida does, that the violence – or 'crimes' – of the contemporary world leads to 'victims [that] are innumerable and nearly always anonymous' (2001c, p. 4).

Thus, for Derrida attention to the city, to transactions that take place there, should be encouraged because it links up with the possibility that is encouraged by the manner in which those that are oppressed are singled out on the basis that they are 'increasingly (...) what one refers to as intellectuals, scholars, journalists, and writers – men and women capable of speaking out – in a public domain that the new powers of telecommunication render increasingly formidable – to the police forces of all countries, to the religious, political, economic, and social forces of censorship and repression, whether they be state-sponsored or not'. The city would have no value to Derrida's approach if it were not for this promise of the manner in which identity is fragmented by way of an attention to ideas rather than identity. But it is also a necessity because of the limitations of the nation-state: 'If we look to the city, rather than to the state, it is because we have given up hope that the state might create a new image for the city' (2001c, pp. 5-6). Which is to say that

depoliticization involves a decoupling of the relationship between the nation-state and the city, the origins of the Greek polis.

By focusing on the city Derrida hopes to ultimately contribute to a renewal of the nation-state. But this nation-state would go beyond the classical manner in which it expands the refuge and immunity offered by the city (2001c, p. 8). There would be a reassertion of territory that offers safety, and recognizing international conditions, offers safety to those seeking refuge, out of a commitment for a just and democratic politics, but also the problematic implications of refusing to do so (2001c, p. 9). For in conditioning the construction of the metropolis, on the basis, for instance, of national identity, or economic imperatives, as happens in both the refusal to accept refugees on the grounds of national integrity, or economics, provides the basis for an emboldened police, and as such sovereignty: 'one has to be mindful of the profound problem of the role and status of the police, of, in the first instance, border police, but also of a police without borders, without determinable limit, who from then on become all-pervasive and elusive, as Benjamin noted in *Critique of Violence* just after the First World War' (2001c, p. 13).

For all his emphasis upon the inclusive possibilities of the cosmopolitan city, and respect for those that work for the betterment of refugees Derrida therefore identifies significant limitations in the conception of the cosmopolitan nation-state. These are developed in more detail in his comments on cosmopolitan politics more generally, and the importance of being sceptical about offers of hospitality. That said, as I argue earlier, Derrida does not suggest that we should or even can replace cosmopolitanism with a hospitable political project; we cannot 'cultivate an ethic of hospitality' (2001c, p. 16). We should have respect for those that attempt to do so, and in doing so work towards new, more inclusive forms

of affiliation and improve the lives of refugees. However, he insists that such a project is 'tautologous' (2001c, p. 16). Rather, hospitality for Derrida, we might recall, is the reconceptualization of deconstruction in relation to the political. Politics is hospitable. Nonetheless, Derrida does argue that it can make a contribution to a political project and that this should take place by way of offering affiliation and support to those working to be hospitable. This demands an examination of the limitations of cosmopolitanism, and as such its key thinkers. Foremost here is Immanuel Kant.

Kant is important here since his theories of cosmopolitanism and 'perpetual peace' make explicit references to the inclusion of difference. The problem is that they also express a certain reserve. For Kant the host can only offer 'hospitality' on a temporary basis; 'the right of visitation' (2001c, p. 21). The foreigner can never become a co-citizen with the host. This is because Kant makes hospitality dependent upon state sovereignty (2001c, p. 22). As such Kant's cosmopolitanism has a particular incorporation of 'natural law' (2001c, p. 20). His cosmopolitanism involves a transformation of unconditional sovereignty, but not a movement towards a sovereignty under certain conditions. So why is this still important? For Derrida Kant's cosmopolitanism articulates an inheritance that is retained within contemporary liberal democracy as well as the gesture towards an ethic of hospitality. Ultimately they inscribe the role of unconditional sovereignty by presenting a concept, even if it does not take the form of the nation-state, as an ideal.

Derrida's political project largely interrogates the Western, Christian, Latinized, ontotheological inheritance, as I discuss in my previous sections. And yet in his later texts he asserts a certain hope in Europe that stands in contrast to the United States (Borradori and Derrida, 2003; Derrida, 2004a). That is, to the political entity of Europe (though, it

should be emphasised, this is not the European Union). In these texts Derrida asserts that the hope he places in Europe is 'without any Eurocentrism' (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 116; Habermas and Derrida, 2003, p. 291; Derrida, 2004a, online) and points to how his work has interrogated the Western tradition, and how he has been accused of turning his back on it 'these past 40 years' (2004a, online). But why should we take him at his word, and what then of other places and experiences that are repeatedly marginalised? These arguments perhaps make more sense if we refer to *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe* (1992).

More specifically, on the one hand his autobiographical reflections that 'it is, perhaps, the feeling of someone who, as early as grade school in French Algeria, must have tried to capitalize , and capitalize upon, the old age of Europe, while at the same time keeping a little of the indifferent and impassive youth of the other shore' (1992, p. 7). And on the other hand, and more conceptually, his concern to avoid the pitfalls of both 'Eurocentrism and anti-Eurocentrism' (1992, pp. 12-13). In this chapter I have investigated Derrida's writing on the pitfalls of the Western inheritance, but what are the pitfalls of anti-Eurocentrism? Firstly there is the responsibility to register the legacies of Eurocentrism that an anti-Eurocentrism risks secreting. Here we would do well to pay attention to the specificity of the text's title; 'The Other Heading'. To be able to choose another heading there needs to be consideration of the choice of heading that has hitherto dominated discussion. This is particularly important when the choice of heading is difficult to discern, and when an event, such as a 'crisis' (Derrida's language), is announced in a manner that only ambiguously refers to the sovereignty that is proclaimed or threatened.

However, there is, secondly, also a promise that Derrida identifies in Europe that fleshes out the perfectibility of Kant's cosmopolitanism. For Derrida maintains that we should not ignore how the European tradition includes the Enlightenment, and with it a series of ideas about permitting the exchange of different political ideas to take place, mass participation in politics, human rights, and questions about responsibility, even if they have been pushed back against at every moment by lawyers, politicians, and capitalists, and philosophers that are concerned with articulating such an inheritance as an ideal, even in the name of 'perpetual peace' (as with Kant). So, I think that Derrida's articulation of the promise of Europe risks privileging the European tradition and marginalizing experiences and ideas found elsewhere, including his own, frequent, autobiographical writings on his experiences at the margins of French identity (see 2004b, pp. 75-93). Nonetheless, this privileging is not inscribed by Derrida himself. Derrida provides a framework for exploring the limits of the European, and in so doing points to both the responsibility for responding to inheritance, and the possibilities of taking this inheritance in new directions. This touches upon why Derrida suggested that an alternative form of politics was most likely to be found in the university, and specifically the humanities (2001a).

Conclusion

In this chapter I have worked to open up the question of how best to respond to the spectrality of the global financial crisis by way of an attention to politics in the traditional sense of the governance of the nation-state. In Section One I worked with Derrida's writings on the nation-state by following his argument that an approach to it can be supplemented by focusing upon the question of inheritance in addition to the question of

empiricity. It follows Derrida's argument that if we are to open up to the empiricity of the spectres of the crisis, an examination of inheritance opens up questions about the implications that are at stake. With this emphasis upon inheritance I turn in Section Two to the question of what this means for the future of the political and the nation-state. I discuss Derrida's argument that the nation-state, as a deconstruction of writing, has always been subject to deconstruction itself, but that the technologies of the contemporary world intensify the possibility that this deconstruction might be characterised by an irrevocable deconstruction, militarily, culturally, economically, and technologically, to the point at which even the political comes into question. I then turn to consider what the implications are of this deconstruction.

In Section Three I examine the argument that this deconstruction of the political and the nation-state needs to be viewed in the context of a wider intensification of deconstruction that is facilitated by the proliferation of spectres. Before setting out to do so I reiterate my point in my earlier chapters that my attention to Derrida's work is largely driven by the possibilities that he identifies in spectres and how they are tied to a 'democracy to come'. But after doing so I explain that this emphasis upon the possibilities of spectres involves also involves responsibility. That the inheritance of spectres depends upon how they are approached. And in this context there is a responsibility to acknowledge how they can be approached in ways that intensify inequality, marginalisation, and violence through new technological apparatuses as well as more 'medieval' mechanisms; a responsibility that the concept of 'autoimmunity' attempts to articulate. In doing so I set out a bleak picture of how spectres can be approached. However, in Section Four I refer to how the apparatuses of the nation-state remain linked to cosmopolitan institutions and

transactions that facilitate interactions between citizens on an equal footing, despite how they are limited in terms of their capacity to acknowledge the inheritances that I set out in my previous sections.

In summary, this chapter attempts to open up an approach to questions of affiliation by reflecting upon consideration of the spectrality of the events of 2008 in conjunction with a consideration of the possibilities of politics in the traditional sense in which they relate to the nation-state. Operating in relation to the tradition of Critical Theory, this thesis does not begin from the notion that the political should centre upon the study of government and nation-states, but upon everyday experiences and decisions in society. However, in this chapter I have examined politics in the traditional sense of the governance of the nation-state in order to examine whether it can nonetheless provide certain insights into the challenges that face a more inclusive political project. In doing so I argue that while there are limitations to such an approach, set out specifically in section three, there are is also a strong case to be made for interactions to continue to take place. That said, I also ultimately argue that as beneficial as the European, Enlightenment project of cosmopolitanism is when faced by theocratic politics and extremism, this position that Derrida takes risks letting slip of the benefits of examining and interrogating inheritance, . To further develop this emphasis upon inheritance I turn in my next chapter to the examination of the politics of knowledge, scholarship, and the university.

CHAPTER FOUR: SCHOLARSHIP

Introduction

In my last chapter I examined the significance of the spectres of the crisis of 2008 by considering the importance that Derrida attributes to politics in the traditional sense of governance and the nation-state. I explain in my last chapter that Derrida's approach to the nation-state suggests how the spectrality of 2008 can be conditioned in a manner that supplements spectres of marginalisation, of autoimmunity, and terror that are integral to the conception of sovereignty and the state as a result. I articulate Derrida's argument that governments can contribute to threatening spectres through explicit articulations of threats but also the less explicitly, but also with spectral effects, the 'letting die' of citizens (and non-citizens). I suggest that the spectrality of 2008 has the potential to serve as a means of conditioning not only the singularity of the events associated with that spectrality, but the concept of the event itself, with restrictive implications for the hospitality of the nation-state. However, I also set out Derrida's argument that the nation-state, as a site of the political, can provide the basis for interventions, and that the existence of the nation-state is threatened by developments in science, technology and industry, and the globalisation of media and communications technologies, capitalism, and ideology. At the conclusion of my last chapter I refer to the importance that Derrida attributes to an intellectual intervention in the inheritances that underpin the contemporary condition of the political.

In examining Derrida's arguments that the university can indeed provide a space from which to approach the spectrality of 2008, and develop a more inclusive political project, this chapter focuses upon how Derrida ultimately argues that scholarship is uniquely

positioned to respond to the politics of spectres. Specifically, this chapter focuses upon Derrida's argument that the university has a particular relationship with the question of unconditional hospitality. In my previous chapter I set out his claim that sovereignty is always haunted by the spectre of unconditional hospitality, and the history of politics is the history of the relationship with the foreigner. I explain his argument that in this context cosmopolitanism is a more nuanced approach to the question of hospitality than authoritarian regimes before and after its emergence. Here I examine how Derrida deconstructs this argument through the phenomena of scholarship and the university. I set out how he articulates how they have developed from the haunting of sovereignty by the role of the unconditionality of knowledge. To explore the possibilities of scholarship and the university for responding to the spectrality of 2008 I set out in more detail what he means by their unconditionality, how they are linked to the politics of spectres, how they are linked to contemporary spectral effects, and how their possibilities can be best addressed through a specific intervention in the academic field of the 'humanities'.

In Section One I begin this chapter by examining the relationship that Derrida sets out between scholarship and politics, and more specifically sovereignty. I focus upon Derrida's arguments about how scholarship is linked to the spectre of the unconditional, and how this has both troubled sovereignty and been a source legitimisation and supplementation for it. To set this out in detail I pay particular attention to the manner in which Derrida describes the role of the academic. In Section Two I examine in more detail how scholarship is related to justice by focusing upon how scholarship can be receptive to spectres. To do this I undertake a comparative discussion of the approaches to scholarship, spectres, and spirit of Karl Marx and Martin Heidegger. Section Three

combines the reflections on the relationship between sovereignty and scholarship in section one, and scholarship and spectres in section two, to examine the implications of contemporary spectral effects, including the spectrality of 2008. Finally, in section four I examine how scholarship and university might become particularly hospitable, and 'speak with ghosts'. In doing so I explore a tension, largely examined by Derrida scholars, between Derrida's emphasis upon a 'new humanities' and his antipathy towards cultural studies. I do so on the basis that while the humanities are particularly well positioned from a conceptual perspective to address the politics of spectres, cultural studies can provide a substantial contribution to exploring such a project.

1. Sovereignty and Scholarship

In this first section I open up my examination of Derrida's argument that a political project requires an attention to scholarship by leading with the question of how scholarship links to the political concept of sovereignty. As such this section ultimately argues that the university has a particular relationship with the *unconditional,* and or *unconditional hospitality*, that I set out in Chapter One as the condition that makes conditions possible. I argue that the university is a vital counter-force to the repression of autoimmunity that needs to be posited in relation to contemporary spectres, and the spectrality of economic crisis specifically. However, in doing so my intention is to open up a discussion about the possibilities without that which limits this promise. Moreover, my concern at the beginning here is not the manner in which the promise of the university is inhibited by specific contemporary factors, from specific national governments, business and industrial interests, or religious, ideological and cultural factors. I will address these later in this chapter. For the moment I will focus on the risks that are involved in a relationship

with sovereignty, as well as in attributing sovereignty to the university on the basis of its promise of unconditionality.

To examine Derrida's discussion of the relationship between scholarship and sovereignty I will focus on 'The University without Condition' (2001a), a text where Derrida focuses upon this question in a sustained way. The importance of scholarship, and even the institution of the university, for responding to sovereignty can be seen in how Derrida sets out his approach at the beginning of the text: 'in truth, it will be less a thesis, or even an hypothesis, than a declarative engagement, an appeal in the form of a profession of faith: faith in the University and, within the University, faith in the Humanities of tomorrow' (2001a, p. 24). And yet this does not prevent him from emphasising the inheritance of an axiomatic in which the scholarship serves to supplement sovereignty. Deploying his deconstructive framework in which metaphysics is interwoven with différance, he deconstructs the manner in which the conditionality of sovereignty is dependent upon unconditional hospitality to speculate that scholarship and the university meet this demand and combines the claim with an empirical consideration of how the university has been a site of meditation on the concept of sovereignty in its various forms, from the nation-state to religion, culture, economics, technology, and science.

More specifically, Derrida argues that if we are to focus upon the significance of any specific form of scholarship in its relationship sovereignty, we need to focus upon the form that is most closely linked to questions of the phantasmatic. He argues that we need to focus on the field of the humanities, the field that 'has always been linked to the question of man, to a concept of that which is proper to man' (2001a, p. 25). Thus, an

attention to the humanities provides the basis for intervening in 'the power of the nation-state and (...) its phantasm of indivisible sovereignty' (2001a, p. 26). As such he identifies a promise in the sovereignty of the university and the humanities. Nonetheless, despite the promise of the humanities Derrida maintains that the unconditional sovereignty of the university and the humanities, 'heterogeneous to the principle of power', also means that 'the university is also without any power of its own' (2001a, p. 27). There is, he argues, a fundamental fragility in the constitution of the university when it faces conditional sovereign forces such as the nation-state, organised religion, ideology, and capitalism; it is 'often destined to capitulate without condition, to surrender unconditionally' (2001a, p. 28).

As an obvious example, Derrida notes that 'the organization of research and teaching have to be supported, that is, directly or indirectly controlled, let us say euphemistically "sponsored", by commercial and industrial interests' (2001a, p. 28). But he also argues how the spectres of the marginalised and the oppressed are also subject to being appropriated by sovereignty. This is largely already set out in in a more general political context in *Spectres of Marx* (2006: pp. xix-xx), where Derrida refers to the spiritualisation of spectres, but here Derrida supplements the argument by emphasising the susceptibility of scholarship specifically. And yet, with the concept and the discipline of the humanities there is, as with cosmopolitanism, a consideration of different lived experiences. He insists that that the promise that he identifies can be found in other academic fields, such as the natural sciences (2001a, p. 29). Nonetheless, the humanities have a particular relationship with a 're-thinking' of 'the concept of man, the figure of humanity in general' (2001a, p. 29). But, if the humanities, the university, and scholarship are to be affirmed

this nonetheless requires a certain sovereignty, even if it is just a 'commitment' (2001a, p. 29).

Nonetheless, in a manner similar to the way in which he argues in 'Force of Law' that deconstruction is made possible by sovereignty (2002b), Derrida suggests that this sovereign commitment makes possible an expanded terrain of idiomatic, aesthetic, legal, political, economic, social and techno-scientific investigation (2001a, pp. 29-30). Furthermore, for Derrida this possibility can be further explored if we consider how the humanities contribute to the production of what he refers to as the "as if" and a 'politics of the virtual' (2001a, p. 31). On the one hand Derrida notes how such an experimentation with the as if involves a 'delocalizing' movement, through the 'virtualization of the space of communication, discussion, publication, archivization', that ultimately brings into question the notion of a place of the political (2001a, p. 31). If the grounds for the political are so difficult to identify this raises the question of whether the identification of politics can occur and whether we retain the concept of sovereignty, with its problematic legacies. But also, that this delocalization might be to suggest a certain abandonment 'to the arbitrary, to dream, to imagination, to utopia, to hypothesis' (2001a, p. 32). And yet, on the other hand he maintains that the questioning of the 'as if' still retains a reflective, scholarly relationship with sovereignty.

He makes this case on the basis of the claim that the articulation of the "as if" that takes place in the humanities involves a 'putting to work [of] certain types of judgment' (2001a, p. 32). That is, reflections about what happens in relation to lived experience. For example, the "as if" might suggest something creative (in the traditional sense of the fine arts for instance, that is notoriously considered at a remove from the "real" world) (2001a,

p. 33-34). Nonetheless, Derrida also suggests that the 'event' that is inaugurated with the 'as if' compels a 'taking place' (2001a, p. 34). The virtual element of the taking place means that ' "place" must be real, effective, concrete enough to belie the whole logic of the "as if" ' (2001a, p. 34). Nonetheless, despite this 'taking place' and the progressive implications that this has, Derrida argues that there still needs to be an examination of 'who is responsible for such a profession of faith. Who signs it? Who professes it?' (2001a, p. 35). This should not mean that we lose sight of our responsibility to how the "as if" and the virtual are constituted, but it does mean that this responsibility is there to be responded to.

To investigate how responsibility might be instigated Derrida suggests that considers the phantasmatic, sovereign figure most associated with scholarship: 'the profession of professor, the principle of authority that derives from it, and the profession of faith' (2001a, p. 35). Deconstructing the role of the professor, Derrida notes that it has a definition of '*performative* declaration' that has a long religious inheritance (before 1300, Derrida notes, from the *Oxford English Dictionary*) that is particularly manifested in 'an act of sworn faith, an oath, a testimony, a manifestation, an attestation, or a promise, a commitment' (2001a, p. 35). He acknowledges that this interpretation of profession is highly specific, and that there is a very different interpretation that is perhaps more common that refers 'craft' and 'career', and therefore a certain 'competence, knowledge, know-how' (2001a, p. 36). But he also argues that profession is linked to the unconditional in as much as it involves a commitment to responsibility. Derrida acknowledges that with such a privilege there is an articulation of hierarchy. For instance, the distinction to be made in contemporary universities within the division between on

the one hand, academic staff and students, and on the other hand administrative and support staff. Yet, Derrida maintains that an appraisal of this hierarchy should not lead us to overlook the promise and responsibility of acts of profession.

So, on the one hand Derrida argues for the profession of faith in knowledge, the profession that he himself claims at the beginning of the text to wish to contribute to. This would mean that scholars make a conscious effort to consider that their actions have implications, and that they are not just confined to the ivory tower of the academy. But on the other hand, Derrida's articulation of the implications of scholarship is also an articulation of the responsibility of scholarship. This second articulation of scholarship troubles the notion that there can be specific conventions about the form in which responsibility should take, and as such the notion that there *should* be specific conventions. So, Derrida asserts that even if:

> In a classical university, in conformity with its accepted definition, one practices the study, the *knowledge* of the normative, prescriptive, performative, and fictional possibilities (...) that are more often the object of the Humanities. (...) This study, this knowledge, this teaching, this *doctrine* ought to belong to the theoretical and constative order. (2001a, p. 39)

Again, to emphasise, this use of the 'ought' is not wishful thinking on Derrida's part, but rather an articulation of the promise of deconstruction.

So, while Derrida asserts that scholarship, the university, and the humanities are in danger of being appropriated by sovereignty, due to the fragile autoimmunity of their unconditionality, Derrida maintains that its unconditionality will, nonetheless, always haunt sovereignty. As such there is the possibility within scholarship for particularly intimate and complex relationships with the repression of spectres, and of the spectre of autoimmunity. To examine such a repression Derrida continues with an analysis that he

undertakes in *Eyes of the University*' (2004b) where he examines the way in which Immanuel Kant applies his division of faith from knowledge in relation to the university. Here Derrida emphasises how Kant's division is applied to the humanities, and inscribed, by way of divisions between '*phusis [phenomena] / techné*, *phusis / nomos*, nature versus humanity', within 'sociality, law, history, politics, community, and so forth' (2001a, p. 32, italics in original). The relevance of this division to examining the repression of spectres rests with the way in which, at the very moment at which they articulate an examination of lived experience they repress their deconstructive irreducibility. This has consequences for academic inquiry, but also more broadly for the political, since it inscribes a certain 'passivity' at the moment of investigation.

In Chapter Three I examine Derrida's articulation of a tension relating to cosmopolitanism, a theory of the political that is in large part indebted to Kant, between its limitations upon difference that result from such rigid articulations of faith and knowledge, and the possibilities in its reference to multiplicity. Here Derrida articulates a similar tension. On the one hand Kant's axiomatics provide the basis for examining the deconstructions involved in the relationship between dichotomies such as 'art and nature', and which in turn have consequences for a variety of interventions such as performance, production, the idiomatic, and effect (2001a, p. 42). However, the commitment to these concepts also articulates a 'passivity (...) suffering and even the torture of a punishment' (2001a, p. 42). Firstly, this is significant, for Derrida, if we bear in mind the significance that he attributes, and which I have neglected up until this point, of the contemporary phenomena of the 'theatrical worldwide-ization of the confession' (2001a, p. 42). But, secondly, this is particularly important in terms of scholarship

because throughout the essay Derrida argues that the key characteristic of the professor that effaces the professorial responsibility that Derrida celebrates is that they confess to adherence to a certain scholarly inheritance, which is to say a certain sovereignty.

Thus, while Derrida maintains the deconstructive promise of what we might term a *cosmopolitan*, Kantian scholarship, he suggested that we need to consider how its confessional condition relates to spectres and ultimately the body. It provides a clue as to how the university, a possible site of such radical political alternatives (in the broadest sense) can contribute to some of the most invasive appropriations and exploitations of the biological. And yet, within that his examination of the confession – on a scale that extends beyond scholarship in the traditional sense to include aspects of life more generally such as work, he argues that we also need to be attentive to a subtle change in its constitution that is indicative of deconstruction. He notes, with the traditional Christian conception of confession there is a tendency to emphasise sins that affect the soul, particularly as it relates to the afterlife (2001a, p. 42). However, the confessional that is to be found in contemporary scholarship and work appears, on the contrary, to relate to sins, or crimes, that affect the body (even the Pope, he notes, now refers to crimes against humanity) (2001a, p. 27). For Derrida this development suggests the destabilising influence of the spectre.

In this section I have attempted to describe the possibilities and limitations that Derrida identifies within the relationship between the sovereignty and scholarship. More specifically, I have worked to explain Derrida's faith in the conceptual promise of scholarship, the university, and the humanities that stands in contrast with their contemporary conditions. I explain his argument that the university has a unique

relationship with the question of unconditional hospitality that I set out in Chapter Three. However, I also focus upon the unique position that Derrida attributes to the humanities; that they are particularly significant because of the manner in which they are so intimately bound up with questions of lived, human experience (even if this has not traditionally been within the humanities in practice). However, in doing so I also introduce Derrida's argument that the university's link with the unconditional makes it susceptible to appropriation by sovereign forces, from the nation-state to capitalism, and ideology to religion. Then, linking up with my focus on spectres, I draw attention to how Derrida investigates the role of sovereignty through an examination of the intermediary phantasmatic figure of the academic professor. Here I pause, in order to consider the relationship between scholarship and spectrality in closer detail.

2. Talking with Ghosts

In Chapter Three I discuss the violence that can arise from the repression of responses to spectres, by referring specifically to the spectre of autoimmunity. I emphasise how a repressive approach to spectralities of foreigners, refugees, migrants, terrorists and other others, as well as spectralities that do not immediately suggest the spectral in its embodied characteristics, such as war, famine, marginalisation, and, in the context of this thesis, economic crisis, provoke a questioning of inheritance and, as a consequence, a return, which is really a turn, to messianisms, found in the so-called "return" of nationalism and religious fundamentalism, as well as within the supposedly secular domain of sophisticated techno-scientific rationality. Thus, if scholarship, and the humanities specifically, is to intervene in these issues in a way that serves to prevent spectres from turning in to new phantasms of sovereignty, we might wish to consider how

spectres can be engaged with. To do this I turn here to Derrida's writing on Marx and Heidegger. Firstly, I engage with Derrida's argument that, despite Marx's explicit disregard for the significance of spectres, Marx nonetheless provides a vital framework for the possibilities of considering the multiplicity that Derrida puts at the heart of his interest in them. Secondly, I examine Derrida's argument that Heidegger, by contrast, presents a far more problematic approach to spectres through his turbulent engagement with 'spirit'.

Spectres of Marx begins with a complex contradiction in which it is both an *impossibility* and *necessity* to 'learn to live' (2006, p. xvi). Derrida explains that this activity is impossible because if learning is undertaken 'alone' this contradicts the manner in which life can only be conceptualised through the meditation on the lives and deaths of others (2006, pp. xvi-xvii). And yet, Derrida also asserts that the concept of being alone can only be conceptualised by learning of (2006, p. xvii). The implication that he ascertains is that the question of life is, by contrast, a question of an entity that encompasses life and death – a ghost. The significance of this scenario for investigating a political project through the humanities is that whenever we are dealing with the question of being, we are in effect dealing with an entity that is open to deconstruction, but also repressive of the spectrality from which the concept of being is derived. However, this emphasis upon the spectre also has consequences for the notion of the political as a site of conflicting forces with their own discrete identities.

When Derrida writes of '*politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations', he emphasises, by contrast, a politics shaped by responsibility; a 'being-with spectres' (2006: xviii, italics in original). But the evasiveness of the ontological that he assigns to spectres

also presents difficulties for approaching them. If spectres are to be engaged with, how can this happen without referring to them? His approach, pursued in *Spectres of Marx*, is to focus upon how the impossible encounter with the spectre is rendered as such. Here Marx and Marxism are particularly important. While Marx has a contradictory relationship with spectres, Derrida suggests that there is, nonetheless, an attempt on Marx's part to register how spectres are involved in political, ideological, social, economic, and technological conditions, and on an international scale that set him apart within the Western canon. In particular, Derrida draws attention to the manner in which the spectre haunting Europe at the beginning of *The Communist Manifesto* refers to a multitude of hauntings, for Europe refers to an entity with multiple states, non-state institutions, and citizens (Derrida, 2006, p. 2). However, Derrida also suggests that if we are to consider Marx's legacy there should only, in the name of justice, be a consideration of Marx's own spectral plurality.

Before I focus upon the plurality of Marx's spectres I will follow here how Derrida approaches the concept of the spectre via Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, a text that he focuses upon for its subtle meditations on questions of haunting, and more specifically the question of the haunting of the individual in relation to others (the other characters in the play and, politically, the state of Denmark). The lesson that Derrida takes from Hamlet is that if we focus upon specific forms of spectrality we risk giving in to the dominance of 'spirit', an entity that increasingly 'assumes a body, it incarnates itself' (2006, p. 4). However, Derrida also notes how the ghost in *Hamlet* remains difficult to see. Throughout the text the ghost acquires embodied form, but always remains elusive. Specifically, the face of the ghost, the means of truly identifying it, remains hidden beneath a visor. For

Derrida this is a depiction of how ghosts always remain liminal, and the authority of armour is doubly important. The spirit is accompanied by what he calls the 'visor effect': a 'power to see without being seen' (2006, p. 8). And yet, despite how such a ghost can become increasingly haunting, Derrida insists that its spectrality is subject to deconstruction, that this deconstruction can be examined, and that a commitment to justice can be pursued.

To do this Derrida sets out three components of such a haunting. Firstly, that haunting always involves 'mourning' (2006, p. 9). *Hamlet* is aggrieved by the injustice of his Father's murder, but he is also in mourning. His Father's spirit appears in response to this mourning. Secondly, the mourning is impossible without some form of 'language' or, better still, in a Derridean vein, 'writing' (2006, p. 9). And thirdly, mourning and writing are impossible without 'work' (2006, p. 9). With spirits and spectres there is always a work of mourning that can be traced through writing. This emphasis upon work of mourning subsequently exposes the multitude of actions that are involved in the articulation of the spirit and the spectre. And yet, despite this framework, Derrida insists that 'what seems almost impossible is to speak always *of the* spectre, to speak to *the* spectre, to speak with it, therefore, especially *to make or to let* a spirit speak' (2006, p. 11). His response is that such an encounter jars with a tradition in which 'scholars believe that looking is sufficient' (2006, p. 11). The examination of spectres 'seems even more difficult for a reader, an expert, a professor, an interpreter' (2006, p. 11).

The engagement with spectres is not completely ignored within scholarship. More generally he notes that the examination of oppositions between 'the real and the unreal, the actual and the inactual, the living and the non-living, being and non-being' is to be

found in a 'hypothesis of a school of thought, theatrical fiction, literature, and speculation' (2006, p. 12). Now, returning to Marx, Derrida insists that Marx provides a seminal critique of spirit as it manifests in capitalism and its effects in society, economics, technology, politics, history, literature and aesthetics, as well as on an international scale. However, Derrida also sees problems in the manner in which Marx reacts against the spectres. As I set out in Chapter One, in *The German Ideology* Marx argues that the bourgeoisie is prevented from articulating the reality of society by an ideology that is determined by its particular economic interests. But as Derrida also explains, Marx argues, with a critique of the work of Max Stirner, that bourgeois ideology manifests in an obsession with spectres (2006, p. 6). Thus, Marx is in this sense consistent with the dismissal of spectres, even if he pays attention to them and contributes to the deconstruction of spirit.

Thus, Derrida warns that with Marx's emphasis upon the real economic conditions of society he establishes a new spectral entity, hidden behind a visor. But he also refers to the manner in which this logocentric tendency in Marx's work has translated into the spirit of Marx himself within the various forms of Marxism. Indeed, Derrida asks whether the question of the conference at which he presents the lecture *Spectres of Marx*, 'Whither Marxism', risks contributing to this logocentric possibility (2006, p. 15). But he also recalls that the manner in which 'the end of Marxism', suggested in the early 1990s at the time of the conference by the Cold War the collapse of the Soviet Union and the incorporation of China into the world market, as well as the notion of the 'end of history' celebrated by neoliberalism, closely resembles what were, for Derrida and his colleagues 'forty years ago, our daily bread' (2006, p. 16). His suggestion here is that the emphasis upon spirit

and the refusal to engage with its spectral plurality inevitably provides the basis for a spectre of crisis. As Prince Hamlet laments, 'the time is out of joint' (2006, p. xxi).

To examine the consequences of the out of joint Derrida turns to Heidegger's examination of 'dis-jointure' in the classical Greek tradition (2006, p. 27). Here, Derrida notes Heidegger's argument that the reference to dis-jointure is intended to articulate the 'gift' of 'joining, adjoining, adjustment, articulation of accord or harmony' (2006, p. 28). Dis-jointure, or crisis, brings forth harmony, with harmony found in law, technological and industrial rationality, and ultimately ontological questions of presence and being (2006, p. 31). For Heidegger, as Derrida discusses in *Of Grammatology* and which I refer to in Chapter One, this gift, even in its articulation as being, violates the heterogenous possibilities of being. But while Derrida registers the manner in which the articulation of crisis emboldens certain forms of authority, he also suggests that Heidegger's approach presents a more discrete inscription of spirit. He argues that Heidegger presents a 'desert-like messianism (without content and without identifiable messiah)' (2006, p. 33). At this moment in *Spectres of Marx* Derrida returns to the possibilities of Marx's approach. But before I continue with this, I will examine Heidegger's repression of the spirit in more detail, as it poses particular problems for examining spectres.

To do this I want to briefly refer here to Derrida's closer examination of Heidegger's approach to spirit in *Of Spirit* (1989). On the one hand this effaces the notion of Heidegger's avoidance of the concept spirit because it focuses upon Heidegger's explicit engagement with the concept in the 'Rectorship Address' of 1933 and 'Introduction to Metaphysics' in 1935. However, on the other hand Derrida describes how the spirit that Heidegger inscribes is to be found in his continued retreat from articulating spectral

effects in the name of an original heterogeneity. Moreover, Derrida argues that they are particularly troubling given how they run alongside Nazism, and how Heidegger, particularly with the 'Rectorship Address' (in fact titled by Heidegger 'The Self-assertion of the German University'), supplements Nazism with an intellectual project that is specific to the university. Since this text refers explicitly to the university Derrida's examination of it is my focus here. Initially there are the overtly nationalist and authoritarian articulation of the academic rector as someone who is 'guided by the inflexibility of this spiritual mission, the constraining nature of which imprints the destiny of the German people with its specific historical character' (Heidegger in Derrida, 1989, p. 33).

So, Derrida identifies that for Heidegger the 'spirit is at the head, and in the highest, since it leads the very leaders' (1989, p. 33). The relationship with Nazism becomes more detailed however when Derrida sets out Heidegger's argument that the university has a duty to pursue four interwoven commitments, relating to: 1) science; 2) the world; 3) 'earth-and-blood'; and 4) the 'decision' (1989, pp. 34-35). For Heidegger all aspects of the university, in 'the academic organization, in the legislation of faculties and departments, [and] in the community of masters and pupils' are to contribute to exploring these aims (1989, p. 38). This linking of spirituality with four aims that are readily associated with the history of Nazism therefore suggests that Heidegger was not only complicit with Nazism, but that he worked to supplement it. That in this text he 'spiritualizes National Socialism' (1989, p. 39). Now, Derrida notes that there is a possibility that Heidegger was, rather naively, attempting to link Nazism to spirit in order to rupture it from its obsession with the 'natural, biological, [and the] racial' (1989, p. 39). But Derrida suggests that to

make this claim would be to overlook Heidegger's avoidance of how 'Geist is always haunted by its Geist'; the repression of spectrality, and with it justice (1989, p. 40).

I think it is worth recalling here that, near the beginning of *Of Spirit*, Derrida refers to 'what, today; are for me the open questions – questions opened by Heidegger and open with regard to Heidegger' (1989, p. 8). Derrida appreciates Heidegger's commitment to register the violence of metaphysics, and leave open the possibility of heterogeneity. But Derrida argues through *Of Spirit* that the emphasis upon dismantling metaphysics depends upon a series of axiomatics for doing so, to be found in 'religions, philosophies, political regimes, economic structures, religious or academic institutions. In short, what is just as confusedly called culture, or the world of spirit' (1989, pp. 109-110). It requires protection, and therefore the articulation of what protection might be constituted by. So, despite the logocentric tendency in Marx's material dialectics and rejection of spectres, there is nonetheless a commitment to consider the role that spectres play in all their diversity. In particular we might consider Derrida's opposition to attempts to reclassify Marx as a philosopher, and 'to depoliticize profoundly the Marxist reference' (2006, pp. 37-38). To do so would be completely disregard Marx's critique of capitalism on its international scale, Marx's role in establishing the First International, a meeting that, due to political conditions, 'had to remain quasi-secret', and which was characterised by a movement - communism – 'that was essentially distinguished from other labour movements by its international character' (2006, p. 46).

In this section I have worked to examine the tension within the humanities that Derrida transfers from his analysis of cosmopolitanism by way of the consideration of the spectre. I explain that Derrida makes this case on the basis of a deconstruction of ontology, but

also the manner in which the spectre provides Marx, albeit in a manner that Marx ultimately confines through a commitment to materialism, with a framework that investigates so many forms of exploitation. I discuss how Derrida works, by way of a consideration of the spectres of Marx, to not rely upon observation, and consider how to let spectres speak by speaking with them. I note that this may seem problematic for those who make the case for those who argue for the role of representation in a politics of affiliation, but Derrida insists that the alternative is to repress the plurality of spectres, and the democracy to come, in the name of new phantasmatic forms of sovereignty. Moreover, as his discussion of Heidegger suggests, this can take place in the form of an inscription of a spirit that is clearly linked to Nazism, but also within the dismantling of metaphysics in the name of heterogeneity. With these questions in mind my next section considers how speaking with spectres plays a role in Derrida's approach to the humanities.

3. Scholarship and Contemporary Spectral Effects

In this section I continue with the emphasis upon the "as if" and the humanities that I discuss in section one and focus upon the consideration of the relationship between scholarship and discrete spectral effects. Accompanied by a reflection on speaking with ghosts, I focus here upon examining the global conditions that thread through Derrida's discussion of the contemporary promise of the humanities, but which are articulated more explicitly in *Spectres of Marx*, and which is fundamental to the structure of this thesis. That is, while the differences between governance, scholarship, and the media, three key aspects of Marx's approach, are 'doubtless complex, differential, conflictual, and overdetermined', they nonetheless 'communicate and cooperate at every moment toward

producing the greatest force with which to assure the hegemony or the imperialism in question' (2006, p. 66). More specifically, this section considers how this relationship affects a scholarship that intends to talk with the spectrality of 2008. It refers to the significance of:

> So many spectral effects, the new speed of apparition (we understand this word in its ghostly sense) of the simulacrum, the synthetic or prosthetic image, and the virtual event, cyberspace and surveillance, the control, appropriations, and speculations that today deploy unheard-of powers. (2006, p. 67)

As I explain in section one, as daunting as these spectral affects are, for Derrida the suggestion that these technologies limit how the university and the humanities can deconstruct sovereignty not only overlooks a fundamental aspect of how they rely upon unconditionality to be brought into existence, but contributes to the repression of deconstruction. If there is a responsibility to these affects there needs to be a consideration of their specificity that goes in hand with their general spectral condition. A focus of Derrida's here is the manner in which, with a specific relationship with scholarship, they manifest through 'new techniques of communication, information, archivization, and knowledge production' (2001a, p. 25). These affects are spectral in as much as they involve novel negotiations of the unconditional, transforming the nature of interactions between individuals, the communication and form of inheritance, and their role in the creation of novel, 'singular oeuvres' (2001a, p. 26). In relation to the spectrality of 2008 this suggests that scholarship can complicate reductive narratives that might be found in governmental politics, governmental institutions, and a news media intimately interwoven with capital. Nonetheless, Derrida maintains that the attribution of legitimacy

to the disruptive possibilities of spectres only risks to inscribe new phantasmatic forms of sovereignty; of *spirit*.

But what would be more complicated from the perspective of attributing weight to specific spectres is, as Derrida suggests in *Of Spirit* in a reading of Heidegger, to 'avoid' doing so. How then to go about prioritising particular ways of speaking with spectres? In a manner indebted to Marx's critique of capital, Derrida emphasises that:

> One of the most serious questions that is posed, and posed here, between the university and the politico-economic outside its public space is the question of the marketplace in publishing and the role it plays in archivization, evaluation, and legitimation of academic research. (2001a, p. 25)

Here I want to focus upon how Derrida suggests that the university is subject to appropriation by 'the power of the nation-state', the 'economic powers (to corporations and to national and international capital)', and 'the powers of the media, ideological, religious, and cultural powers, and so forth – in short, to all the powers that limit democracy to come' (2001a, p. 26). To do this I will link this text with his comments in 'Faith and Knowledge' on the spectres of autoimmunity that are amplified by the global marketplace and which I previously discuss in Chapter Three.

To recall, in Chapter Three I discuss Derrida's argument in 'Faith and Knowledge' that the spectrality of integration within globalisation – and specifically the global marketplace – is accompanied by the spectral threat of marginalisation. Thus, if the university, and the humanities specifically, can contribute to the marketplace the question I want to consider is whether they might amplify the spectre of marginalisation, and with it proliferate the exploitation of the unconditional possibilities of the humanities in ways that ultimately lead to new forms of nationalist, ethnic, racial, and religious fundamentalisms, as well as

sophisticated techno-scientific manipulations of the biological. To examine this, I turn here to Derrida's examination of confession that I touch upon at the end of section one. For with this attention to confession Derrida considers how confession is interwoven with attempts to avoid marginalisation and be included within the dynamics of the market. In this sense the turn from Christian confession to the 'juridical concept of "crime against humanity" ' that might otherwise be viewed as a progressive turn to the multiplicity of lived experience hints at the articulation of bodies that bid to be at the disposal of capital.

And yet, confessional attempts at relevance disrupt the integrity of these bodies, and renders them spectral. We need not focus on the manner in which the global market has become supplemented with virtual work, and manual labour treated as archaic. For instance, he refers to how there exist various forms of 'tele-work', such as that of air-traffic-controllers, 'those who guarantee the mediations or transmissions of which there remain only virtual traces' (2001a, p. 37). Rather, we can focus, as Derrida does, upon the manner in which the repression of spectral effects, means that 'others can also be dissimulated or displaced. Which is to say, as is always the case with the topics of repression, inscribed in other places or other systems' (2002a, p. 62). That is, how any recourse to bodies is haunted by how:

> The declared stakes already appear to be without limit: what is the "world": the "day", the "present" (hence, all of history, the earth, the humanity of man, the rights of man, the rights of man and of woman, the political and cultural organization of society, the difference between man, god and animal, the phenomenality of the day, the value or 'indemnity' of life, the right to life, the treatment of death, etc.)? (2002a, p. 62)

The confessional therefore meditates upon spectres in limited ways, and this can apply to how it links up with globalisation, scholarship, and the scholarship of the spectrality of 2008. But Derrida also suggests in 'The University Without Condition' that if we focus on work, we can identify even more specific ways in which the expansion of globalisation generates spectres of marginalisation. In part this is because of the way in which access to these new sophisticated forms of virtual work 'remain partial, heterogeneous, unequal in their development' (2001a, p. 47). However, if we recall Derrida's articulation of the work of mourning and the importance that he attributes to it for an approach to 'talking with ghosts' we can also consider how approaches to work are, in his terms, intimately interwoven with the negotiation of the spectre. Thus, we can consider how the lack or loss of employment, or just the threat of the loss of employment, supplements the spectre of marginalisation on a quantitative basis, but Derrida also suggests that we should consider how work has a particular conceptual relationship with spectrality.

Here Derrida's reasoning for discussing work in relation to scholarship becomes apparent. On the one hand it links scholarship to the conditions of the market. On the other hand, he considers how work involves a particularly intimate relationship with the phantasmatic that restricts the unconditional promise of scholarship. To examine the condition of confession and its distinctiveness from scholarship Derrida focuses here upon the meaning of work. Considering work in more of traditional sense before arriving at its relationship with the spectres, he proposes that we deconstruct the concept in three ways, p. 1) what *takes place* (the 'activity'); 2) what is *produced* by work (the object, the aim, the product, or the oeuvre of the work); and finally 3), what I have just alluded to, the relationship between confession, work, and finality: 'the end of work' or even 'death of

work' (2001a, p. 42). Furthermore, to consider how this distinction is made between profession and confession he focuses upon the "*professionalisation*" (as confession) of the humanities.

It may seem like a melodramatic academic statement to suggest that the fate of the humanities is significant for questions about human rights and workers' rights. However, aside from the conditions faced by 'unemployed teachers or aspiring professors, in particular in the Humanities' (2001a, p. 46), Derrida argues that such a focus brings to the forefront the encroachment of a commitment to phantasms in relation to articulations of the world and lived experience. Here Derrida focuses upon the manner in which the humanities must necessarily negotiate the task of inheritance of working 'to know and to think their own history', by way of the consideration of 'the act of professing, the theology and the history of work, of knowledge and of the faith in knowledge, the question of man, of the world, of fiction, of the performative and the "as if", of literature and of oeuvre, etc' (2001a, pp. 49-50). Derrida's point here is that despite the manner in which the humanities disturb the phantasm and generate the experience of haunting, if the role of the university is to be asserted, particularly at a time of crisis, such as that suggested by the spectrality of 2008, there needs to be a consideration of the negotiation of how this involves a confessional commitment to work. In a very superficial sense this justifies the articulation of scholarship as work, since there must remain an articulation of sovereignty (and phantasm) in its retention.

But this superficial articulation needs to be worked through in a manner that goes beyond work, to a professorial 'thinking of the "perhaps" of that dangerous modality of the "perhaps" that Nietzsche speaks of and that philosophy has always tried to subjugate'

(2001a, p. 54), and which provides the basis for learning how to talk with a plurality of ghosts. Here Derrida suggests that to explore the humanities there need to be attempts at crossing 'disciplinary borders', linking up with 'departments of genetics, natural science, medicine, and even mathematics' (2001a, p. 50). In so doing Derrida again inscribes a commitment to something like a cosmopolitan form of scholarship that recognises both the possibilities and limits of both dividing and collapsing their distinctiveness. More broadly, this means linking up with the variety of ways in which idiomatic reflections about everyday life. But this possibility is also a responsibility to consider the implications of failing to consider idiomatic experience. But before I examine how this might be pursued in more detail in my final section, I want to consider here how Derrida argues that such an approach is not only full of promise, but a responsibility.

The point about the responsibility towards such a project is to a large degree already set out in section two where I set out the implications that Derrida identifies in Heidegger's avoidance of the haunting of spirit by the spectre. However, here I wish to refer to the manner in which Derrida sets out the implications of avoiding the spectre of the loss of work, 'the end of work', and 'the death of work', and emphasise the responsibility for addressing it. For Derrida emphasises that while the end of work can be articulated in terms of a promise; as the moment at which profession in the sense of the consideration of the conditional (and therefore the deconstructive consideration of the unconditional), or just the moment at which life is made easier by automation (the promise referred to by Marx and Lenin [2001a, p. 46]), he insists that we should not underestimate the repression that can arise from the ontological crisis that the spectre of the end of work

conjures. The end of the work might mean 'the origin of the world' (2001a, p. 45), an engagement with the unconditional, but it can also conjure the spectre of marginalisation.

How then can an attention to scholarship, the university, and the humanities in particular intervene in such a situation? On the one hand we might say that scholarship can contribute by focusing attention upon the broader experience of spectrality, with an attention to the spectral effects of rhetoric but also contemporary media technologies, or with a Marxist approach, upon the role of capitalism. In this way we might suggest that a particular focus upon the spectrality of 2008 is restrictive, and only establishes a new phantasm, a new means of appropriating the event, and as such a new means of appropriating lived experience. But on the other hand, we might consider the following counter-arguments. Firstly, by undertaking a scholarly engagement with the spectrality of 2008 we are provided with resources with which to examine the deconstruction of the political. And secondly, that the spectrality articulates responsibility, and with it the prospect of repressing this responsibility. More specifically to scholarship, the responsibility to the spectrality of 2008 articulates an examination of the conditional, at a time and rhythm that is distinct from the demands of politics in the traditional sense of the nation-state and government.

The subsequent question might therefore be how to prioritise intervention. Here Derrida suggests focusing upon the forms that particularly appropriative, and as such a focus upon the ideas that make appropriation possible. But, as his work on deconstruction and différance suggests, we cannot really talk about appropriation in the truest sense. In this axiomatic sovereignty is always subject to deconstruction, and if we suggest that it is not, and that we are subject to the absolute control of sovereignty, we are repressing

responsibility, exacerbates the spectre of autoimmunity, and presents a condition of conflict with democracy to come. In this sense I think we would do well to consider his specification, in relation to capital and to the media more specifically, that we should not really speak of 'appropriation' but rather 'exappropriation (the radical contradiction of all "capital", of all property or appropriation, as well as all the concepts that depend on it, beginning with that of free subjectivity, thus of emancipation as ordered by these concepts)' (2006, p. 112). In my final chapter I will explore in more detail my proposal that the most significant forms of spectral effects, and 'exappropriation', are to be found in contemporary media. But before I do this, I will examine in my final section in this chapter how scholarship can provide the means of intervening in this field.

4. A New Humanities (and Cultural Studies)

So far in this chapter I have set out the relationship between scholarship and sovereignty, scholarship and spectrality, and scholarship and contemporary spectral effects. I set out how Derrida's examination of scholarship makes a particularly important contribution to the question of a politics of spectres by way of its meditation upon the conditional (and therefore its encounter with the unconditional). In this final section I examine how a commitment to scholarship that meditates upon the conditional, and therefore sovereignty, can take place in more practical academic terms. However, as a result this leads me to an antagonism with Derrida's emphasis upon the 'new humanities' and his disparagement of the 'good-for-everything concept, cultural studies' (2001a, p. 50). On the contrary, I refer to writers (Hall, 2004; Bowman, 2004; Zylinska, 2004, Wortham, 2006) sympathetic to Derrida and deconstruction but who also make a case for cultural studies as a location in academia where authority, both within the university and outside,

is being challenged. Thus, as I set out earlier in this chapter, if we are to consider Derrida's approach to scholarship, we would likely do well to consider his emphasis in 'The University Without Condition' upon the 'humanities to come', a phrase that closely resembles 'democracy to come'.

However, as I have also worked to articulate, he argues that we are faced by an aporia when approaching the humanities. It is not just that the humanities have always been appropriated by sovereign forces, but that the humanities, as with democracy, is always conditioned by the restrictions of metaphysics. The task that he therefore sets out is to focus upon the phantasmatic forms that dominate the politics of spectres, memory, and inheritance. To expose these phantasms to their plurality by talking with them. And yet, as I have also said, Derrida's examination of scholarship, the university, and the humanities in conceptual terms is accompanied by empirical claims about the limitations of the contemporary university and humanities. Thus, to negotiate this he argues for an interdisciplinary approach to the relationship between the humanities and departments within the natural sciences such as 'genetics, natural science, medicine, and even mathematics' (2001a, p. 50). He argues that while they do not explicitly refer to the humanities, there are nonetheless those within these departments that will 'take seriously' questions about the implications of science for humanity. However, shortly before making this claim he makes two qualifying statements.

Firstly, that this interdisciplinarity should not mean that distinctions between the departments should be collapsed in a way that would satisfy those wishing to reduce the number of faculty that are employed and, as such, diminish the diversity of endeavours being undertaken within the university. However, secondly, this leads him to the

argument that we should not be tempted by the 'good-for-everything concept, "cultural studies" ' (2001a, p. 50). Now, I have said that this is understandable in terms of Derrida's argument that the products of the humanities are intertwined with the possibility of their appropriation (or, more specifically, exappropriation). And yet, I will to the contrary in the following pages that cultural studies can make a vital contribution to the encounter with multiplicities that he identifies in the humanities. Here I identify four main contributions by cultural studies: 1) it has historically been characterised by the interrogation of the western tradition (a concern that has been so central to Derrida's project), in terms of how it has contributed to the marginalisation and oppression of individuals and communities; 2) it retains, today, a certain disciplinary sovereignty that provides a basis for the examination of the humanities, even if it does not articulate it within its name; 3) as a consequence of its concern with the margins, it has sought out a supplementary examination of politics that pushes beyond the confines of traditional political science and political theory; and finally 4) it has opened up questions about the politics of the symbolic, and therefore explored a liminal space that has a particular affinity with Derrida's concept of spectrality.

To approach my alternative position I want to focus here upon a certain ambiguity in Derrida's rejection of cultural studies. For while he rejects cultural studies, he does not address how it is characterised in some very different ways, including: Stuart Hall and the Birmingham School, Comparative Literature departments in the US, and Baudrillardian expositions of simulacra. Moreover, I want to draw attention here to writers who have pursued a deconstructive cultural studies (Hall, 2004; Bowman, 2004; Zylinska, 2004). My attention turns here to a volume of the online journal *Culture Machine* titled

'Deconstruction is/in Cultural Studies'. In this volume Derrida's dismissive line about cultural studies is frequently deployed as a point of departure for discussion, and it involves arguments in favour of a deconstructive cultural studies as well as those that side with Derrida's gesture (Herbrechter, 2004; Kamuf, 2004). Here I will focus upon Peggy Kamuf's argument against a deconstructive cultural studies in 'The University in the World it is Attempting to Think' (2004). Here Kamuf broadly agrees with Bill Readings' argument that cultural studies has been characterised by navel gazing about its political contribution to the point at which it has become anti-academic and anti-intellectual.

Interrogating the complicity of the university is an important task, Readings affirms, but he suggests that cultural studies has, over time, come to exploit the 'lesbian and gay, African-American, and feminist movements' that it has claimed to work for (Readings in Kamuf, 2004, online). This is bad enough, Readings argues, but he also suggests that this has undermined the progressive possibilities of scholarship. Now, Kamuf notes a counter argument by Samuel Weber that we should not overlook the extent of the university's role in institutionalising the progressive elements of cultural studies. Nonetheless, she develops Readings' argument by arguing that cultural studies provides an 'incredible alibi' for a desire to be accepted by authority through the legitimacy that is bestowed by the academy. By contrast, Kamuf asserts that while deconstruction cannot escape the desire for authority, it has nevertheless 'never had much use for this alibi' (2004, online). Thus, it is here that Kamuf sets out an incongruence between Derrida and cultural studies.

For Kamuf the key difference between cultural studies and deconstruction is with how it deconstructs itself by articulating itself as only one form of writing among others (the use of the indefinite article – *une* écriture). Likewise, Kamuf argues this does not mean that

the 'humanities', in its plurality, 'would be the place of *events* that occur as what Derrida insists on calling in French *oeuvres*, which English in translates as 'works' (2004, online, italics in original). Here, Kamuf suggests that we would recall Derrida's approach to the 'as if' as a 'politics of the virtual' (2001a, p. 31). Derrida, I will note again, works to go beyond the binary condition of critique and emphasise a stronger commitment to examining inheritance and responsibility. Nonetheless, he acknowledges that there needs to be a site of intervention all the same. Kamuf subsequently suggests that this dichotomy also applied to cultural studies, and that it is too invested in encouraging intervention and resistance rather than undertaking analysis (2004, online). Kamuf acknowledges how the other contributors to the volume that she writes (Hall, Bowman, Zylinska) have attempted to apply a deconstructive approach to cultural studies. However, she ultimately argues that we need to consider the general condition of cultural studies rather than such exceptional examples, and with the emphasis upon resistance rather than deconstruction she suggests that there is a nascent anti-intellectualism.

However, my suggestion here is that there are two issues with this position. Firstly, that Kamuf seems to draw out a contradiction between Derrida's arguments in 'The University Without Condition' that while the humanities have promise it is also the case that in practice they are generally unfulfilled and that they are at the service of new forms of sovereignty. Secondly, as Gary Hall suggests, it would be unfortunate to overlook the relationship that cultural studies also has with multiplicity (Hall, 2004). But before I set out what I think is the promise of cultural studies I think it is important to consider in a bit more detail the relationship between cultural studies and the politics of the oppressed and marginalised. To do this I want to refer to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's

'Deconstruction and Cultural Studies: Arguments for a Deconstructive Cultural Studies' (2000). Spivak of course being notable for translating *Of Grammatology* into English, but also for her contribution to postcolonial theory with 'Can the Subaltern Speak' (1988). In 'Deconstruction and Cultural Studies' Spivak provides a more thorough examination of the institutionalisation of cultural studies. However, Spivak also ultimately suggests that the promise of cultural studies might be recuperated by way of an attention to how it has focused upon the 'improper' (2000, p. 14).

Here Spivak identifies two issues with cultural studies. Firstly, that it has been incorporated within academic disciplines such as Comparative Literature, Area Studies, History, and Anthropology, disciplines that she suggests are far more congruent and complicit with capitalisation and the legacies of colonialism (2000, p. 30). Secondly, is the problem that Kamuf alludes to above, via Readings. Spivak argues that a more subtle problem is to be found in cultural studies' tendency to idealise difference. In this way she elaborates upon from her argument in 'Can the Subaltern Speak' where she suggests that Subaltern Studies in India idealised the subaltern subject and resistance in such a way that was counter-intuitive an attentiveness to the diversity of forms of oppression. More specifically she refers to how Subaltern Studies was influenced by Antonio Gramsci's theory of 'counter-hegemony' (the promotion of alternative forms of ideology and culture) and the 'organic intellectual' (the intellectual that supports such a project). This is interesting here because of how counter-hegemony and the organic intellectual were also taken up by leading scholars of Birmingham Cultural Studies like Stuart Hall and Angela McRobbie (Gary Hall, 2004).

In contrast to Subaltern Studies and Birmingham Cultural Studies Spivak subsequently suggests that a new deconstructive cultural studies that acknowledges their radical project but negotiates the pitfalls of the idealisation of difference might take place in something like Derrida's 'New International' which functions as a classroom, thinking through the limits of international as the limits of culture, and scrutinises that which is constitutive of the 'improper' (2000, pp. 34-36). But if Spivak suggests that this does not exist, Gary Hall, on the contrary, suggests that it does:

> I would even go so far as to say that, with its concern for anti- and inter-disciplinarity, emphasis on 'practical' politics, its relation to popular culture, the everyday and the other (be it seen in terms of sexuality or gender, race or ethnicity or whatever), and willingness to be 'adventurous' and 'ambitious' and to use 'continental theory' (such as that of Derrida) (…) to innovate 'outside the scholarly tradition' (McRobbie) – not to mention its self-conscious awareness of the aporia of authority at the heart of academic legitimacy – cultural studies is currently the means by which the university thinks itself, at least in the UK and US; and has come to replace that part of the humanities. (Hall, 2004, online)

The problem here is that we are slipping into an empirical debate that I do not have the time or space to qualify, and which is incongruent with my attention in this thesis to theory. However, without wishing to diminish the importance of attention to how questions of the improper relate to questions of the oppressed and the marginalised, I nonetheless wish to turn here to an emphasis upon Cultural Studies' examination of the symbolic and how this links up with Derrida's work on spectrality, as emphasised by Simon Morgan Wortham (2006). Having set out Derrida's 'deeply complex and highly ambivalent relationship to orthodox academia' (2006, p. 1), Wortham describes, in a fashion that resonates with Stuart Hall's emphasis upon the organic intellectual, Derrida's preference for 'public acts', and how he only passed his doctoral *agrégation* in 1980

(2006, p. 4). However, as Derrida's involvement with GREPH from the mid-70s also shows (Group de Recherches sur L'Enseignment Philosophique, or Research Group on the Teaching of Philosophy), a group campaigning for the study of philosophy in French secondary education (with a view to teaching the impact and implications of Western philosophy), Derrida's 'counter-institutional' approach worked to generate debates beyond the university about the impact of philosophy and the Western tradition, in a way that resembles to some degree the emphasis in Cultural Studies in the Birmingham tradition of studying marginalised groups (2006, p. 9).

But, furthermore, Wortham contributes to the critique of Derrida's argument that cultural studies is just a 'good-for-everything concept' (Derrida in Wortham, 2006, p. 23) by arguing, with reference to Derrida's text *Given Time*, that an attention to culture involves and examination of the symbolic, which is in turn a vital examination of 'an inextricable *excess* built into rationalized and administered economies' (2006, p. 23, my italics). Through an examination of *Given Time*, Wortham refers to how Derrida argues that the articulation of the symbolic involves a gift which establishes a condition of obligation and debt (2006, p. 50). This is because no matter how free or generous the gift, there is always an obligation to register the gift, and therefore an obligation to give something back, otherwise the gift would not be registered as such a gift. Now, Wortham notes Derrida's point that the setting up of an encounter with unknown risks 'a kind of incalculable madness', but he also refers Derrida's argument that it demands a response, a responsibility, and the question of what that responsibility might perhaps entail (2006, pp. 52-55). This responsibility, he suggests, is integral to making the promise of scholarship possible.

Thus, Wortham directs attention to the manner in which Derrida's 'new humanities' touches upon the liminality of spectrality (2006, p. 26). Furthermore, we are taken back to the premise that Derrida sets out in 'Force of Law' (2002c), in which law makes deconstruction possible. Thus, for Wortham the symbolic is a means of working at the limits of deconstruction. But this also points me in the direction of what I have been proposing earlier in this chapter and this thesis. Namely, that if we are to investigate the political we would do well to turn to its secretion in the media as the site of its limits. Thus, I want to suggest here that it is in this sense that cultural studies, with its emphasis upon working at the limits of the symbolic, operates at the threshold of the humanities, and can therefore serve as location within academia to explore the possibilities of sovereignty and the political. Furthermore, it points to the significance of the media.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have continued to reflect upon the significance of the spectrality of 2008 in terms of its relationship with the question of affiliation. In doing so I have set out Derrida's argument that scholarship not only provides the basis for a more nuanced approach than the nation-state and cosmopolitanism permits, but also provides the basis for opening up some of the more discrete implications of contemporary forms of sovereignty. Integral to this proposal is the hospitality of scholarship to the conditional, by turn meaning its relationship with the unconditional and, as a consequence, its relationship with the prospect of an alternative political landscape. In Section One I set out the relationship that Derrida describes between scholarship and the political in terms of how sovereignty demands a scholarly project because of the way in which it is haunted by it, even if the scholarly project that is established can be relatively conservative and

compliant with the sovereignty in question. By doing so I examine Derrida's argument that scholarship provides the basis for the exploitation of lived experience, but also to developments in human rights and the conception of democracy as a viable form of state.

In Section Two I examine Derrida's work on how sovereignty and scholarship should be approached by comparatively assessing Derrida's writing on a Karl Marx and Martin Heidegger. In doing so I argue that Derrida is not only more sympathetic to Marx's approach, despite substantial reservations. I examine the attention that Derrida places upon Marx's references to spectres to articulate the consequences of ideology, philosophy, history, technology, and predominantly the capitalist mode of production, while being attentive to the contradiction of Marx's dismissive approach to spectres. But Derrida contrasts Marx's approach with Heidegger's avoidance of spectres, and how a thread can be identified between Heidegger's 'openness' and, firstly, the explicit support he gave for Nazism and, secondly, how he provided it with spiritual legitimacy. Focusing upon the unconditionality of the university and the attention that Derrida places on Marx's critique of capitalism Section Three considers how the university is affected by the sovereignty of contemporary global capitalism, and how it accompanied by the proliferation of spectral effects. In this section I consider how the spectrality of 2008 sits in relation to these effects. I argue that while hospitality should be offered to the spectre, it needs to be considered in relation to this broader range of spectral effects.

By focusing upon these spectral effects, I continue with the discussion in my chapter on the politics of the nation-state where I refer to how the expansion of the global market conjures the spectre of marginalisation. Here I work to supplement this argument by considering Derrida's examination of how scholarship – and more specifically the

academic position of the professor – sits in a tension with the conception of work. I examine his argument that the confessional nature of work amplifies the spectre of marginalisation that is essential to the market, and how this threatens scholarship as a site of engagement with the unconditional, the event, and the 'perhaps'. Finally, in section four I assess how Derrida's commitment to a 'new humanities might take place in the contemporary university. Revisiting the promise of a critical intervention in the humanities outlined in section one, I argue that its conceptual relationship with the spectre, as that which operates at the threshold of lived experience, provides an intervention for the political, that can be supplemented by interdisciplinarity. But I also argue that scholarship would do well to draw from the history of cultural studies, on the basis that it has provided just such a critical intervention in the ties between the western tradition in its ties with colonialism, of capitalism, but also its attention to the obligations of the symbolic.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE MEDIA

Introduction

In both Chapter Three and Chapter Four I have set out the importance of considering the role of the contemporary media in conditioning the political and the possibility of an alternative political project in response to a crisis such as that of 2008. I examine Derrida's arguments about how the media contributes, through its dissemination of spectral effects to the displacement of the inheritances that inform the traditional contours of the nation-state. I have discussed his suggestion that the media have contributed to the constitution of new political entities, such as those of ideological, nationalist, and religious fundamentalisms, as well as the deconstruction of the very concept of the political itself. In Chapter Four I have taken this further by considering how contemporary media affects the possibility of scholarship as a political space from which to influence politics more broadly. I examine how they affect scholarship's particular relationship with unconditional hospitality. In so doing I have been working under the proviso that the media haunts these spaces, and moving towards my argument that I pursue in this chapter; that of the three overdetermined cultural spaces that dominate contemporary politics, it is the media that do so in the most discrete and significant ways.

In this chapter I examine the proposition that the examination of the media is vital for investigating the implications of the 2008 global financial crisis. In doing so I engage with the claims from Critical and Cultural Theories that I set out earlier in this thesis (from Benjamin, Adorno, Jameson, and Baudrillard) that while the media might not be the most immediately violent forms of politics, it is the most significant in terms of its repercussions for political agency, and the proposal that I find in Derrida's work that the

media is where the logocentric, the spectral, and the political are the most advanced, and subsequently the most radical site of 'democracy *to come*' (2006, p. 81, italics in original). Moreover, I pursue the argument that if the media is the site of the most advanced developments in politics, it also has the most profound implications for religiosity, given its secretion of decisions, and therefore its engagement with the 'secret', a concept that is integral to the development of religiosity. Thus, in this chapter I unpack the relationship that Derrida sets out between the media and the political, the role that the spectrality of the 2008 global financial crisis plays in this relationship, and possibilities that an encounter with the media can have for a more hospitable politics.

In Section One I set out the relationship that Derrida identifies between the media and the political by focusing upon how it involves acts of filtering, selecting, privileging. In so doing I begin to open up a contradiction in which the spectacular and globalised nature of telecommunications and mass media are interwoven with something that is more akin to discretion, and how it is more beneficial to speak of 'teletechnology' rather than media or mediation. In Section Two I focus upon this contradiction more specifically. Returning again to the tension between examining contemporary evidence over inheritance, I discuss Derrida's linking of considerations of the teletechnological to religiosity. More specifically, I focus upon the relationship that he describes between contemporary media and the evangelical Christianity emanating from the United States, and how this differs from other Abrahamic religions. In Section Three I speculate upon the filiations associated with the teletechnological that Derrida's negotiation of contemporary media theorises, in order to articulate the means of a political project of intervention. Finally, in Section Four I set out how, despite the problems that are raised when considering the political

discretion of contemporary teletechnologies, Derrida suggests that in order to negotiate these there must be a responsibility to how they also involve the most sophisticated of disruptions of inheritance and sovereignty.

1. Filtering, Selecting, Privileging

In this section I introduce the argument that an attention to the media presents us with a space that is more acutely in need of consideration in relation to the political than those hitherto examined in this thesis – the nation-state and scholarship. My suggestion is that there is a more urgent task to intervene in the politics of the media on the basis of how there is a secretion of actions such as filtering, selecting, and organising, actions that constitute political interventions, or more precisely political economy. To unpack the significance of the media my suggestion is to begin with how Derrida links his approach to it with his attention to inheritance. To begin, when approaching the spectrality of Marx in *Spectres of Marx*, Derrida suggests that we note how:

> An inheritance is never gathered together, it is never one with itself. Its presumed unity, if there is one, can consist only in the *injunction to reaffirm by choosing*. "One must" means *one must* filter, sift, criticize, one must sort out several different possibles that inhabit the same injunction. (2006, p. 18)

Thus, if we focus upon how the media involves acts of filtering, selecting, and choosing, we are engaging, in a discrete manner, with inheritance.

But if we pursue this emphasis upon the act of discretion that entwines the media with inheritance, we can also focus upon how, despite the articulations of specific inheritances – and how contemporary media can be so spectacular on a global scale - we 'inhabit it in a contradictory fashion around a *secret*' (2006, p. 18, my italics). Derrida asserts that 'one always inherits from a secret', since the articulation of inheritance negotiates the

possibility of its loss. It involves an injunction 'which says "read me, will you ever be able to do so?" ' (2006, p. 18). It is in this manner that Derrida suggests that concept of the secret is closely linked to the concept of the border that is bound up with the public space, the community, the nation-state, and other political entities, and that we should reflect, when considering fate of the nation-state, that:

> If this important frontier is being displaced, it is because the medium in which it is instituted, namely, the medium of the media themselves (news, the press, telecommunications, techno-tele-discursivity, techno-tele-iconicity, that which in general assures and determines the *spacing* of public space, the very possibility of the *res publica* and the phenomenality of the political). (2006, p. 63)

Of particular significance here for Derrida is the manner in which the media 'is neither living nor dead, present nor absent: it spectralizes' (2006, p. 63). However, returning to the common thread in this thesis, Derrida tends to shy away in *Spectres of Marx* from an explicit engagement with specific media forms, instead requesting that we consider how they relate to the question of the spectre, and how they spectralize. But if we consider it worthwhile to interrogate this in order to examine the significance of the field in question, and Derrida's approach to it, for examining the spectrality of 2008, as I do in my previous chapters in relation to the politics of the nation-state and scholarship, we can do so by turning to how this question was examined in two interviews that were given shortly after *Spectres of Marx*, and which continues to examine the themes that were explored in it; 'Artifactualities' and the interview that lends its title to the publication, *Echographies of Television* (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002). Beginning with 'Artifactualities', we can note that Derrida works to examine the implications of the discretion of the media.

Here he further deconstructs whether there are problematic assumptions that accompany concepts such 'representation' and 'communication' that he undertakes in the

essay 'Différance' (1982a) by including an attention to 'information' and, in particular, "live" broadcast. His suggestion in 'Artifactualities' is that attention needs to be placed upon how contemporary media outpaces and outmanoeuvres the capacity to examine how the media works (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 4). For instance:

> When a journalist or politician seems to be speaking to us, in our homes, while looking us straight in the eye, he (or she) is in the process of reading, on screen, at the dictation of a "prompter", a text composed somewhere else, at some other time, sometimes by others, or even by a whole network of anonymous authors. (2002, p. 4)

It is problematic enough for Derrida here that contemporary media outmanoeuvres analysis, but he also suggests that there is an intersection between the political economy of the media and more traditional political frameworks, such as the nation-state. He makes the claim that with the media there is, inevitably, a privileging 'of the national, the regional, the provincial or the Western' (2002, p. 4).

He argues that this inheritance is so strong that while 'some journalists make laudable efforts to escape this law, (...) *by definition*, it can't be done enough, and in the final analysis it is not up to the professional journalists' (2002, p. 4, italics in original). He does not explicitly set out why this is the case here, but if we consider his writing on hospitality that I have discussed in my previous chapter I think this becomes more understandable. To recall, Derrida argues that hospitality can only ever be conditional, even though it is haunted by the unconditional, and even though it might be committed to the unconditional (in the case of scholarship for instance). But we can also focus upon how approaches to the media make specific contributions to the conditioning of hospitality. To give an example he discusses the wars of the former Yugoslavia taking place at the time

of his interview (2002, p. 4). While we might draw attention to the manner in which the media were being manipulated by the ethno-religious forces, he also suggests that we need to consider how there is an affinity with the economic concentration of 'information and broadcast capital' (2002, p. 5).

On the one hand Derrida asserts that attention should be placed upon how Europe ignored the rise of nationalism because its 'only reality (...) is economic and national, and whose only law, in the case of alliances as well as conflicts, remains that of the market' (2002, p. 5). But on the other hand, there is also an affinity between nationalism, the emphasis upon the accumulation of capital (and why an emphasis upon capital has its limitations), and concentration in what Derrida calls 'artifactuality'. A portmanteau of 'artefact' and 'actuality' that attempts to articulate the artificiality and particular significance of "live" media. The phenomenon of ' "live" communication, or communication in so-called real time', for example in the form of the interview, hides but also 'sacrifices' the role of the decision in the worship of the "live" (2002, p. 5). Thus, live media contributes to the conditioning of hospitality at a discrete, teletechnological level. However, Derrida also suggests that the conditioning of hospitality by the worshipping of live broadcast is relatively exposed to investigation in comparison with the discretion of "information" and "communication" (2002, p. 5). Moreover, he insists that we need to be careful not to assume that the examination of decisions is possible – that all we have is 'simulacrum and delusion' (2002, p. 5).

He suggests that the teletechnological emphasis on live can be supplemented by an even more sophisticated alibi for the idolatry of real life and presence that evades the impact of contemporary teletechnologies (2002, p. 5). The task, therefore, is to examine how

artifactuality manifests. Derrida does this by referencing a more specific portmanteau that he calls 'actuvirtuality'; of actuality and the virtual. If artifactuality refers to a general artificiality of reality, actuvirtuality refers to how artifactuality is synthesised through the 'synthetic image, synthetic voice, all the prosthetic supplements that can take the place of real actuality'. This may at first seem a contradiction, since Derrida argues that the artifactual is characterised by the masking of its very artifactuality. The role of the 'virtual image, virtual space, and so virtual event', and how it can 'no longer be opposed, in perfect philosophical serenity, to actual reality', indicates how the obsession with "live" is at a remove from reality (2002, p. 6). For Derrida this turn to virtual reality indicates the manner in which what underlies this emphasis upon live broadcast media is not so much the spontaneity of lived experience, but rather 'much more ancient possibilities' (2002, p. 6).

Live media, Derrida suggests, puts constraints upon the type and complexity of content that can be included, so it would seem only natural that this would be transformed by way of an ideal form of reality (2002, p. 7). What this also means, however, is that the ideal form of event opens up the consideration of how live media supplements racial, ethnic, and nationalist divisions of the sort of the wars of the former Yugoslavia. To articulate how contemporary media technologies can provide the basis for a turn to the body, Derrida turns here to the manner in which the French Far Right have gained appeal amongst voters traditionally sympathetic to the politics of the Left. Specifically, Derrida describes Jean-Marie Le Pen's attacks on the "free-trade-ism", and "economic libertarianism" of the European Union, critiques shared with the Left (2002, p. 14). Derrida's suggestion is that the resistance to an alliance with Le Pen on the basis of his

authoritarian, xenophobic, and anti-Semitic positions conflicts with the tendency towards the messianicity attributed to media forms (2002, pp. 14-15). Derrida notes that the incapacity to anticipate political developments affects sovereignty and provides the basis for political movements to rise up against oppressive regimes, as with the demolishing of the Berlin Wall could go relatively unnoticed.

Nonetheless, it also indicates how difficult it is to examine politics from a scholarly perspective, and also intervene in politics in the name of a project that examines the conditioning of hospitality to justice. He refers to the space that the photograph of the public intellectual takes up in magazines (2002, p. 5), the manner in which they are forced to comply with the rhythms of interviews on the telephone and radio questions, providing reduced answers that demand more complex responses. These are problems that I have already discussed in Chapter Four in relation to scholarship. But here there is a particular emphasis upon how the public intellectual intersects with the media. For instance, Derrida argues that means by which a text such as Emile Zola's 'J'accuse' could have an impact on contemporary society and politics is completely disturbed by changes to 'public space', and how 'the paths traced by information and decision, the relationship between power and secrecy, the figures of the intellectual, the writer, the journalist, etc' (2002, p. 24). Here, however, we come across a tension that arises from Derrida's emphasis upon inheritance. For while Derrida refers to the movement towards the virtual and ideal media forms, there is not a great deal of detail about specific teletechnological forms.

In the interview conducted by Bernard Stiegler that follows 'Artifactualities' in *Echographies of Television* Derrida's reluctance to disassociate contemporary media from the figure of the nation becomes clearer, though it needs to be reached by way of an

examination of Derrida's emphasis upon 'teletechnology', as opposed to 'media'. Stiegler encourages Derrida to elaborate upon why he refers to 'teletechnology', and Derrida explains that his intention is to articulate that 'what appears to be most alive, most live' nonetheless retains the element of 'différance or delay, the time it takes to exploit, broadcast, or distribute it' (2002, p. 39). Stiegler asks whether the resonance of live transmission with lived experience – *being* – is really possible, hinting at the argument that he sharpens elsewhere (Stiegler, 2001) that Derrida overlooks the theoretical possibility for – and empirical evidence that strongly suggests that – technologies have developed to the point at which only a commitment to an alternative counter-technological project can suffice (2002, p. 39). But Derrida responds that while it is tempting to commit to a specific approach to the technological, there is always a negotiation of the limitations of "live" broadcast, for to suggest otherwise necessarily represses the manner in which the phantasmatic is bound up with the consideration of spectrality (2002, p. 40)

In order to clarify this, I think it is helpful to consider here how Derrida works to clarify what he means by a 'politics of memory' that he presents in *Spectres of Marx*. Stiegler asks whether there should be an emphasis upon articulating more favourable inheritances, supported by institutions such as the nation-state. However, Derrida argues, on the contrary that 'we must awaken to critical vigilance with regard to the politics of memory: we must practice a politics of memory and, simultaneously, in the same movement, a critique of the politics of memory' (2002, p. 63). To do this Derrida suggests that there needs to remain an emphasis upon a vigilance that goes beyond specific modes of response, to a consideration of response itself – to the filtering that is involved in

inheritance. The reason for this is that any conception of "live" media should be aware of how the proliferation of spectral effects raises the question of whether 'the concept of the addressee that would have to be transformed', and, moreover, in the context of the spectral effects of the media, this is 'essentially what is happening' (2002, p. 55).

However, if this emphasis upon spectral destabilises the concept of the addressee, this might place limitations upon the notion of the citizen, or the sovereign political, and with it the notion of the political entity and the nation. The explanation for this is to be found in how the spectre relates to the secret. In my next section I turn to consider how an attention to the media and its secretion of the political helps to explain how the West, and more specifically the United States, has come to acquire such credibility. In doing so I draw attention to Derrida's argument that this rests in the particular relationship between the West and the United States with the teletechnological through its affiliation with an evangelical Christian inheritance. Here I examine in more detail the contradiction that seems to arise from the manner in which contemporary teletechnologies are so global, noisy, ubiquitous, and spectacular, while also being linked to the concept of the secret. To examine this in further detail my suggestion here is to focus upon the manner in which Derrida situates contemporary teletechnologies in relation to the inheritance of the ontotheological, and specifically in relation to Christianity, and how this differs from the other Abrahamic religions of Judaism and Islam.

2. **Tele-technology, the Good News, and the Secret**

In this section I examine the relationship that Derrida sets out between the media and the secret in more detail. In doing so I discuss his arguments about how this relationship provides the basis for new forms of sovereignty, but also his arguments about how these

developments are characterised by a condition of insecurity. To open up this discussion I begin with an examination of Derrida's proposals about how the media contributes, in a paradoxical and complex fashion, to both the troubling *and* reaffirmation of concepts of the home and national territory, but also more profoundly and intimately, the notions of self, as well as of the media itself. In so doing I discuss Derrida's argument that an attention to the complex and discrete transformations taking place in the media need to be passed through a consideration of how they are made possible through negotiations of difference. Finally, this leads me to consider how these paradoxes set up the importance of considering the developments in religious fundamentalism as the implications that are perhaps the pressing to come to terms with. I introduce Derrida's argument that the developments of secrets and phantasms within religious fundamentalisms – the so-called 'return of the religious' – constitute the most problematic issues for a more hospitable politics.

To approach Derrida's discussion of the media's relationship with the secret I will open here with his discussion in *Of Hospitality* of the importance of considering how the media, despite its sophistication and power, is haunted by its limitations. On the one hand he argues here that new teletechnologies of 'the telephone, the television, the fax or e-mail, the Internet as well (...), introduce ubiquitous disruption, and the rootlessness of place, the dis-location of the house, the infraction into the home' (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000, pp. 89-91). In this sense we see the disrupting of the concept of the self. However, on the other hand, and in a fashion that would seem incongruent with the pervasion of technologies today, he questions the integrity that these technologies have. Here he recalls his earlier work in *Of Grammatology* by suggesting that the relevance of

contemporary media technologies depends upon their capacity to facilitate the ability 'to hear yourself-speaking' (2000, p. 91). There is always concern that the utterance of decision what we wish to be disseminated or affected will not take place. So, he maintains that we need to refer to a deconstructive transformation of the self rather than its undermining.

So, while Derrida sets out in *Of Grammatology* how this lack of 'constitutive meaning' has been deconstructed, in *Of Hospitality* he supplements this project by investigating how this sense of insecurity threads through the questions of the filial, the familial, the patriarchal, the territorial, and the national, and ultimately the political. However, in doing so he also makes important comments about how the media can be a site of the political in ways that are not acknowledged. To set out such a situation he turns here Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*. Specifically, Derrida discusses Oedipus' request to Theseus that his daughters, Antigone and Ismene, be shielded from the knowledge of his final resting place, such that they will always have his memory. However, as Derrida suggests, this is both a considerable gift *and* wounding, since Oedipus essentially traps his daughters in a condition of ambiguity, mourning an inability to mourn properly. For Derrida this story articulates a link between the patriarchal bond that Sophocles imagines and the manners in which phantasms of fraternity, ethnicity, and nationality demand a conceptualisation of the location and identity of the inheritance (a mourning of mourning), that results in the phantasmatic conceptualisation of others and foreigners, and ultimately produces the reconceptualization of sovereignty. However, Derrida also argues that this (re)turn to sovereignty is also possible with the media, given that it can be dislocated from its origins in such versatile ways.

So, Derrida's approach to hospitality does not begin with any intrinsic spectre of the foreigner, but rather the spectre of language's uncertainty – a disruption to being unable to hear oneself speak. Thus, it is in this sense that there can be a paradoxical situation in which there is a trajectory towards media forms that provide for the secretion of inheritances but also do so in such spectacular and global ways. This returns us to the Derrida's deconstructive concepts of the trace and différance. For Derrida responds to this by suggesting that while the trajectory of sovereignty is indeed towards secretion it must necessarily, in a deconstructive manner, negotiate différance in order to be made possible. However, if we are to further examine how the media negotiates difference in increasingly spectacular and global ways Derrida suggests that we should consider the close links between globalisation and Christianity, or what he prefers to call 'globalatinization' (2002a, p. 50). Derrida's concern with 'globalatinization', and its dissemination primarily from the United States, is pursued in a number of texts from 'Faith and Knowledge' (2002a) onwards (2005b; Borradori and Derrida, 2003), but here I will focus upon 'Above All, No Journalists' (Derrida, 2001b), a short text where he particularly emphasises its relationship with the secret.

In this text Derrida begins by discussing the scenario in Abrahamic scripture in which God shares a secret with Abraham. By doing so this provides the basis for the provocation to think that it would translate into today's media landscape as an injunction to exclude journalists (hence 'above all, no journalists') (2001b, p. 56). It would be an '*unconditional* secret' in which everything would be subsumed within the secret (2001b, p. 56, italics in original). However, for Derrida this changes, to a certain extent, with Christianity, and specifically the figure of Christ 'who will have been the first journalist or news-man, like

the Evangelists who bring the Good News' (2001b, p. 57). For Derrida this suggests an important difference within the Abrahamic religions between the retention of the secret by Judaism and Islam, and the role of the evangelical in Christianity (2001b, p. 57). He acknowledges that mediatisation is to be found in relation to all these other religions, but he nonetheless insists that attention needs to be placed upon the influence of Christianity – and specifically the various Protestantisms – in the United States, because of how it intersects with how the United States is 'the land of maximal capitalist exploitation of televisual technologies […] and of the most spectacular televisual stagings' (2001b, pp. 59-60).

To open up an examination of the relationship between Christianity and teletechnology in more detail Derrida turns here to the concept of the 'media' itself. He describes how it 'implies naturally a medium or mediation, a remote message, instantly sent and received in a space that as a result is neither private nor secret' (2001b, p. 61). However, a contradiction that Derrida identifies here is that there is a secretion of the mechanism of mediation. With Christianity the negotiation of spectres is to be found in the manner in which the figure of Christ is attributed a privileged form of spectrality, as 'Holy Ghost' (2001b, p. 61). In his approach to the presentation of a privileged spectral form like so-called "live" media, on the basis of its proposed connection with instant transmission and capacity to navigate obstacles to communication, Derrida draws attention to the manner in which this promise of the media continues to summon the presence of that which threatens to disturb it.

Thus, supplementing his argument about the transformation of the self and how the media is only ever a prosthetic with a limited shelf-life, he argues that the media is also

characterised by a contradiction in which 'technology is used to protest against technology. Television always involves a protest against television: television pretends to efface itself, to deny television. It is expected to show the thing, "live", directly ' (2001b, p. 62). If attention is therefore places upon the proficiency of media technologies, it is therefore accompanied by a secret that they can never be enough. He suggests that attention should be placed upon the manner in which televangelism manifests in the United States offers the Good News, and how it indicates a certain interaction between capitalism, Christianity, and tele-technological, but he also suggests that attention needs to be placed upon the manner in which CNN offers a secular access to the miracle of mediation. This secretion of authority would therefore lead Derrida to suggest that it is important to protest, at certain moments, 'against the cosmopolitical tendencies of technology, against the dislocation, delocalization, uprooting associated with teletechnology' (2001b, p. 62). Nonetheless, it is the radical departure from the mediation of the secret found in the various nationalisms and religious extremisms Derrida finds particularly important to address.

Important here is the manner in which the religious extremisms today involve a departure from the religious in a more traditional sense. They are made possible by interactions with contemporary media. This happens, Derrida tells us, through how they often react against the contemporary world (of which the media is constitutive), and because they pass their messages through the media (2002a, pp. 61-62). For Derrida we would do well to consider the American televangelists, but more recently we might do well to consider the dissemination of horrific videos by Islamic extremists. Now, Derrida's intention here is not to recuperate the religious to some idealised mode, though, as I will

suggest in section four, he does identify a certain promise in the onto-theological. Rather, his point is that while religions in the past – including Christianity – involved a concern with the interaction between questions of being, even when concerned with concepts such as the secret or the spirit. These would manifest, he points out, in terms of a reflection upon lived experience, and through certain rituals and practices, including those of the membership of religious community. By contrast, there has been a trajectory towards an intensification of the relationship with the spectral.

This is not just problematic in terms of a withdrawal from the consideration of justice and difference. Rather, it sets the basis for conflict, given that these symbolic assemblages will always come into contact with incongruence. It is in this sense that he suggests in 'Faith and Knowledge' that the 'new wars of religion' are derived from the teletechnological capacities of 'digital culture, jet and TV' (2002a, pp. 61-62). If we focus upon the way in which the teletechnological threatens certain forms of secret – of nation, community, religious community – my suggestion here is that we would do well to focus upon the underlying framework for Derrida's approach to the political disruption brought about by teletechnological developments: that in 'a more or less secret fashion, and thus more or less public, there where this frontier between the public and the private is constantly being displaced, remaining less assured than ever, as the limit that would permit one to identify the political' (2006, p. 63). There is a disruption of the onto-theological here because the means by which the secret is disseminated – the tele-technological, is increasingly subject to the spectre that 'is neither living nor dead, present nor absent. It does not belong to ontology, to the discourse on the Being of beings, or to the essence of life or death', what Derrida refers to as 'hauntology' (2006, pp. 62-63).

This conception of a new affiliation helps to explain how the 'return of the religious' could come to exist as a phenomena of the mid-1990s, despite the impermanence of the spectre. With the return of the religious we have here a deep-seated fear of the 'evil of abstraction' (2002a, p. 43). The registering of the spectral can only take place via the registering of some form of inheritance, such that the theological and the ontological, faith and knowledge, are closely intertwined. As a result, while the return to the religious can be so opposed to:

> Those sites of abstraction that are the machine, technics, technoscience and above all the transcendence of tele-technology [it] is at the same time involved in reacting antagonistically and reaffirmatively outbidding itself. In this very place, knowledge and faith, technoscience ("capitalist" and fiduciary) and belief, credit, trustworthiness, the act of faith will always have made common cause, bound to one another by the band of their opposition. (2002a, p. 43)

This subsequently suggests a tension in which any inheritance needs to be considered by way of not one source, but two, of both 'faith' *and* 'knowledge'.

Derrida therefore suggests that attention needs to be placed upon how the teletechnological is underpinned by a certain ' "logic", "formal rigour", and "possibilities" which is the role of 'law' (2002a, p. 51). So, we have a relationship between law – that relates to the secret – on the one hand, and the manner in which the teletechnological disturbs the secret, such that there is 'an infinite spiral of outbidding, a maddening instability among these "positions" ' (2002a, p. 51). In my earlier chapters I refer to how this spectre of insecurity can even be present in the West, and here an attention to the teletechnological sets out why: how it can be 'at the same time hegemonic and finite, ultra-powerful and in the process of exhausting itself. Simply, those who are involved in this outbidding can pursue it from all angles, adopting all "positions", either simultaneously or successively, to the uttermost limit' (2002a, p. 52). Thus, Derrida asserts that the notion

of, for example, 'the surge of "Islam" ', can only really be addressed by considering the imposition of a 'borderline' between the internal and the external, the relationship between secret and teletechnological: 'the passageway between this interior and all the apparently exterior dimensions (technoscientific, tele-biotechnological, which is to say also political and socioeconomic, etc)' (2002a, p. 58).

So, despite the manners in which contemporary media can be so theatrical and so broadly transmitted on a global stage, Derrida warns that we need to be mindful about the subtle ways in which a return to identity and the home are inscribed. In so doing, there is a certain provocation to think how contemporary media in the west are underpinned by forms of faith that operate at a remove from considerations of difference and justice. However, there are also more serious concerns about where a dependence upon certain phantasms can lead, and it is in this sense that the emergence of religious fundamentalisms can be explained. However, if we are to further examine this problem, we are therefore called to theorise ways in which these acts of faith can be articulated. In my next section I will examine what the most significant sites of intervention might be after the 2008 global financial crisis. To do this I will draw from the forms that Derrida suggests that sovereignty have taken.

3. **Tele-technological Sovereignty**

In this section I speculate upon the types of tele-technological sovereignty and affiliation that should be considered in relation to the global financial crisis. In so doing I return to the tension, set out particularly by Derrida in *Rogues*, that traditional forms of sovereignty based upon the authority of actors and institutions are being made redundant, and that spectral effects are taking their place. To do this I continue to work with the proposals set

out in my previous section in which the home and the self are being disturbed by spectral effects. However, this time I am more attentive to the forms that sovereignty can take in this transitional phase, in order to make more concise interventions in relation to the spectrality of the crisis of 2008. Specifically, I elaborate upon the globalatinization and return of the religious that I introduce above. In doing so I focus upon the sovereignty attributed to democracy and freedom in the West, and specifically the United States. My argument being that, despite the suggestions that this might be contradictory, democracy and freedom should be considered as phenomena that are particularly associated with the rise of new forms of teletechnological sovereignty through the ways in which they are particularly hospitable to new ways of taking decisions.

To reiterate my point in section two, in *Of Hospitality* Derrida argues that 'these techno-scientific possibilities threaten the interiority of the home ("we are no longer at home!")' but also 'the very integrity of the self, of ipseity' (2000, p. 53), but he ultimately argues that we need to consider how we are drawn back to questions of sovereignty through the structure of the secret. However, here I work to elaborate upon the examination of how sovereignty that has been disseminated through globalatinization and which ultimately manifests in the return of the religious – and the wars of religion – I will pursue the notion that there are new teletechnological affiliations. In the interview 'Echographies of Television' (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002). Here he asserts that the importance of a 'right of inspection' because of how, even when he is at home, he feels subject to 'all these machines and all these prostheses watching, surrounding, seducing us, [such as] the quote "natural" conditions of expression, discussion, reflection, deliberation are to a large extent breached, falsified, warped' (2002, p. 32). Thus, contemporary teletechnological

developments have come to affect the traditional 'rhythm' of inspection and for responding, but also the relationship between the private and the public, the location from which to undertake any inspection:

> The "home" (...) is no doubt what is most violently affected by the intrusion, in truth by the breaking and entering of the telepowers we're getting ready to talk about here – as violently injured, moreover, as the historical distinction (it is old, but not natural and not timeless) between public and private space. (2002, pp. 32-33)

For Derrida the destabilization of the ipseity of the home, and of ipseity more generally 'was always the case, but today the accelerated deployment of particular technologies increases more rapidly than ever the scope and power of what is called private sociality, far beyond the territory of measurable-surveyable space' (2000, p. 57). Specifically, Derrida draws attention to how this occurs 'through the phone, the fax, e-mail, and the Internet, etc' (2000, p. 57). Here we have two phenomena that I have referred to in Chapter Three already which I think are worth recalling. Firstly, the troubling of nation-state, and the manner in which it articulates the division between the private and the public – how the nation-state is 'suddenly smaller, weaker than these non-state private powers' (2000, p. 57). This is the basis for the new affiliation of the teletechnological. But before setting this out it is worth considering how, secondly, there is a reaction from within the traditions of the nation-state, which 'sometimes takes the form of a rearrangement of the law, of new legal texts, but also of new police ambitions attempting to adapt to the new powers of communication and information, in other words also to new spaces of hospitality' (2000, p. 57).

In its attempts to counteract challenges to its sovereignty from contemporary

teletechnologies, Derrida suggests that the distinction between what constitutes legitimate public authority and what constitutes private activity is becoming harder to discern. As an example, he refers to the censorship of pornography. Whatever our stance on pornography's ethics, he suggests that the desire of the nation-state to manage what citizens can and cannot have a right of inspection is a broader question that relates to archival materials and information for other subjects. More specifically, Derrida refers to how criminals are finding ways of hacking into private details. The complicity between governments and insurgents, as forces that have dubious claims to sovereignty, is already articulated by Derrida in relation to the politics of the nation-state. However, with the speeds and rhythms of contemporary teletechnologies this distinction also becomes much harder to define. My suggestion here is to turn to how Derrida works with the figure of the spectre.

With the spectre Derrida argues that there is a certain homogeneity shared by the sovereignty of, for instance, the nation-state, and counter-forces (be they criminal, insurgent, or emancipatory forces). But if there are effects that make it particularly difficult to discern the role of sovereignty, it is 'by the fantastic, ghostly, "synthetic", "prosthetic", virtual happenings in the scientific domain and therefore the domain of the techno-media and therefore the public or political domain' (2006, p. 79). The spectrality is important here in that it traverses the threshold between life and death, and as such the notion of the event: 'It is also made more manifest by what inscribes the speed of a virtuality irreducible to the opposition of the act and the potential in the space of the event, in the event-ness of the event' (2006, p. 79). The event as that which is unanticipated, unknown, is disturbed because of how it is supplemented by that which is

made possible through the intersections of various teletechnological apparatuses.

This emphasis upon how teletechnological apparatuses contribute to the constitution of the event, supplements the notion that the event is bound up with questions of unconditionality, and therefore how teletechnological is subject to différance. However, this emphasis upon the role of teletechnological also suggests that it is becoming increasingly difficult to recognise or 'measure', in Derrida's terminology, the event as an unanticipated, interruptive experience. The implication that Derrida identifies here being that the encounter with the impossible is repressed, leading us to the dissonance between teletechnologies and their production. That is, a dissonance that resembles the Marxist theory of capitalistic overproduction, as well as the manner in which the crisis of 2008 was the result of a rupture in communication between financial markets and the housing markets (and subsequently the economy). With this repression of the unconditional we are therefore presented with the situation in which the possibilities of teletechnologies give impetus to the return of 'entire regiments of ghosts (...), armies from every age, camouflaged by the archaic symptoms of the paramilitary and of the postmodern excess of arms (information technology, panoptical surveillance via satellite, nuclear threat, and so forth)' (2006, p. 100).

What are these phantasms, or rather, which phantasms should be given particular attention? In *Spectres of Marx* Derrida talks of the phantasm of the triumphant West, liberal democracy, and the free market, but he examines this tradition more explicitly in *Rogues* (2005b). Here he undertakes a much more thorough examination of the rise to sovereignty of democracy, from its rejection in classical political thought to its adoption by the United States, and through the power of the United States, its dissemination

through globalatinization. However, in relation to the 9/11 attacks he discusses how the United States responded by calling for the defence of democracy and freedom, against an ' "axis of evil" (2005b, p. 50). However, he also points to how the United States worked to restrict the democratic rights of its citizens (2005b, p. 50). In so doing he points to a form of democratic sovereignty that privileges the taking of decisions over the defence of justice. In this way we are presented with a type of sovereignty that can make use of the diversity of decision-making opportunities that accompany developments in teletechnologies, even if it means drawing to a close, in an autoimmune fashion, democracy and the nation-state.

It is through this link between democracy and teletechnological difference that we can open up questions about who are threatened by the developments in the media and how. In *Spectres of Marx* Derrida points to how the messianicity of contemporary politics points to ascendency of 'the war for the "appropriation of Jerusalem" ' (2006, p. 73). This is clearly also the case in 'Faith and Knowledge' (2002a), but in *Rogues* Derrida opens up an incongruence between the sovereignty of democracy in the West and the absence of a liberal democratic tradition in the Islamic world (2005b, p. 41). Now, mindful of Derrida's occasional acts of affiliation with liberal democracy we might be concerned about a certain privileging of the West here. However, this would be to overlook a subtle and important point. That is, that those who have access to taking decisions are attributed sovereignty, while those who are not are denied it. Moreover, if we consider that the sovereignty of liberal democracy and freedom is being supplemented through advances in the media, the prospect of such cultural and social incongruence suggests why it is important.

So, it is in this manner that I turn to Derrida's arguments in 'Faith and Knowledge' that acts of religious extremism react against 'the hypersophistication of military tele-technology' but also, more generally, ' "digital" and cyberspaced culture' (2002a, p. 88), he suggests that we have here a broader reaction against the 'evil of abstraction' that is found in the secularism of "live" broadcast media. Religious extremism does this, Derrida claims, through an act of 'revenge' that reverts to 'to bare hands, to the sexual organs or to primitive tools, often to weapons other than firearms' (2002a, p. 88). The phantasms articulated by these extremisms, haunted by the spectre of teletechnological abstraction, engage in an ever more intense negotiation of spectrality, toing and froing between faith and knowledge, such that religious extremism can be just as concerned with 'the calculable and the incalculable' as what might seem more secular scientific and technological projects (2002a, p. 90). It is in relation to this combination of corporeal politics and calculation that Derrida suggests that the sectarian politics of Judaism, Islam, and Christianity are concerned with questions of demographics (2002a, p. 90).

More specifically, Derrida suggests that the politics of spectres can be more fully examined by considering its articulations of 'violent sundering' and 'counter-fetishism' (2002a, p. 92). 'Violent sundering' in that there is a violence committed against some form of 'originary *physis*' (2002a, p. 92). Firstly, violence against 'originary physis' means violences against an entity that is 'authentically generative, sacred, unscathed, "safe and sound" ', which might include 'ethnic identity, descent, family, nation, blood and soil, proper name, proper idiom, proper culture and memory' (2002a, p. 92). Secondly, there is a 'counter-fetishism' in which the 'tele-technoscientific machine (...) becomes a machine of evil, and of radical evil, but a machine to be manipulated as much as to be exorcised'

(2002a, p. 92). That said, Derrida also warns against suggesting that there is a uniform approach to the reaction against and manipulation of the teletechnological. For while, for instance, extremist movements are made up of irrational fanatics, there are also actors involved that are exploitative but also, by necessity, skilled and intelligent (2002a, p. 92). This distinction points towards Derrida's critique of globalatinization as a deconstruction of the Western tradition, Christianity, and the cosmopolitical.

Texts such as 'Above All, No Journalists' and 'Faith and Knowledge' allude to the complicity of the West with religious extremism, both in terms of its own Christian fundamentalism, but also the secreted religiosity of technology, and teletechnology specifically. For Derrida we undoubtedly need to be vigilant to the rise of extremism. However, he also argues that in order to respond to it in more responsible ways we need to also consider how they are the continuation of attempts to live with the teletechnological 'in daily familiarity' (2002a, pp. 89-92). Again, as I have frequently noted, Derrida argues that we are faced with teletechnologies that disturb the capacity to inspect, analyse, and comprehend: 'never in the history of humanity, it would seem, has the disproportion between scientific incompetence and manipulatory competence been as serious' (2002a, p. 92). And yet, despite this incomprehensibility, he also suggests that they are accepted 'with a mastery that is taken for granted and whose proximity is ever closer, more interior, more domestic' (2002a, p. 92). And yet, as Derrida's emphasis upon autoimmunity indicates, deconstructing the condition of unconditional hospitality and, more essentially, deconstruction, mastery can never be achieved because of the manner in which its authority is dependent upon the negotiation of spectres.

The point this leads me to, and where I think we need to again be mindful of the risk of

sectarianism, is that the teletechnological, and by extension the inheritance of the Western and the Christian provides the basis for an unprecedented form of deconstruction. In this manner we link up with Derrida's argument about the promise of Europe that I allude to in Chapter Three. That is, that Europe has a unique relationship with the secularism of the Enlightenment. Here I think it is important to emphasise, as with his approach to the promise of Europe, that Derrida identifies promise in the teletechnological on the basis of the possibilities, alliances, and solidarities that have otherwise not been considered. My reading here being that, firstly, attention needs to be placed upon how the analysis of the teletechnological offers the most advanced means addressing the secretion of the theological through the teletechnological, but also, secondly, that this exposes the promise that the teletechnological expresses the most sophisticated response to the incompleteness of sovereignty. In my final section I will explore the particular relationship that Derrida sets out between teletechnological advances and his conception of 'democracy *to come*'.

4. Tele-technological Dissonances

So, despite all the dire warnings that Derrida explores in relation to the expansion of spectral effects, from the politics of the nation-state to scholarship and more traditional forms of writing, Derrida ultimately argues that the provocation of questions of sovereignty and affiliation should be viewed as a moment of promise. He suggests that an emphasis be placed upon exploring the inheritance to the responsibility, or 'right of inspection' that is derived from teletechnology's relationship with the secret. My suggestion here is to focus upon how Derrida focuses his attention to acts of 'sharing' that, for him, are one of the key characteristics of contemporary spectral teletechnologies. I

discuss how he examines this by way of the sharing of images of violence, suffering, or injustice, always destabilise authority, not necessarily through their content, but through the manner in which, as I set out in my previous sections, they provoke fundamental questions about faith, and subsequently regenerate questions of political affiliation. That said, the questions of their conceptual possibility and their likelihood are very different.

My suggestion here is that when approaching Derrida's promotion of a 'right of inspection' we should bear in mind his claims about concepts such as responsibility and, in particular, inheritance. For in his articulation of a right of inspection there is a suggestion that he is referring to the assertion of a right that is bequeathed as opposed to a right that is established or maintained. The task is to identify the diversity of filtering, selecting, and decisions that we are exposed to with contemporary teletechnologies, and how this ultimately brings the notion of individual identity into question, a concept that is integral to sovereignty and logocentric authority (Derrida in Derrida and Stiegler 2002, pp. 54-55). Nonetheless, Derrida asserts that we should not become complacent about the need to intervene in the act of taking decisions, and of choosing how to use teletechnologies. Moreover, contrary to Bernard Stiegler's argument that the 'technical evolution' that is taking place 'makes possible a cultural politics aimed at turning the addressee into an actor or agent in production' (2002, p. 56), Derrida argues that it is vital to recall that the 'addressee', including the 'consumer', 'has never simply been a passive receiver' (2002, p. 56).

Derrida asserts that within the disturbance of traditions there is a questioning of inheritance that opens up new considerations. As a result, Derrida guards against developing specific forms of literacy, or new media literacy that respond to contemporary

teletechnological developments. For Stiegler the proliferation of access to new teletechnological literacy holds promise (cameras, video editing, the internet). Derrida is not averse to the democratisation of teletechnologies, such as "interactivity" (2002, p. 57). However, his emphasis is upon intervening in the manner in which rights of inspection are already being asserted. For instance, he draws attention to the manner in which the contemporary teletechnologies displace interpretations of place, impose incompetence and a sense of marginalisation, and sets up the basis for the return of so many ghosts (2002, p. 57). But this proliferation also indicates how the 'information' and 'communications', otherwise attributed such integrity, are altered and transformed through discrete interpretations (2002, p. 58).

This says something broader about how the use of contemporary teletechnologies for regressive political forces should not be classified as a 'reappropriation' of forms that owe their development to the interaction between the ontological and the theocratic, but rather 'exappropriation' that indicates how there can never be a complete appropriation or reappropriation without exposure to différance (2002, p. 58). Derrida's intention here is to be mindful to how the overlooking of exappropriation leads to the possibility of a 'war between appropriations' (2002c, p. 58). But Derrida suggests that while we should be attentive to the conflicts here this can be positively supplemented by considering how this condition of différance holds promise. Here the possibilities of teletechnologies promise to go further than a politics that focuses upon the institutions of the state or university. It suggests a contradiction with Derrida's argument that I refer to in Chapter Three in which the nation-state can be a 'bulwark against certain international powers, certain ideological, religious, or capitalist, indeed linguistic, hegemonies' (2005b, p. 158).

However, he suggests that we should be careful about politicising the media, suggesting that it can lead to crude oppositional positions. As a consequence, he even asks whether 'perhaps the political must be deterritorialized' (2002, p. 64).

As with the right of inspection, however, this is led by the proposition that the political is 'no doubt (...) deterritorializing itself' (2002, p. 64). Nonetheless, he insists that we should consider how:

> We are given this imperative to think the political beyond the political, as it were, or the democratic beyond democracy – by technics concretely, urgently, every day – both as a threat and as a chance. Every time we turn on the television or use the telephone or fax, these questions (...) become unavoidable. (2002, p. 64)

Subsequently this raises the question of what might be given attention to whether there is any organisation, any economy, that would come to replace the political. Here Derrida suggests that there should be a consideration of the emphasis that is placed with the deployment of contemporary teletechnologies upon "sharing". This "sharing" emphasizes 'what it is possible up to a point to have in common [but also] dissociations, singularities, diffractions' (2002, p. 66). It registers differences without attempting to set boundaries, unlike the restrictions of community, 'if by community one understands a unity of languages, of cultural, ethnic, or religious horizons' (2002, p. 66).

How then to focus upon sharing that precedes the boundaries and boundedness of community? Firstly, we might consider here Derrida's arguments in 'Faith and Knowledge' about how, before being bound in religious community, there is a necessity of a 'fiduciary "link" ' that links 'pure singularities prior to any social or political determination, prior to all intersubjectivity, prior even to the opposition between the sacred (or the holy) and the profane' (2002a, p. 55). Secondly, this would mean paying

attention to the acts of filtering, selecting, and organizing that I set out in section one, and in relation to globalization, or rather 'globalatinization'. More specifically, how globalization, despite its claims to heterogeneity, ultimate 'dissimulates' difference by binding it together in a geographic and therefore global term (Derrida, 2003, pp. 121-123). It is for this reason that he prefers to talk of '*mondialisation*' in the French – which translates as 'worldwide-isation', since the world does not have the totalizing simplicity of the geographic and scientific conception of the globe (Borradori and Derrida, 2003, p. 121).

Subsequently, the challenge would be to encourage vigilance, 'without presupposing or assigning an obligatory identification or reidentification' (Derrida and Stiegler, 2002, p. 66). However, it would also encourage the notion that the

> Technical transformation of the telephone, of the fax machine, of television, e-mail and the Internet – will have done more for what is called "democratization" (...) than all the discourses on behalf of human rights, more than all the presentations of models in whose name this democratization was able to get started. (2002, p. 70)

As an example, Derrida refers to the argument that Soviet totalitarianism or the 'police state' could not survive when faced by 'a certain threshold in the density of the telephone network' (2002, pp. 70-71). If we look to how China and Russia make sophisticated use of teletechnologies for authoritarian policies both domestically and internationally, we might suggest that this is rather naïve. However, Derrida's discussion of the relationship between evidence and testimony suggests to me that there remains an opening up of the question of authority, even if it seems unlikely to deliver a more progressive political scenario. To explore this argument, I think it helps to refer to Derrida's discussion of specific example of the sharing of the video recording of police brutality by four white

LAPD officers against Rodney King, an unarmed black man (2002, p. 90). For Derrida we find here an assumption of the legitimacy of the teletechnological – and video recording specifically – that has progressive implications.

On the one hand Derrida finds promise in the manner in which the video lent credibility to claims about racial injustice, claims that were exacerbated by the acquittal of the police offers by an all-white jury, and which were made possible by 'the possibility of recording the voice, the presence of the body, gesture, etc' as well as in the manner in which it disseminates around the world, and 'nullifies delays' (2002, p. 90). However, Derrida's attention is particularly drawn to the manner in which the video becomes, as a piece of evidence, a challenge to the testimonial, not only of those involved with the case, but to the testimonial aspect of faith and affiliation more generally. The video, as evidence, opens – or rather 'reopens the question of testimony' (2002, p. 90). This consideration of testimony, for Derrida, more broadly reopens questions about credit, debt, and faith. However, more surgically, for Derrida it is particularly important, from the perspective of considering spectrality, to consider how it opens up questions about the significance of corporeal identity. He proposes that there have been positive developments in the medical media of 'radiography, scanners, and grafts' that have enabled an emancipatory transformation of 'our body and our relationship to our body' (2002, p. 96).

Now, if spectres trouble the body, we might be concerned here that there might be a destabilization of human rights, and that the transformation of the body might benefit some but lead to new forms of marginalisation and oppression for others. However, for Derrida this would overlook the manner in which the spectre is bound up with the question of the gaze. His suggestion here is that the spectre is generated by the 'thing' that

precedes us, that need not take the figure of a human body (2002, p. 123). Thus, Derrida argues that while he may have a 'an even greater sense of the "real" when what is photographed is a face or a gaze', the "reality effect", that he refers to instead 'stems here from the irreducible alterity of another origin of the world' (2002, p. 123). As such, he argues that 'what I call the gaze here, the gaze of the other, is not simply another machine for the perception of images. It is *another world, another source of phenomenality, another degree zero of appearing*' (2002, p. 123, my emphasis).

But are progressive responses to the promise of spectrality realistic? Here I would suggest we again consider Derrida's argument in *Spectres of Marx* that the contemporary situation of *spectral effects* '*conditions and endangers* any democracy'. That is, implications of 'the new speed of apparition (we understand this word in its ghostly sense) of the simulacrum, the synthetic or prosthetic image, and the virtual event, cyberspace and surveillance, the control, appropriations, and speculations that today deploy unheard-of powers' (Derrida, 2006, pp. 66-67). While this threat to democracy might seem problematic, perhaps we should view it in relation to his argument about liberal democracy. That liberal democracy is an articulation of democracy's failure as much as its progressive possibility. That democracy is underpinned by a relationship with 'diastema (failure, inadequation, disjunction, disadjustment, being "out of joint")' (2006, p. 81). It is in this sense that the spectral effects that disturb liberal democracy are to be considered as manifestations of democracy in its purely impure form; of an encounter with 'democracy *to come*' (2006, p. 81). As I have suggested above, this does not mean that we should be passive to the developments in the media and to spectral effects. Derrida encourages acts of vigilance,

intervention, and selecting in the media, but he also emphasizes the importance of recognizing that democracy is underway through the media.

Thus, as J Hillis Miller emphasises, while the

> Spectral cyberspace in which so many people around the world more and more live has, willy-nilly, transformed politics and is weakening the nation-state and party-politics, it also is the space within which the "link of affinity, suffering, and hope" that Derrida calls the New International is, through innumerable e-mails, openings of websites, use of chat rooms, and mobile phone conversations, allowing those almost clandestine alliances, without name, without party, without country, without class affiliation, without status, to form themselves, across all national borders and across all barriers of class, race, and gender. The new regime of tele-communications allows these alliances to form and then to perform their counter-conjurations of that hegemony that has without meaning to do it put the possibility of such extraordinary perlocutionary efficacy in their hands. (2001, p. 10)

After the crisis of 2008 much has been written about the degree of significance that the internet and social media specifically played in the mass movements of the Arab Spring, the Indignados, or Occupy (see for example Castells, 2012; Trottier and Fuchs, 2014; Della Porta and Mattoni, 2014). However, my suggestion here is that attention should be placed upon how traditional forms of sovereignty and affiliation are destabilized by the spectrality of 2008.

My suggestion here then is to take the destabilising implications of the spectrality of 2008 as a chance for an alternative politics. The destabilization of traditional notions of sovereignty and affiliation can no doubt demands a consideration of inheritances that can result in the manifestations of phenomena such as the return of the religious. Moreover, we should be attentive to how the pervasiveness of such inheritances provides for likelihood of such a trajectory. Nonetheless, we need to avoid suggesting that this is inevitable, or that certain approaches should be pursued. Such a response would risks

replicating the forms of democratic sovereignty that the United States pursued after 9/11, undermining and denying the possibilities of the democratic in the name of its defence. Specifically, I want to finish here by emphasizing that if 'hope' is to be located in the media it is to be located in its disruptive dissonances rather specific forms of alternatives or resistances. The latter risks short-circuiting ongoing practices of sharing, and subsequently the chance of a more hospitable politics. As such, I would instead draw attention to the religious question of the link; of the moment at which faith opens up to difference, to different forms of knowledge, before affirmation. Ultimately this means addressing the conditions and limits of what is understood by the secret, the project that I have attempted to pursue in my previous sections in this chapter.

Conclusion

By examining Derrida's writings on the media – or rather 'teletechnologies' – I have worked in this chapter to consider what I think is the most challenging sphere of politics. Of all three thematic locations of politics that I investigate in this thesis, I suggest that it is his Derrida's discussion of the media – or rather teletechnology – that is the most pressing, for three principle reasons. Firstly, this is because the media is integral to the problem that I set out at the beginning of this thesis; that developments in media technologies have conditioned politic in the profound ways. Secondly, while Derrida's approach suggests that we should not be as pessimistic as the theorists that I discuss in Chapter One, in particular Theodor Adorno and Fredric Jameson, but also in a more complex sense Walter Benjamin and Jean Baudrillard, Derrida identifies issues that help to explain the violence of contemporary political extremisms. But also, thirdly, that an analysis of the media presents us with some of the most original and sophisticated rebuttals to assumptions

about political sovereignty. In Section One I open up my consideration of the significance of the media for the political that Derrida sets out by focusing upon how we approach the media by way of its relationship with the discrete – and therefore secret – acts of political economy of filtering, selecting, and privileging.

By focusing upon the relationship between the media and its discrete acts of decision making I suggest that there is a particular relationship between Derrida's work on the media and his work on inheritance. With an emphasis upon concepts like the secret and inheritance, my attention therefore turns to the relationship that Derrida explores between the media and the religious, as a question of origins. In Section Two I examine how Derrida explores the ramifications of these arguments through an analysis of how they intersect with considerations of the inheritance of Christianity, and specifically Protestant evangelistic Christianity found emanating from the United States. I discuss his argument that of all the Abrahamic religions, the developments in teletechnologies indicate the development of a globalised Christianity because of the particular emphasis in other religions upon the role of the secret. While the secret is also at play in the teletechnological and in Christianity, Derrida suggests that it is of very different dynamic that stresses the establishment of a new political community. It is an attempt to articulate some of the characteristics of this new community that I explore in Section Three.

In this section I shape the new teletechnological affiliation around the tensions that arise from the possibilities of their particularly spectral conditions. For in this section I explore Derrida's suggestion that teletechnologies have played a crucial role in facilitating the rise of extremisms that both conjure experiences of the 'violent sundering' of 'originary *physis*', and, as such, also conjure counter-fetishistic phantasms. The responsible response

to such a scenario is what I attempt to set out in Section Four, which is also the promise of the teletechnologies. For Derrida ultimately argues that a notion of teletechnological affiliation is a contradiction that is increasingly destabilising not only the concept of the political, but also the possibilities of its boundaries that make the concept relevant. In this sense teletechnologies are making the most sophisticated contribution to the 'diastema' that characterises what Derrida identifies at the heart of 'democracy', that democracy is ultimately 'to come'. It is this approach that I seek to defend in my next and final chapter, exposing the arguments that I have researched in my previous chapters to three specific takes on Derrida's legacy, and contribution to responding to a spectrality such as that of the 2008 global financial crisis.

CHAPTER SIX: REFLECTIONS

Introduction

In my previous substantive chapters I have explored a deconstructive, expositional approach that aims to be what Derrida calls 'more than critical' (Derrida, 2001a, p. 26). I have investigated Derrida's proposal that an ethico-political project can be served by deconstructing specific issues and events such as the spectrality of the 2008 global financial crisis by turning to questions of inheritance to explore the terrain of the political. In doing so I have examined the political in the traditional sense of its relationship with government and the nation-state, scholarship, and the media. In each chapter I have developed my examination of questions of spectres and inheritance to work to identify the locations and means of political interventions. Moreover, it has engaged with Derrida's argument that attention be placed upon the condition of sovereignty rather than idealising certain forms of resistance or suffering. This has led me to engage with Derrida's arguments about the significance of the inheritance of an interaction between faith and knowledge – the 'two sources' (2002a). So, this thesis has taken the crisis of 2008 as a starting point and a provocation but is has made a case for an engagement with theories of inheritance to progress from that starting point.

In this chapter I work to take a step back and reflect upon my findings. I do so by consulting the works of three writers, Richard Beardsworth, Bernard Stiegler, and Michael Naas, that reach very different conclusions to those that I develop and in relation to the three themes that frame my previous substantive chapters. In the case of Beardsworth (on the politics of the nation-state) and Stiegler (on scholarship) they present critiques of Derrida's work, while in the case of Michael Naas he presents a

distinct approach to the question of inheritance and the significance of the media. Subsequently I divide this chapter into three sections, one for each of my previous three chapters. With a more recent text by Richard Beardsworth that makes a case for a cosmopolitan political project. With the work of Bernard Stiegler I examine an argument against Derrida's emphasis upon scholarship in the sense of an attention to knowledge, and in favour of the development of a project of education. Finally, with from Michael Naas I discuss a novel and extensively researched project that has explored the relationship between Derrida's work on the media and its relationship to Derrida's considerations of the inheritances of the religious and the rational.

In section one I set out Richard Beardsworth's arguments against Derrida that there needs to be a stronger commitment to cosmopolitanism that acknowledges their progressive contributions to defending and strengthening the rights of citizens in contemporary societies. In response I argue that this overlooks some very important questions that Derrida raises about the limitations of cosmopolitanism, and how this feeds into an argument about the contribution of expanding the scope of the political to include knowledge and the media. In section two I examine how Bernard Stiegler develops an argument education over scholarship on the basis of a very different interpretation of deconstruction that questions Derrida's faith in the disruptive role of différance. In doing so I agree with Geoffrey Bennington's argument that this overlooks the role of the trace in Derrida's conception of différance, before considering how this leads to a somewhat didactic approach to knowledge. Finally, after setting out how Michael Naas opens up important questions about the relationship between the media and the religious, I suggest

that he risks abrogating responsibility to a certain messianicity that plays around the technological representation of events.

1. Richard Beardsworth: Hospitality and Cosmopolitanism

In Chapter One I discuss Richard Beardsworth's *Derrida and the Political* (1996) as a means of reflecting upon a reading of Derrida's engagement with the political, and because this concern is so central to the book. On the one hand I argue that this text makes important contributions to approaching Derrida's relationship with politics by way of its consideration of Derrida's relationship with key theorists of political modernity (Kant and Hegel), and theorists that have made a key contribution to theorising postmodernity (Heidegger and Levinas). However, on the other hand, I also argue that Beardsworth's criticisms of Derrida's engagement with politics are somewhat unfair, and problematic in their own terms. Specifically, I argue, by way of a counter-argument by Geoffrey Bennington (2000) that Beardsworth's criticisms of Derrida's approach to 'the gift', 'choice', and 'inheritance' are somewhat deterministic and didactic. Why then return to Beardsworth? Firstly, to reflect upon the specific interventions that Derrida suggests, and what we might suggest in response to the global financial crisis, and secondly, because in his more text, *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory* (2011), Beardsworth undertakes a critique of Derrida's engagement with cosmopolitanism and the nation-state as a site of reasoned exchange that I focus upon in Chapter Three.

So, this section is an attempt to reflect upon Derrida's examination of the institutions of politics in the traditional sense of the political and his work on their possibilities and limitations for facilitating justice. Before considering the argument that Beardsworth pursues in relation to cosmopolitanism I will recap the critique that he sets out in *Derrida*

and the Political and how his later text builds upon this. Beardsworth's main concern with Derrida in the earlier text is that he fails to sustain attention to the significance of what Beardsworth refers to as 'originary technicity' (1996, p. 151). What Beardsworth means by this is that when Derrida emphasises the irreducibility of metaphysics to time, he does not give enough attention to the manner in which metaphysics is made possible, and, subsequently conditioned, by technical apparatuses. Beardsworth acknowledges that with concepts such as différance and iterability Derrida explores the issue of original technicity and that he deploys this framework in his later works that discuss the politics of the nation-state and democracy explicitly. However, Beardsworth also argues that Derrida fails to go far enough in exploring how original technicity affects the condition of the political.

In *Spectres of Marx*, Beardsworth suggests, Derrida's discussion of how politics is destabilised by contemporary spectral effects fails to consider that these developments have the capacity to transform the impact of deconstruction upon an alternative, more inclusive political project (1996, pp. 147-148). For Beardsworth the problem underpinning this issue is that Derrida's emphasis on the trace undermines the responsibility for taking decisions – for choosing the 'lesser violence' (1996, p. 154). Picking up his critique of Derrida in *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory*, Beardsworth argues that a cosmopolitan political theory can provide just such a means of identifying decisions. However, in doing so he contrasts his approach to cosmopolitanism from that of Derrida – the cosmopolitanism that I suggest in Chapter Three might provide a means of responding to the spectrality of the global financial crisis of 2008.

Unpacking the contradiction that Derrida sets out within democracy (its 'autoimmune' condition of 'diastema'), Beardsworth identifies two discrete 'aporia' relating to: 1) the rights of the individual versus the integrity of the collective; and 2) the undertaking of deliberation versus the act of taking a decision (2011, p. 195). The significance of these aporia for Beardsworth is that they show that Derrida's cosmopolitanism, with its emphasis upon exchanges more generally rather than in relation to specific subjects, and emphasis upon deconstruction to inform more inclusive decisions, is idealistic, overly focused on abstract philosophical concerns with 'choice and limit', and provides an alibi for political irresponsibility (2011, pp. 197-198). So, by contrast, Beardsworth emphasises how an encounter with law involves a much more discrete engagement with the 'modern conditions of life' (2011, p. 201). More specifically, Beardsworth identifies three subsequent issues. Firstly, that contemporary liberal law involves negotiations of 'difference, freedom, and empowerment in complex societies', and that 'there is nothing essentially "normalizing" or "dominating" about this principle' (2011, p. 203). Beardsworth therefore makes an even more pronounced break from Derrida's concern with the violence of metaphysics.

Secondly, Beardsworth suggests that because liberal law has developed in tandem with scientific, technological, and economic developments in society more generally, there needs to be a closer attention to empirical conditions. As a consequence, he suggests that Derrida's 'understanding of singularity and of political risk', pinned to debates about metaphysics, also overlooks how the conception of 'the sovereign individual' is also tied to political modernity through its relationship with law (2011, p. 203). As such Beardsworth suggests that Derrida neglects the possibilities that are presented by the

singular subject or citizen. Thirdly and finally, while Beardsworth acknowledges that liberal law risks dissolving discussions about the relationship between liberty and equality, he suggests that, as deconstruction would suggest, 'the other is, in the language of deconstruction, "always already" in the liberal self' (2011, pp. 203-204). As a consequence, this relationship can be drawn out through careful attention, particularly to acts of 'reciprocity and obligation' (2011, pp. 203-204). Thus, working to identify and improve these interactions, Beardsworth calls for 'progressive liberal cosmopolitanism' (2011, pp. 203-204).

For Beardsworth, Derrida's acceptance of cosmopolitanism is simplistic (2011, p. 208). He argues that the aporias that Derrida attributes to democracy, and by extension cosmopolitanism, are pinned to Aristotle's characterisations of liberty and equality, and not contemporary technoscientific society (2011, p. 208). Contemporary conceptions of liberty and equality are not dependent upon Aristotle's conceptions of how they conflict with each other, on the basis of a divide between the individual and society, but rather that they are considered as interwoven and interdependent concepts, with the individual made possible by the community, and the community made possible by the individual (2011, p. 208). As a result, Beardsworth also argues that this has repercussions for Derrida's theory of unconditional hospitality. This is because he argues that we 'should therefore not equate, as Derrida does, incalculable singularity with freedom, and moral, legal and political calculation with equality' (2011, p. 208). So, for Beardsworth unconditional hospitality does not equate to freedom, and the law does not equate to equality, it is a far more nuanced scenario with particular acts of political interaction and reciprocity.

Beardsworth claims that Derrida's conception of unconditional singularity is a 'hyperbolic understanding of politics' that attempts at being tied to a more 'specific understanding of politics, found in 'formal or numerical equality' (2011, p. 209). By not attempting to identify what determines unconditional hospitality, Beardsworth suggests that Derrida allows singularity to ride free of determination, and ignore how cosmopolitanism conceptualises social differentiation (2011, p. 209). Thus, if Derrida favours the perfection of law, he undermines it by focusing upon such an abstract conception of the political (2011, p. 210). Here Beardsworth refers again to his sympathy for the Hegelian emphasis upon speculation that he refers to in *Derrida and the Political* by stating that he favours the 'Hegelian understanding that conceptual limits provide for the possibility of difference' (2011, p. 219). He finds it problematic that Derrida refuses to speculate upon the constitution of that which is radically other to the law (2011, p. 220). Here Beardsworth turns to Derrida's 'On Cosmopolitanism'. Calling out Derrida's argument that cosmopolitanism is characterised by a limited offer of hospitality, Beardsworth suggests that 'rather than developing a bolder cosmopolitan right of resort, Derrida emphasizes, from a philosophical perspective, the aporetic logic of hospitality through which all more inclusive inventions of hospitality must necessarily pass' (2011, p. 220).

The conclusion that Beardsworth reaches here, as in *Derrida and the Political*, is that Derrida retains a certain Heideggerian impulse with his emphasis upon conceptions like the promise of différance, the 'gift', democracy *to come*, and unconditional hospitality (2011, p. 221). Specifically, he argues that Derrida's commitment to unconditional hospitality is adequate for aesthetic creativity or technical invention, but not for political interventions, arguing that politics, by contrast, recognises that it takes place 'in a field of

differently weighted, mobile forces' (2011, p. 221). For Beardsworth politics is bound up with limitations in ways that aesthetics and technicity are not. Thus, the paradox of deconstruction is that, in wishing to prevent mastery and domination, it runs the risk of reproducing it by *not* contesting it in determined ways' (2011, p. 221). It is not enough to rely upon the deconstruction of sovereignty, there needs to be a greater engagement with decision-making and leadership:

> Given the nature of global problems and over-delimited nation-state politics, to forge an ethos and politics of less democratic hypocrisy and greater cooperation between developed and developing nations requires the risk of more global determinations and more leadership. (2011, p. 221)

Now, as I discuss in Chapter One, Geoffrey Bennington has argued that Beardsworth's confidence in defining the conditions of the current technoscientific epoch have two problems. Firstly, there is Bennington's accusation that Beardsworth's claims about the effects of contemporary technoscience are deterministic and deny the role of decision (in the service of the 'lesser violence'), to the point of being fatalistic. But, secondly, I also discuss Bennington's argument that Beardsworth overlooks Derrida's contributions to examining the implications of technology as well as Derrida's linking of spectrality to inheritance. Bennington notes, as I have attempted to pursue in my previous chapters, that the figure of the spectre is not just a figure that haunts but is a concept that helps to frame the constitution and limitations of figurations of sovereignty. What then might be added to this discussion that I do not already address in Chapter Three? My suggestion here is that while Beardsworth pins his theory of cosmopolitanism to real material conditions in a way that evokes Bennington's criticism, he nonetheless raises a question

about whether Derrida's cosmopolitanism sufficiently links the examination of inheritance to a political project and is therefore as practical as Derrida suggests.

To set up my consideration of Derrida's linking of inheritance and cosmopolitanism I will begin by briefly recapping my discussion about how he attributes significance to the question of inheritance, the types of inheritance that he draws attention to, and the types of inheritance that I emphasise in response to the spectrality of the global financial crisis. Specifically, I draw attention to Derrida's response to 9/11 in 'Autoimmunity' as a means of opening up the significance and difficulties of considering inheritance for a political project. I discuss Derrida's general claim that the spectacular nature of the attacks places demands upon knowledge, how they rejuvenate the production of spectral effects in the West – and specifically the United States – and more substantially questions about terror and sovereignty, crucial questions of the political. In so doing I suggest that 9/11 provides an important source of comparison for responding to the crisis of 2008. I examine Derrida's argument that a media spectacle such as 9/11 involves an act of terror not only in the sense of the actual loss of life, but the disturbance brought to knowledge. As such Derrida raises broader questions about the relationship between the symbolic, inheritance, and the political, since the inheritance of terror is sovereignty, a key concept for politics, is intimately woven with the inheritance of threat.

I therefore examine how Derrida's work on the relationship between inheritance, terror, and sovereignty makes a particularly significant contribution to his examination of the political more generally. I discuss his proposals that a careful attention to the history of terror, via a consideration of inheritance, provides the basis for a more nuanced approach that is vital for articulating how the ambiguity of the Bush administration's description of

terrorism, and declaration of Global War on Terror, provided considerable latitude for an expansive US foreign policy. However, by suggesting that the repetition of rhetoric and imagery has a terroristic quality because of its disruption of knowledge, Derrida also opens up more significant questions about the nature and location of the political in ways that hint how the spectrality of an event such as 9/11 – or the global financial crisis of 2008 – can intensify it. I explain that, by deconstructing the inheritance of terror Derrida also opens up a question about the relationship between politics in the traditional sense of governments and nation-states, and the symbolic domain, such as the media. Thus, he emphasises the importance of a responsibility towards examining inheritance on the basis of an empirically concerned proposal that the restriction of an engagement with inheritance is at the heart of the threat facing political interventions. For this reason, alongside the deconstruction of terror, Derrida also undertakes a deconstruction of other concepts that are integral to the contemporary nation-state and the restriction of the political, such as credit, debt, belief, faith, religiosity, tolerance, and, of particular significance here, cosmopolitanism.

Thus, while 'Autoimmunity' includes some speculations about the types of inheritances that will be called upon in response to the global financial crisis of 2008 (the dominance of the United States including its government, media, law, and particular onto-theological traditions), my attention subsequently turns to 'Force of Law', a text that involves a far more sustained analysis of the relationship between inheritance and the political. As I explain, this text is also of interest to Beardsworth. He suggests that it is a rare instance where Derrida emphasises the political in contrast to the 'gift' that is found in literature and aesthetics. As such Beardsworth ultimately suggests that this is not enough of an

intervention since it fails to consider the impact of contemporary technoscientific society. However, by contrast, I argue that Derrida's discussion in 'Force of Law' of the relationship between sovereignty and deconstruction – that sovereignty (or rather law) makes deconstruction possible – provides the basis for Derrida's discussion of the troubled future of the nation-state, in *Spectres of Marx,* and particularly in *Rogues*, as well as his proposals about the proliferation of ethnic, racial, biological, and gendered violence.

More specifically (and again an emphasis upon inheritance is vital here) is the manner in which Derrida discusses how the nation-state and these phenomena are bound up with a condition of what he calls 'autoimmunity'. With this concept Derrida suggests that what is problematic is the secretion of the religious, with its implications in tow, by way of the proliferation of the technological (and specifically teletechnological). Indeed, Derrida suggests the contemporary return of the religious needs to be considered in terms of a passage by way of the technological inscription of the religious (as opposed to the religious directly). As such, Derrida suggests that if we examine contemporary technical apparatuses at a remove from their theocratic inheritance (from law and politics to the teletechnologies of the media) we risk ignoring how they are subject to deconstruction. Furthermore, I explain that for Derrida this is not only problematic from a detached, intellectual point of view. Rather, I explain that it provides a means of considering how he moved towards his later interventions in contemporary politics, to the point at which, despite significant reservations, he is willing to support the acts of nation-states, a cosmopolitan political project, and therefore components of liberal democracy under certain conditions.

Here Derrida suggests that a cosmopolitan politics, the politics of the city (the precursor to the state), and the nation-state, can provide moments of exchange that explicitly inscribe responsibilities. The problem being that these moments of exchange are being disrupted by developments in contemporary technologies and ideologies, but Derrida also suggests that liberal democratic institutions can provide a 'bulwark' against these developments. Subject to deconstruction they are 'perfectible'. However, as I also set out, Derrida makes substantial arguments against liberal democracy, cosmopolitanism, tolerance, and the liberal democratic nation-state. This revolves around his proposals about the concept of hospitality, and more specifically the implications of the spectre of 'unconditional hospitality'. His suggestion being that the institutions of liberal democracy restrict the encounter with unconditional hospitality in ways that ultimately provide the basis for an autoimmune reaction.

For Derrida the defence of democracy is contradictory. Essential to democracy, in its marrying of commons (*demos*) and rule (*cracy*), is its condition of 'diastema'. As such, the institutionalisation of democracy, even before the ideological apparatuses of free market economics are layered on top through liberal democracy, necessarily places limits upon the disruptive character (and promise) of democracy. Specifically, in relation to cosmopolitanism, Derrida is concerned about the way in which the concept suggests, through the reference to the 'cosmos', that it is both possible and desirable to conceptualise the conditions of the world, despite accepting difference and the role of faith. That is, an idealistic framework that is maintained from St Paul through to Kant and today's neoliberalism. Derrida's response is therefore to focus upon the intersection of the political and that which it prohibits; that which is 'unconditional'. This calls for a

project that engages with politics but must also go beyond it, taking place in society, economics, technology, and other diverse fields that are too diverse to summarise. In short, it calls for the significance of scholarship and the university, the line of enquiry I pursue in Chapter Four.

So, my suggestion here is that Beardsworth neglects some very important problems that Derrida raises with cosmopolitanism, but also how Derrida takes a rather unsentimental view of the implications of the trace, the spectre, and subsequently unconditional hospitality. In relation to Beardsworth's claim that Derrida is inattentive to the question of the individual subject and the promise of phenomena of reciprocity, obligation, and responsibility, I want to again emphasise here the importance of inheritance in Derrida's work. This approach leads me to suggest that Beardsworth's approach to cosmopolitanism does not really offer a radical supplement to the conditional support that Derrida lends to it. However, more substantially, I argue that Derrida's hesitance around the concept of cosmopolitanism and human identity more broadly – through his attention to a politics of memory, inheritance, and 'unconditional hospitality' – opens up the possibility of a more substantial contribution to encouraging contemporary political engagement that is particularly important in the context of responding to the spectrality of an event such as that of the global financial crisis of 2008.

In response to Beardsworth's argument that to focus a democratic politics upon unconditional hospitality is fanciful, I think that this overlooks the manner in which Derrida does not set out unconditional hospitality as a project but rather an articulation of the spectral. Given that Beardsworth references Derrida's short essay 'On Cosmopolitanism' it seems surprising that he does not focus upon Derrida's argument

that 'one cannot speak of cultivating an ethic of hospitality' (2001c, p. 15). Rather, Derrida argues that hospitality always involves a haunting of the home – a tension between conditional and unconditional hospitality – such that ethics, if we are to take it to mean 'one's home', is 'thoroughly coextensive with the experience of hospitality', such that '*ethics is hospitality*' (2001c, pp. 16-17, italics in original). But this approach is, in turn, underpinned by Derrida's emphasis upon examining inheritance. As abstract from contemporary political considerations as this might seem (as Beardsworth suggests), I argue that Derrida's approach provokes vital questions about the impact of terror, the event, sovereignty, the ways in which the politics are troubled by questions of the unconditional, what this means for scholarship, and how the domains of the symbolic and the media are perhaps the most subtle locations of the political decision making.

2. **Bernard Stiegler; Scholarship and Education**

In my previous section I therefore work to counter Beardsworth's criticisms of a Derridean approach to the crisis by focusing upon the contribution that can be made from attention to inheritance, because of how this broadens an awareness of what the political means, and therefore of the possibilities for political intervention as well. But if Beardsworth commits to the political in the more traditional sense of political theory and international relations theory, Bernard Stiegler presents an alternative intervention that focuses upon the importance of a critical response to scholarship and inheritance. Here, as Geoffrey Bennington suggests, there is a certain similarity with Beardsworth, for they both turn, respectively to politics and scholarship, out of a concern for political urgency (2000, p. 164). Furthermore, Beardsworth draws from Stiegler in *Derrida and the Political* to articulate the importance of a more robust political response to contemporary

technoscientific society (1996, pp. 151-152). Now, I have already set out arguments about the limitations of privileging a particular location of the political in my section on Beardsworth. Nonetheless I wish to examine Stiegler's work here because of the manner in which it raises important questions not only about Derrida's approach to scholarship, but to the significance of inheritance and therefore spectres in responding to a spectrality like that of the crisis of 2008.

In this section I will consider how Stiegler argues that originary technicity demands that political alternatives be explored and pedagogically disseminated, along with other ethical, technical, and economic interventions more generally. But before I focus upon the differences that exist between Stiegler and Derrida in relation to the scholarship and education I think it is important to work with the core theoretical reasons of why Stiegler heads towards the promise of education rather than scholarship. To do this I will focus here upon how Stiegler questions the disruptiveness that Derrida attributes to writing and the grammè in *Of Grammatology*, and which forms the basis of Derrida's subsequent proposals on the deconstructive promise of law, scholarship, and the media that I have explored in my previous chapters. Stiegler's proposal, explored in *Technics and Time I: The Fault of Epimetheus* (1998), is that attention should be placed upon the theoretical possibility of how original technicity suggests that the disruptive promise that Derrida identifies in writing is in turn dependent upon a technical condition that is so absolutely irreducible that it cannot be originally framed in the orthographic manner that Derrida sets out. Moreover, Stiegler justifies this empirically by claiming that the powers of libidinal, cognitive, and virtual technologies over human attention attest to the limits of

political intervention that emphasises the possibilities of the symbolic (Stiegler in Abbinnett, 2015, pp. 67-68).

For brevity I will not examine Stiegler's *Technics and Time I*, but focus on how Stiegler pursues this departure in an explicit fashion in 'Derrida and Technology: Fidelity at the Limits of Deconstruction and the Prosthesis of Faith' (2001). If we bear in mind the emphasis that Derrida places on inheritance, debt, credit, faith, and the secret that I have explored in my previous chapters, Stiegler's claim that of all the ghosts haunting the world today 'one is more haunting than all the others: the crisis in faith, loss of "credit" ' (2001, p. 238). In so doing Stiegler brings into question the emphasis upon inheritance that I take from Derrida's works and apply to the spectrality of 2008. This is not to say that Stiegler ignores the contemporary existence of religious fundamentalisms and '*secular faith*'. Rather, Stiegler suggests that these phenomena are 'convulsive', to the extent that today the predominant experience is one of 'disinheritance and disorientation' (2001, p. 238). So, targeting Derrida's suggestion that writing is originary, and can be determined through a consideration of metaphysics rather than the empirical, he argues that Derrida fails to accommodate a significant difference between writing and technicity (2001, pp. 251-252).

For Stiegler the 'arche-writing' that Derrida sets out in *Of Grammatology* should be distinguished from writing; 'it is not writing: it is the structure of elementary supplementarity' (2001, p. 253). Another translation of this elementary supplementarity is what Stiegler calls a 'quasi-transcendental necessity' of a relationship between being and technology (2001, p. 253). The purpose of this translation lies in Stiegler's attempt to articulate what he views as a 'stricture [within Derrida's work] of prosthesis and faith'

(2001, p. 254). While he argues that Derrida is right to propose that the media – or what Derrida calls teletechnologies – involve a play between faith and technicity, Derrida is wrong in 'Faith and Knowledge' when he equates teletechnology fully with science and reason (2001, p. 259). Fully equating teletechnology with science and reason is problematic for Stiegler because he argues that attention needs to be placed upon how teletechnology is only a very specific form of technics that focuses upon the significance break of the symbolic. Important here is the manner in which Stiegler develops a different approach from Derrida to the work of Edmund Husserl with regards to memory, or 'retention'.

If for Husserl primary retention refers to the perception of certain objects in the short term, and secondary retention refers to the recollection of memories in the long term, Stiegler conceptualises a level of tertiary retention or memory that refers to the way in which primary and secondary retention are only made possible by an amalgamation of the two (see Roberts, 2012). So, there needs to be an attempt to stand back from the symbolic and reflect upon our assumptions and beliefs. It is in this manner that Stiegler argues that 'technics is the condition as much of science and knowledge as of religious faith' (2001, p. 259). But as much as this means that Stiegler is even more sceptical than Derrida in relation to the limitations of the symbolic, it is also here that Stiegler identifies deconstructive promise (2001, p. 259). For Stiegler promise is to be found in the manner in which symbolic, cultural, or 'epiphylogenetic' memory is to be found in the aporia between the symbolic and the irreducibility of original technics (Roberts, 2012, p. 15). Particularly noticeable here is the manner in which he refers to 'arche-belief', in a manner that modifies Derrida's emphasis on arche-writing (Stiegler, 2001, p. 260).

With arche-belief he attempts to articulate the importance of a critical approach to memory that he suggests is absent with Derrida's concept of arche-writing. But as I have already discussed in Chapter Five in relation to the media, Stiegler articulates a different approach to the conception of a 'politics of memory' that Derrida puts forward in *Spectres of Marx*, as well as to hospitality: 'a politics of memory and hospitality – of heritage, adoption and grafting – must consequently be a politics of the supplement, that is, of technics' (2001, p. 261). Thus, Stiegler develops the counter-argument that I touch briefly upon in Chapter Five in which he suggests that we need to put forward a critical response to the contemporary politics of memory, and with it a specific, competent alternative. The event is always irreducible, but to respond to this claim Stiegler suggests that we need to pursue technical or 'prosthetic competence' rather than focus, as Derrida does, upon inheritance (2001, p. 262). How then does Stiegler's differing approach to deconstruction relate to a different approach to scholarship and education?

In *States of Shock: stupidity and knowledge in the 21st century* (2015), and specifically the part of the book titled 'The University with Conditions'; Stiegler presents an explicit riposte to Derrida's 'The University without Condition' (2001a). Here Stiegler argues that attention needs to be on education rather than Derrida's emphasis upon scholarship or 'truth'. However, he also makes an attention to culture integral to his approach, albeit not cultural studies as a discipline. In this text Stiegler translates his suggestion of the empirical disruption of the symbolic into his approach to the university. Specifically, he does so by approaching the role of the university in formulating competent prosthetic forms, and how it ties in with a more general promotion of an 'intergenerational' cultural transmission of competency, as he sets out in *Taking Care of Youth and the Generations*

(2008). For Stiegler the purpose is not the development of truth or sovereignty, as Derrida argues, but a more practical question of how successive generations are to be incorporated into the technical apparatuses of existing society. Thus, Stiegler encourages an intervention in this moment of incorporation. This means focusing upon how the young are anticipated by capitalism at the level of labour and professionalism, but also at the far more discrete level of the 'corruption of the attentional capacities of youth and childhood by colossal industrial means' (2015, p. 154).

The advancement of technoscientific capitalism has therefore led to a situation of what Stiegler calls 'systemic stupidity' (2015, p. 174). An argument that he also deploys when referring to the global financial crisis of 2008 (2010, p. 45), and more recently the unfolding of global environmental disaster (2018, p. 12). Nonetheless, Stiegler maintains that an alternative is indeed possible within the university. Moreover, Stiegler suggests, in a manner resonant with Derrida's argument that it is through the university is a site of reflection upon sovereignty, for Stiegler it is a site of reflection on the technical. The principle example for Stiegler here is the development of digital technologies. For if quantum mechanics has been the attempt to understand and contribute to the development of nanomachines, for Stiegler this could only have been made possible through endeavours that, if not strictly referred to as such at the time, can nonetheless be conceptualised after the fact as 'digital humanities, software studies, web science, digital studies, [and] philosophical engineering' (2015, p. 160). However, unlike with Derrida, Stiegler suggests that the reflection upon sovereignty does not derive from a deconstruction of conditions, or acts 'without condition', but rather that 'academic freedom is always a conditional freedom' (2015, p. 170).

By focusing upon the *conditions* of the university, as opposed to its encounter with unconditionality, Stiegler therefore suggests that we can more proactively explore the possibilities of a relationship between the inside of the university and its outside, an impetus that Derrida, Stiegler suggests that it is actually particularly lucid in 'The University without Condition', in relation to the interdisciplinary engagement between the humanities and the sciences (2015, p. 210). Stiegler argues that promise is to be found in intergenerational cultural activities – even Facebook – where anyone is invited to a 'banquet where all are equal' in the companionship of the techno-logical symposium that is now being woven by digital tertiary retention' (2015, p. 210). But he tempers this enthusiasm by returning to the issue of the disintegration of credit that he discusses in 'Derrida and Technology' (2015, p. 218). His response is therefore to call for a 'rethinking' of all 'retentional practices', such as those highlighted above, and to educate as wide an audience as possible in how to use them (2015, p. 220).

So, the question that I will focus on here is whether Stiegler's argument that the possibilities of scholarship depend upon a critical and robust cultural-political project escapes the critique of Beardsworth's cosmopolitanism that I set out in section one. That is, whether Stiegler also restricts the scope of the political. Before I will consider my findings in Chapter Four, I will briefly touch on Geoffrey Bennington's reading of Stiegler's work, since I think this helps to set up a comparison. Specifically, I focus here upon Bennington's arguments that there are issues with how Stiegler privileges technics that result in positivistic approaches to techno-science and questions of the human (2000, p. 168). Key for Bennington here are 'misreadings' that centre upon Derrida's conception of différance (2000, pp. 167-168). For Stiegler, Bennington notes, Derrida overlooks how

différance coalesces in specific positions about '*physis*' – about physical experience, and therefore about life and death (2000, pp. 168-170). The misreading that Bennington identifies therefore focuses upon the notion that, 'the "logical" presentation of *différance* should be sufficient to show that no concept can attain to the value of "presence", and that this situation is (logically) originary' (2000, p. 171, italics in original).

Now, this does not mean that Bennington discards Stiegler's work entirely. He suggests that Stiegler's investigations into the capacity of contemporary techno-science to displace traditional forms of inheritance are vital contributions, and that his attention to technicity rather than the orthographic allows him to open up these questions. Nonetheless, he also suggests that this overlooks how Derrida's attention to the trace and différance not only already permit this approach but provide the basis for an ongoing project that the necessity to foreclose around original technicity prohibits (2000, p. 171). So, in this sense my intention in the rest of this section is to consider how Derrida's approach provides the basis for a more inclusive response to the crisis that is not sentimental about its possibilities but, rather, attentive to how the emphasis upon the need for specific critical approaches and specific alternative approaches has restrictive implications for examining the implications of scholarship. To do this I will refocus my attention on Derrida's argument that the very existence of scholarship – even in its most complicit relationship with power – involves a tacit acknowledgement of sovereignty's limitations.

I explain his argument that while this means that the pursuit of scholarship is derived from attempts to negotiate the limits of sovereignty, and an opening up to an alternative, directs attention to the enabling of new sovereign forms (such as in globalised capitalism, technoscientific capitalism, technoscientific forms of control, ideology, and religiosity).

Thus, as with cosmopolitanism, the orthographic component of scholarship provides the basis for new unforeseen forms of deconstruction, that require examination most significantly in the development of discourses and practices of human rights, hence the significance for Derrida of the humanities. Derrida is attentive to how this raises certain problems with regards to traditional notions of empiricity and ontology, and subsequently for articulating with any certainty the significance of particular kinds of inheritance. Nonetheless, for Derrida the way through this difficulty rests, I explain, in the three elements that Derrida identifies in the spectre: *mourning*, *language*, and *work*. So, the confluence of these three conditions makes for Derrida's examination of spectral politics.

In this way Derrida suggests that we are faced with a field of inquiry that disrupts the conventional scholarly project of observation found with positivism. However, in a key difference with Stiegler, Derrida argues, by way of a critique of Marx's approach to spectres, that we should avoid privileging certain spectres over others. It is this emphasis upon certain types of spectrality that Derrida pins to the out of joint, and how, in turn, it provides the basis for a project that promises, mistakenly, the possibility of a joining, coming together, or more credible economy. I explain that Derrida draws from Heidegger's proposals on the violence of metaphysics to make this point but, in turn, is cautious to acknowledge how Heidegger uses this framework to articulate a destructive framework that culminates most problematically with Heidegger's intellectual supplement to Nazism. This destructiveness is counteracted by Derrida with his argument that the privileging of certain spectres can be permitted on the condition that they are axiomatics that provide the basis for further meditations on sovereignty. Here a recourse

to Marx and Marxism become reasonable, since they make so many interventions in everyday life and propositions about how to open up to them.

Principally, my focus in Chapter Five is upon the manner in which Derrida draws from Marx's emphasis upon capitalism to theorise the conditioning of spectral effects, and how this in turn affects Derrida's approach to scholarship. Specifically, Derrida's attention is upon the manner in which the intersection of contemporary technoscientific capitalism with scholarship and spectrality manifests in the emphasis upon new forms of confession. With confession, he argues, we find a series of reactions against the threat of intellectual marginalisation, such that scholarship can exacerbate the problems of technoscientific capitalism as much as it is conditioned by it. To intervene here Derrida articulates a distinction between confession and a very specific reading of 'profession'. While profession is more commonly articulated in terms of uniquely skilled employment, Derrida identifies an alternative meaning that alludes to a singular, idiomatic act of performance. That is, a self-aware act that recognizes the limitations of performativity. That said, Derrida also emphasizes that the emphasis upon profession faces a particular challenge from the authority of confession. Specifically, Derrida refers to how confession is particularly given significance through its articulation in work.

But if Derrida emphasizes the idiomatic, we are returned to the question of how he approaches a 'politics of memory'. That is, that we should be very careful about supporting certain types of scholarly projects or, as Stiegler suggests, 'prosthetic competence'. For when Derrida articulates the need for a new humanities, and for interaction between such a new humanities and the natural, medical, and physical sciences, he does so on the proviso that they reflect upon the concept of the human that extends from the questions

of the limits of sovereignty and spectrality. That said, in my examination of Derrida's privileging of a humanities to come that resists identification in contemporary academic disciplines and departments, I argue that just as he places an emphasis upon the university, we might extend this gesture to cultural studies, despite, as I mention in Chapter Four, how explicitly opposed Derrida was to the field. My suggestion here being that through cultural studies we are faced with a field of study that combines a number of concerns that Derrida gestures towards being important. It combines a reflection upon the limits of approaches to politics within political theory and political science, with an engagement with communities at the margins of established political discourses, with an attention to the secretion of the political through the media, and with an attention to symbolic exchange. Now, Derrida would hardly be resistant to this. Indeed, in a similar discussion in *Echographies of Television* about technologies of editing he concurs with Stiegler about the need to promote skills in this area. However, he is also sceptical in this interview about how a top-down approach conditions unexpected encounters with the unconditional.

I am particularly attentive here to Stiegler's articulation of widespread 'systemic stupidity', and how this serves as a call for a politics of education. Systemic stupidity seems irrefutable when faced with the short-sightedness of various foreign interventions, environmental ruin, disregard for biodiversity, and, reinvestment in the very economic systems that played a key role in bringing about the global financial crisis of 2008. Yet, I am hesitant here about the political efficacy of deploying accusations of stupidity. Specifically, I am concerned about what the conjuring of stupidity means for forms of prosthetic competency (or what we might call intelligence) that does not fit neatly with

what Stiegler speculates as being important. Here, instead, I would suggest that we turn to Derrida's new humanities and university to come, and to a deconstructive cultural studies. Specifically, I want to emphasise how, by articulating the of unconditionality and spectrality, Derrida promotes interdisciplinary encounters that make possible can enable the new forms of prosthetic competency that Stiegler sees as so important. Meanwhile, I think it is important to consider the lessons that cultural studies provides in relation to the with about a Western-centric notions of knowledge, and how an emphasis upon prosthetic competency conditions the implications of something – as discussed in *Echographies of Television* – like the video footage of the assault of Rodney King, or coverage of a financial crisis and its aftermath.

3. Michael Naas: Underworlds

In this thesis I therefore focus upon the tension between inheritance and contemporary phenomena, and this tension becomes particular amplified in relation to contemporary advances in media technologies. More specifically, I focus upon how teletechnologies involve the secretion of the political. Here Michael Naas is helpful because of the manner in which he refers, in *Miracle and Machine* (2012), to the 'underworlds and afterlives' of the religion, science, and the media (2012, p. 197). In Chapter One I turn to this text because of its emphasis upon Derrida's relationship with the media. However, here my attention is upon articulating the *unsentimental* Derrida that I depict in my previous two sections. In doing so I identify three aspects to Naas' text that are different from my reading of Derrida's work. Firstly, I discuss how Naas undertakes a sort of *volte-face* in relation to his deconstruction of the logocentric through the media by turning to the 'underworlds and afterlives' of the onto-theological dynamic that shapes contemporary

teletechnologies (2012, p. 197). Secondly, I discuss how Naas substantiates this turn through the deployment of exemplary texts and events. Thirdly I suggest that these approaches risk a withdrawal of responsibility to considering inheritance.

From the outset this thesis has articulated, firstly by way of critical and cultural theory and then by way of Derrida more specifically, upon the norms, traditions, and practices of society. This thesis has turned attention from the specifics of the 2008 global financial crisis to inheritances by way of the concept of the spectre. And yet, here I suggest an unease with Naas' suggestion that something is *going on under the surface*. In particular I am concerned about an injunction this brings to delimit a speculative component to investigating spectres. My reference here is Derrida's hesitance at the beginning of *Spectres of Marx* to give figuration to certain spectres, preferring instead to work with the concept of the spectre as a means of responding to issues of oppression and marginalisation by considering the role of différance. This approach, I suggest here, is in contrast to Naas' emphasis upon specific figurations, including the specific figurations of autoimmunity that Naas identifies in Don DeLillo's *Cosmopolis* and the secularism of Europe in *Derrida From Now On* (2008) (that I set out in Chapter One).

My approach to this discussion here is by way of Naas' privileging of certain texts. Firstly, Derrida's and secondly the novels of Don DeLillo. Specifically, I am concerned here with the gestures to privileged texts and examples that limits a critical, deconstructive engagement. Now, I do not have the space here to undertake a comprehensive analysis of Naas' work, but then my intention in this chapter is not to defend Derrida or attack Beardsworth, Stiegler, and Naas. Rather, my intention is to further reflect upon the contributions of Derrida's work. Specifically, I want to focus here upon how Derrida's

approach to messianic promise by comparing it with Naas' priveliging of certain texts and ideas, such as Derrida's essay 'Faith and Knowledge' in *Miracle and Machine* (2012), the significance of the event, and the spectacular mass-media event.

My concern begins with Naas' suggestion that Derrida's 'Faith and Knowledge' is important because it 'condenses a great deal of Derrida's prior work and anticipates much of his work in the decade to follow', to the point at which Naas 'will try to demonstrate in what follows, an absolutely crucial essay, a text *charnière*, as one says in French, for understanding not just Derrida's work on religion but his work as a whole' (2012, pp. 1-2). Naas' suggestion here is that 'by reading an exemplary text such as this one as closely, critically, and patiently as possible, in its spirit and in its letter, one will be much better prepared to read Derrida elsewhere on other themes and in other contexts' (2012, p. 2). In so doing Naas appears to take a very different approach to deconstruction that I have read in Derrida's work and which I have been pursuing in this thesis. As such, my attention turns here to the manner in which Naas engages with the concept of deconstruction. Alluding to the encounter with the unconditional that frames my understanding of deconstruction, Naas explains that he works with 'Faith and Knowledge' in conjunction with other texts by Derrida to consider how it is 'immediately compromised and multiplied, automatically divided' (2012, p. 5).

However, he approaches the text as 'my ''original source'' ', and its compromising, multiplication, and division is accompanied by the intention to consider how it works 'to engulf or inscribe other texts' (2012, p. 5). More explicitly, he asserts that:

> Deconstruction can continue to work today only by being repeated, reread in its letter, and transplanted elsewhere, uprooted and translated into other idioms, grafted onto other contexts, reformatted according to other protocols,

> taken out of its original context and, sometimes, brought closer to "home". (2012, p. 8)

For Naas this means bringing deconstruction to his specific home – to America. Naas recognises that America is 'a ''privileged'' reference for Derrida in ''Faith and Knowledge'' and elsewhere, particularly with regard to the relationship between religion, globalization, global media, and the hegemony of the Anglo-American idiom' (2012, pp. 7-8). However, his emphasis upon America derives from his take on deconstruction that emphasizes repetition over inheritance; the framework of analysis that I utilise in my reading of deconstruction. To set this out in more detail I will turn here to the way in which Naas supplements the privileging of 'Faith and Knowledge' with the privileging of the novels of Don DeLillo.

In *Miracle and Machine* Naas turns his attention to DeLillo's 1997 novel *Underworld*. From the outset then, I retain the concern that Naas presents such a text as an exemplar. But rather than repeat my concern here I will focus upon the tension that I identify between Naas' emphasis upon the roles of religion and the media respectively. First of all, I want to draw attention to the way in which Naas' argues that DeLillo explores the presence of the miraculous in American culture and society, and how 'the ghosts in the machine can lead not only to the miracle of an unrepeatable event but to mass delusions or unimaginable mass destruction' (2012, p. 8). In this line I identify a reference to the progressive messianicity that Derrida formulates in democracy to come (the chance of the 'unrepeatable event') and the hollowing out of the eventness of the event (with 'mass delusions'). However, I have reservations about the promise of Naas' uncovering of the role of the religious.

To examine this reservation, I will jump in the following paragraphs between Naas' comments on *Underworld* in his text's Prologue, two Interludes, and Epilogue. In his Prologue he sets out how *Underworld* introduces 'an American prophesy followed up by an American tale of faith and knowledge, testimony and technology, the miracle and the machine' (2012, p. 13). More specifically, Naas refers to a prophecy that would not 'generally be recognized to be a religious text', nor 'about the future, about some future event that has not yet taken place' (2013, p. 13). Rather, it is a prophecy that 'is promised one day to come to pass' (2013, p. 13). That is, a society that is dominated by the expectation of the event (I am tempted to think here of Baudrillard's infamous comment on the 9/11 terrorists, that 'at a pinch we can say that they *did it*, but we *wished for it*' (2002, p. 5). The beauty of literature therefore being that there is a capability to engage with the underworld of spectrality with a flexibility that is not present with news or "live" footage; with history. History is therefore always playing catch up. In this context the *catch-up* that DeLillo refers to in order to open up the axiomatic is found in the broadcasting of live sport.

The event that bears out this repressed prophecy in *Underworld* is the "shot heard 'round the world", a real-life sporting (baseball) 'miracle' that took place on 3rd October 1951, the spectacular event that opens DeLillo's *Underworld*. Beginning with this singular event, DeLillo follows 'its implications and its consequences as a way of exploring and encapsulating the entire latter half of the twentieth century in America' (2013, p. 15). It is therefore, Naas tells us, 'a great work of fiction about American exceptionalism and exceptional revelations, about both miracles and a day of reckoning that may be looming over us all in the form of a global catastrophe of human origin' (2013, p. 15). But more

than anything it is, for Naas, an examination of the splitting in two of the event into faith *and* knowledge, miracle *and* machine. The combination of the revelatory event and the technological means for making it possible. This is to the point at which he argues that is as if DeLillo's novel 'called for the supplement of a text by Derrida' for an explanation. That Derrida's writings can help to draw out how sport is linked to nuclear warfare: 'between the ordinary and the extraordinary, the playful and the apocalyptic, a simple horsehide baseball and the plutonium core of a nuclear weapon' (2013, p. 18).

In 'Interlude I' these implications start to be summarised with Naas' depiction of how DeLillo moves links the sacred to the profane, the messianic event of a championship-winning homerun to waste disposal. With particular reference to the relationship between nuclear weapons and nuclear waste, Naas tells us how DeLillo sets out how waste and destruction is 'not just the by-product but in many ways the main product of entire industries that do not just result in waste but aim at creating it through consumption, conspicuous and otherwise, and sophisticated machines of death and destruction' (2012, p. 104). The creation of the messianic through waste. In 'Interlude II' Naas refers to DeLillo's linking of waste to criminality and psychological repression, and in so doing sets up the basis for a consideration of the internet, with perhaps the most sophisticated means developed to date of following 'a word through the tunnelled underworld of its ancestral roots'' ' (2012, p. 200). Moreover, with this transformation of the ancestral, Naas suggests that the internet further empowers a man's world, and that it is no surprise that the conclusion to the novel involves an event of gendered violence (2012, p. 201).

If Naas' first three encounters with *Underworld* work to set out the terrain of contemporary American religiosity, Naas' last encounter in his prologue engages with the manner in which the novel turns from an exposition of miracles and their relationship with the machine to examine the nature of the miraculous. Here Naas examines how the episode of gendered violence at the conclusion of the novel provides a platform for DeLillo to turn to the reader, in a breaking down of the fourth wall, to ask whether the miracle – in its fundamental untruth – helps them to live their lives, or whether it is just a prop for their doubts. For myself, DeLillo's turn to the reader involves a didactic injunction to dismantle notions of the miraculous. However, Naas takes this, in the spirit of a certain deconstructive approach, as an acceptance of the inevitable role of faith, and an injunction to messianic acceptance of faith that is open to surprise (2012, pp. 283-284). More specifically, Naas' emphasis is upon the implications that this has for living life (the task that Derrida of course emphasises at the beginning of *Spectres of Marx*).

My suggestion here is that this involves a departure or even abrogation of responsibility for the engagement with inheritance. Now, this seems churlish given that Naas' text undertakes such an extensive examination of Derrida's writings on inheritance. However, my concern here is with how Naas emphasises the possibility of the surprise (of the 'arrivant') in a manner that undermines the importance of identifying locations where such an event can take place. Key here is a contrast I see in Naas' approach to the aleatory significance that he attributes to the United States and the urgency that I identify in Derrida's articulation of the impact of politics of the United States (in the broadest sense) and the rest of the world. Moreover, I argue that this issue undermines Naas' emphasis upon the role of the media, that I otherwise find inspiring for moving towards the politics

of the media. When Naas refers to the role of the secret in Derrida's approach to the media, it strikes me that the tension between examining inheritances and intervening in contemporary political issues is ripped by Naas' emphasis upon how faith begets messianic possibilities, risking complicity with depoliticisation.

My suggestion here being that attention be turned to how Derrida argues that we need to be attentive to what he calls a 'politics of memory', directing attention to how the political interacts with the liminality of memory and spectres. The paradox here being that the louder and more spectacular the domain of teletechnologies, the more it calls upon the secret. As I mention above, my emphasis upon the significance of the media and the secret specifically is broadly encouraged by Naas' work in *Miracle and Machine*. Principally my focus is upon the manner in which this paradox manifests in contemporary American evangelical Protestantism, and more specifically televangelism. To reach this conclusion I pass by way of the authority that Derrida locates in language and which contemporary teletechnologies, despite their sophistication, endeavour to keep up with. But we can also be more specific about the contours of a politics of memory. This is because of how Derrida identifies a particular affinity between the paradox of teletechnological secretion and the global hegemony of the United States. Namely, that faith is articulated not only in the most obvious ways through American televangelism, though this is certainly something specific to the United States, but to the emphasis upon revelation that is placed in more secular forms (such as CNN and the particular advancement of "live" media in the United States, surveillance, and postmodern culture).

As such this supporting of US hegemony sets up a particular type of affiliation, but what if we consider a new tele-technoscientific affiliation and sovereignty? That is, at a remove

from the sovereignty of the nation and the nation-state. However, to conceive of this we risk overlooking the relationship between the national and the teletechnological. At this intersection we have a situation in which the actors, institutions, and concepts of the nation-state are supplemented by ever-more elaborate forms of teletechnoscientific apparatuses, to the point at which the affiliation that has brought them into existence is at least threatened with the spectre of being replaced with the very teletechnoscientific apparatuses themselves (as with religious fundamentalisms). Thus, here we have the capacity for a more reactive politics, supplementing the politics of emergency and securitisation that has been involved in the response to the attacks of 9/11 through the Global War on Terror and the various forms of global financial and capitalist securitisations and economic protectionisms that have taken hold after 2008. However, what I particularly allude to here is the manner in which teletechnological affiliation has the capacity to become even more autonomous, or at least in image only, with the national becoming only a quaint remnant with which to compare contemporary conditions.

In Chapter Five I therefore explore some problematic issues for political engagement and for a more inclusive politics of affiliation that are raised by contemporary media or 'teletechnologies'. Nonetheless, I complete my examination of Derrida's approach to the media my emphasising the promise that is presented by them. Specifically, I lead with Derrida's argument that by instigating différance, teletechnologies have promise for democracy to come. As careful as he is around destabilising political institutions that are imperfect but perfectible, I emphasise how Derrida is concerned to work at the limits of political institutions and consider what contemporary teletechnologies offer for democracy. I refer to the examples that Derrida calls upon – from the collapse of Soviet

Totalitarianism, to the case of Rodney King, to medical imaging. Moreover, I articulate Derrida's emphasis on the promise of sharing, before it is *bound* together in specific syntactical order. The problem, however, is that there needs to be a simultaneous attempt to meditate on how the dissonance of the media is received and responded to. There needs to be a *secret* of accepting the role that dissonance can play – a commitment to the democratic promise of that which can disturb.

It is with this emphasis upon the manner in which teletechnologies alter / transform the political, and it is in this context that I pay particular attention to Naas' text. For Miracle and Machine has the subtitle of *Jacques Derrida and the Two Sources of Religion, Science, and the Media*. And yet my suggestion here is that the text allocates the media only a very light role. While there are references throughout the text to how the media exemplify the role of religion, there are only 26 of 330 pages that are explicitly dedicated to examining the media ('The Telegenic Voice'), where he discusses the article 'Above All, No Journalists'. While Naas focuses upon the role of the secret in a way that has encouraged me to explore this relationship with the political, my suggestion here is that Naas does not fully engage with how this raises the question of how developments in the media – more specifically teletechnology – transform the constitution of the political.

In this thesis I have paid particular attention to the notion that an inclusive political project is to be derived from politics of memory or 'spectres'. As immaterial and virtual as this is, and therefore removed from acts of *corporeal* violence, the line of argument that I pursue suggests that questions of *symbolic* violence constitute and condition the scope of the political, and thus provide a focus of intervention. This approach Naas' text supplements with his attention to the symbolic violence and promise of the religious.

However, by focusing specifically upon the ramifications of religiosity my suggestion here is that Naas undermines a deconstructive possibility of encouraging contemporary political interventions. Specifically, my concern is how this undermines a consideration of how 'inheritance', as Derrida suggests in *Spectres of Marx*, 'is never one with itself'. The religious secret demands that 'one must filter, sift, criticize, one must sort out several different possibles that inhabit the same injunction' (2006, p. 18). This deconstructive injunction is therefore at the root of the secretion of the political, which suggests that how the secretion of the political acquire a certain urgency, attention needs to be on making use of the dynamic between faith and knowledge to explore the media, rather than rest assured in the promise of the religious.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have sought to reflect upon my findings from my previous substantive chapters. All three sections in this chapter reflect primarily upon the tension that runs throughout this thesis between an emphasis upon contemporary issues and a turn to inheritance to help respond those issues. With a reading of works by Richard Beardsworth and Bernard Stiegler this chapter negotiates rather critical positions on Derrida's commitment to inheritances, but with the work of Michael Naas there is a slightly different direction, since I consider that Naas overemphasises the impact of inheritance. Firstly, my engagement with a later text by Richard Beardsworth discusses the question of Derrida's political significance. For Beardsworth argues that there is a need for more robust, cosmopolitan, political project, and that Derrida ultimately withdraws into the obscurity of metaphysics. However, I argue that this overlooks how Derrida's work expands the scope of the political in important ways. In particular I focus

upon how sovereignty is dependent upon the symbolic significance of terror, and therefore that there is a requirement to intervene in the symbolic domain.

With a reading of the work of Bernard Stiegler I take this interrogation of inheritance in a new direction. Ultimately this leads to an argument that there needs to be interventions in culture and education, facilitated by a very specific 'politics of memory' that relays competent prosthetic technologies to future generations, as opposed to an engagement with the singular oeuvres of academics. However, to reach this argument I have discussed Stiegler's more long-term philosophical project of taking deconstruction in a different direction. Specifically, I have discussed his argument that deconstruction needs to be applied to the limitations of the disruptive possibilities of writing (or of what Stiegler prefers to specify as 'orthographic' technologies). However, while I have argued that Stiegler's examination of the limitations of the orthographic open up valuable questions about how cognition, memory, and the libido can be manipulated, I have agreed with Geoffrey Bennington's argument that this overlooks the role of responsibility in Derrida's attentiveness to difference, how this can accommodate Stiegler's commitment to examining technological developments, and that suggest that Stiegler's castigation of 'systemic stupidity' risks being inattentive to the multiplicity of spectres (and what Spivak would call the 'improper').

Finally, with Michael Naas I discuss a text that offers an inspiring and extremely thorough examination of the relationship between religiosity, reason, politics, and the media. I explain that offers a particularly important contribution to considering the role of the secret in Derrida's work, and how this helps to articulate the politics of the media, and the secretion of the political through the media. However, I suggest that Naas's commitment

to explaining the religiosity of the media, identifying exemplary texts to do so, and recuperating the messianic promise of the way in which the media proliferates the onto-theological, undermines the trajectory towards exploring the media's implications. In summary, this chapter works to defend a commitment to considering the significance of inheritance, but also a responsibility for exploring its possibilities.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has taken the 2008 global financial crisis as a point of departure for examining the contributions of Derrida's writings on 'spectres' for responding to questions about inclusive politics. The crisis has no doubt had very real effects. This thesis has not taken the Baudrillardian view that the 2008 crisis was, in his characterisation of the Wall Street crash of 1987, a '*virtual* catastrophe' (1993, p. 26, italics in original). The crunch in the financial markets led to a crunch in the economy, with bankruptcies and redundancies, massive austerity, the exacerbation of already existing inequalities, and no doubt the rise of extremisms and return of neo-fascisms. But the boundary between the real and the virtual is very difficult to discern. Where, for instance, does an event such as the crisis of 2008 cease to be a singular event and start to be a spectre, having a lingering influence over government policy, ideas, and the everyday practices of language and media? Indeed, was the crisis even a singular event in the first place? After all, how can we cut this event from the sub-prime crisis that largely developed in 2007? Indeed, was it not a reiteration of the paranoid politics of the global war on terror, of globalisation, and of the Western?

Working broadly within the tradition of critical and cultural theory, this thesis has argued that an attention to the symbolic opens up important questions about responsibility in relation to mass media events. Turning to the work of Jacques Derrida, it has explored how the spectre of their inadequacy haunts sovereign conceptions and conceptions of sovereignty. It has examined his proposal that attention needs to be placed upon the deconstruction of sovereignty, and how this leads to two distinct movements. Firstly, Derrida's messianic proposal that this deconstruction determines the role of an encounter with difference ('différance'), and therefore of spectres of political alternatives. Secondly,

that this encounter with difference leads to new spectral forms of sovereignty, and that if attention is to be placed upon responding to sovereignty, attention also needs to be placed upon how it is subject to transformation. Now, such a concern with spectres is no doubt epistemologically daunting. The proposal to take the concept of the spectre, as well as specific case studies, as both points of departure and provocations to reflect on responsibility presents an unnerving degree of latitude and invites the kinds of accusations of dilettantism and obscurantism that are familiar with claims about 'postmodern theories'. Nonetheless, this thesis suggests that Derrida's work provides a substantial and consistent theoretical framework with which to investigate the politics of spectres, or 'of memory, of inheritance, and of generations' (Derrida, 2006, p. xviii, italics in original).

I have argued in this thesis that such a project is not only theoretically sound (as Beardsworth suggests) but practicable, given that Derrida supplements his call for an awareness of the 'being-with spectres' with a call for a '*politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations' (Derrida, 2006, p. xviii, italics in original). My suggestion is that Derrida sustains such a politics through the link between his work on spectres and his earlier, seminal works on 'logocentrism'. I argue that Derrida's works involve a commitment to the deconstruction of logocentrism, and that this also means a commitment to redirecting that which makes the logocentric possible, ultimately leading to the possibilities of a politics of justice of the media in the broadest sense of term. As a consequence, I argue that an attention to the 2008 global financial crisis is to be conditioned by the consideration of its relationship with these inheritances, and also seen

as a provocation to consider how the 2008 global financial crisis has provided a resource for their deconstruction.

Subsequently, in Chapters Three to Five I have pursued a deconstructive approach that has examined the logocentric by way of the deconstruction of the political. To do this I have paid particular attention to Derrida's updating of his concepts of the trace, différance, and deconstruction in his later works through the concepts of 'hospitality' and 'autoimmunity'. This has led me to move from the political in the traditional sense of the nation-state, to the intellectual, scholarly construction and deconstruction of the political, and finally to the secretion of the political in contemporary media practices. Ultimately, I argue that the most radical location of political intervention is that of the media. I argue that it is here that there is the most urgent task of intervention, but also the most radical disruption of inheritances that have troubling ethico-political implications. However, to reach this conclusion I nonetheless argue that it is important to not be too dismissive of politics in the traditional sense, either in terms of its conceptual importance or pragmatically in terms of the manner in which it registers difference through specific legal apparatuses and moments of interaction and exchange.

In Chapter Three I have examined the significance of government policy as a site that has conditioned the encounter with the phantasmatic both conceptually and through more corporeal effects. I emphasise that the state retains a role as a focus of sovereignty over the management of life and death through sovereignty over terror. I argue that the nation-state is significant because of how its symbolic sovereignty over terror is inscribed through the corporeality of the management of the death penalty, at the international level (through military intervention), but also at the domestic level, through the retention

of more obvious forms of putting to death but also in the terror of the 'letting die'. This has been exacerbated by the post-crisis nation-state policies of austerity but also hospitality to spectres and inheritances by the nation-state more generally, by way of faith and knowledge (most acutely through its relationship with the media). Subsequently I focus upon Derrida's argument that with the reconstitution of the nation-state's relationship with the spectral through its hospitality to spectres such as those of the global financial crisis there is an autoimmune deconstruction of its organisation. In so doing I discuss how this risks further amplifying a spectre of intellectual disconnection and technological incompetence – of being left behind – that feeds fundamentalist politics, and that if these phenomena are to be resisted there needs to be a responsibility to explore alternative possibilities of hospitality.

While I argue that an attention to hospitality would be best served by taking a trajectory towards examining the media as the most discrete site of politics, I have turned in Chapter Four to the role of scholarship. I have done so because of the way, particularly in 'The University without Condition', in which Derrida articulates the university as a potential site for reflecting upon 'unconditional sovereignty'. Specifically, I examine Derrida's suggestion that scholarship – and particularly the humanities – is a site of reflection on the logocentric and the spectral. After setting out how the relationship between scholarship and sovereignty can be investigated by considering the role of expertise required of contemporary technoscientific capitalism, and how philosophy can be complicit with its most horrific excesses (in Heidegger's support of Nazism), I follow Derrida's argument that the idiomaticity of scholarship has been particularly restricted by a confessional emphasis upon 'work'. Specifically, this chapter focused upon how the

spectrality of the 2008 crisis risks amplifying a flexibility towards the exploitation of the biological. In setting out these risks I support Derrida's argument for interdisciplinary interventions that link up the humanities with the natural sciences. But I also argue, against his explicit criticisms, that such a project could benefit from a tradition of cultural studies that has been committed to investigating the role of the symbolic in its examination of marginalisation and oppression.

However, it is with the media – or what Derrida prefers to call 'tele-technologies' in order to avoid the connotations of pure simulacra that he suggests the media is accompanied by – that I identify the most difficult and most promising location of intervention for a response to spectres like those of the global financial crisis. After setting out Derrida's arguments about how the political is involved in discrete acts of selecting, filtering, and ordering, I consider how he subsequently links these phenomena to questions of inheritance. As a result, I argue that the spectres of the global financial crisis can be a catalysts for an amplification of the 'return of the religious', the 'nationalist', and so many 'secrets'. I have examined Derrida's argument that these phenomena need to be considered both in terms of a turn to inheritance but also in terms of phenomena that are made possible through contemporary developments in the tele-technological. However, I have also considered his argument that the sophistication of these phenomena should not take away from an examination of how they facilitate age-old forms of violence, and specifically gendered and sexual violence towards women. And yet, I also argue that the media is the site of the most radical forms of politics given that it involves such a fundamental deconstruction and reorganisation of inheritance.

Having explored locations of the political my attention turned at the end of this thesis to a hospitable appraisal of my approach to Derrida's works by referring to theorists who have read its significance in rather different ways. Through a reading of Richard Beardsworth's critique of Derrida's cosmopolitanism (and his more assertive cosmopolitan political theory) I work to further emphasise my interpretation that Derrida sets out an important means of working with contemporary liberal democracies while acknowledging the need for a more hospitable politics that actively draws from inheritance and responsibility. Secondly, I have examined Bernard Stiegler's calls for an educational cultural project that prepares future generations, and his critique that Derrida is too committed to the elitist scholarly pursuit of truth. Here I have argued that, in contrast, Stiegler's approach runs the a risk of a more authoritarian approach, and that Derrida's approach is more open to alternative conceptions of sovereignty and spectrality through its interdisciplinary call for links between the humanities and the natural sciences (even if I think that it could benefit from insights from cultural studies). Finally, with a view to my particular emphasis upon the media, I have examined what I consider to be Michael Naas' innovative emphasis upon the relationship between contemporary media and the religious. However, in doing so I have argued that there is a chance to articulate a stronger commitment to the deconstruction of the political, sovereignty, and the onto-theological through the contemporary media.

I want to conclude by reflecting on the limitations of the spectres and inheritances that Derrida has explored in his works. Specifically, I think it is important to note a point that Anthony Paul Smith raises in a review of Michael Naas' *Miracle and Machine* (2014). For Smith directs attention, via Naas, to a point that Derrida makes in 'Faith and Knowledge'

about the absence at the conference at which it was delivered, there were: 'no women (…) and no Muslims or representatives of other cults in attendance to discuss a topic such as religion or the state of religion in 1994, no Muslims to speak of or to represent Islam, which is clearly not just one religion in the contemporary world' (Derrida in Smith, 2014, p. 234). And yet, Smith suggests that in relation to Derrida's offer to speak for the other in their absence, 'there is a certain danger of too easily raising one's voice for the other' (Smith, 2014, p. 234).

As I have alluded to throughout this thesis, Derrida sets out at the beginning of *Spectres of Marx* a commitment to working in the name of justice for those no longer here and not yet here, and an awareness of the restrictions that are imposed by articulating specific forms of oppression. However, as Smith points out, while Derrida (and Naas) do not cite works by women, nor Muslim women, 'they do exist' (2014, p. 235). Thus, if the stakes of contemporary politics are the most pressing for women, as 'Faith and Knowledge' suggests, the question then arises as to why not to consult the literatures, theories, and arguments put forward *by* women. Furthermore, there are a number of texts that examine Derrida's complicated relationship with questions of femininity and feminism (see Feder, Rawlinson, and Zakin, 1997; Holland, 1997). Where then does this leave my trajectory towards the media that I emphasise in this thesis? My suggestion here would be to consider the role that I attribute to cultural studies as an academic project for investigating the implications of the symbolic in terms of its marginalisations and oppression.

Ultimately my intention in this thesis has been to argue that attention should be placed upon the how politics is developing through advances in contemporary media

technologies, or what Derrida prefers to call 'teletechnologies', on the basis that this more fully articulates acts of disseminating decision making. The problem here is that this not only troubles the concept of the political that is to be found in political theory and political science, but that it is itself a particularly difficult sphere to grasp in terms of its politics, on the basis of the speeds and rhythms at which decisions are taken. However, I have also argued that if this trajectory is to be given significance it n the basis that it helps to inform a deconstruction of politics – of the *secret*, through an attention to *discrete* acts of decision making. My substantive chapters have attempted to attribute fidelity to three specific indissociable domains, in politics in the traditional sense, in scholarship, and in the media industries. However, my suggestion here is to direct attention to responsibility for the secretion of the political through spectral effects, be it in what we understand by the "media" or elsewhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbinnett, R. (2006) *Marxism After Modernity: Politics, Technology and Social Transformation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

_____, (2015) 'The Politics of Spirit in Stiegler's Techno-Pharmacology', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 32(4), pp. 65–80.

Adorno, T.W. (1982) *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Norton.

_____, (2003) 'Late Capitalism or Industrial Society?', in Tiedemann, R. (ed.) *Can One Live After Auschwitz? : A Philosophical Reader*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 111-125.

_____, (2005) *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*. London: Verso.

_____, (2007) *Negative Dialectics*, New York: Continuum.

Baudrillard, J. (1988a) 'Simulacra and Simulations', in Poster, M. (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 166-184.

_____, (1988b) 'Symbolic Exchange and Death', in Poster, M. (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 119-141.

_____, (1988c) 'The Masses: The Implosion of the Social in the Media', in Poster, M. (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 207-219.

_____, (1993) *The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena*. London: Verso.

_____, (1995) *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*. Sydney: Power Publications.

_____, (2002) *The Spirit of Terrorism and Requiem for the Twin Towers*. London: Verso.

_____, (2010) *America*. London: Verso.

Beardsworth, R. (1996) *Derrida and the Political*. London: Routledge.

_____, (2010) 'Technology and Politics: A Response to Bernard Stiegler', *Cultural Politics: an International Journal*, 6(2), pp. 181-199.

_____, (2011) *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory*. Cambridge: Polity.

Benjamin, W. (1986a) 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in Arendt, H. (ed.) *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, pp. 217-252.

_____, (1986b) 'Theses on the Philosophy of History', in Arendt, H. (ed.) *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, pp. 253-264.

Bennington, G. (2000) *Interrupting Derrida*. London: Routledge.

Bennington, G. and Derrida, J. (1993) *Jacques Derrida.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Blyth, M. (2013) Austerity: The History of a Dangerous Idea. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borradori, G. and Derrida, J. (2003) 'Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides', in Borradori, G. (ed.) *Philosophy In A Time of Terror. Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 85-136

Bowman, P. (2004) 'The Task of the Transgressor', *Culture Machine,* 6, [Online]. Available at: https://culturemachine.net/deconstruction-is-in-cultural-studies/the-task-of-the-transgressor/ (Accessed: 14 June 2019).

Castells, M. (2012) *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*, Cambridge: Polity.

Cheah, P. and Guerlac, S. (ed.) (2009) *Derrida and the Time of the Political*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ciro, T. (2012) *The Global Financial Crisis: Triggers, Responses and Aftermath*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Della Porta, D. and Mattoni, A. (2014) *Spreading Protest: Social Movements in Times of Crisis*. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Derrida, J. (1982a) 'Before the Law', in Attridge, D. (ed.) *Acts of Literature*. London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 183-220.

_____, (1982b) 'Différance', in Derrida, J. (ed.) *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-28.

_____, (1982c) 'Signature Event Context', in *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 307-330.

_____, (1982d) 'White Mythology', in *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 207-272.

_____, (1988) *Limited Inc*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

_____, (1989) *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*. London: University of Chicago Press.

_____, (1992) *The Other Heading: Reflections On Today's Europe*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

_____, (1997a) *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: s Hopkins University Press.

_____, (1997b) *Politics of Friendship*. London: Verso.

_____, (2001a) 'The Future of the Profession, or the University Without Condition (Thanks To the "Humanities", What Could Take Place Tomorrow)', in Cohen, T. (ed.) *Jacques*

Derrida and the Humanities : A Critical Reader. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 24-57.

_____, (2001b) 'Above All, No Journalists!', in de Vries, H. and Weber, S. (ed.) *Religion and Media*. Stanford.: Stanford University Press, pp. 56–93.

_____, (2001c) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge.

_____, (2002a) 'Faith and Knowledge: the Two Sources of "Religion" At the Limits of Reason Alone', in Anidjar, G. (ed.) *Acts of Religion*. London: Routledge, pp. 42-101.

_____, (2002b) *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971-2001*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2002c) 'Force of Law: The "Mystical Foundation of Authority" ', in Anidjar, G. (ed.) *Acts of Religion*. London: Routledge, pp. 228-298.

_____, (2004a) 'Enlightenment Past and to Come', *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November. Available at: https://mondediplo.com/2004/11/06derrida (Accessed: 14 June 2019).

_____, (2004b) *Eyes of the University: Right To Philosophy 2*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2005a) 'Fichus', in Derrida, J. (ed.) *Paper Machine*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 164-182.

_____, (2005b) *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2005c) *Paper Machine*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2006) *Specters of Marx: the State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. London: Routledge.

_____, (2009) *The Beast and the Sovereign*, *Volume I.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____, (2011) *The Beast and the Sovereign. Volume II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. and Dufourmantelle, A. (2000) *Of Hospitality*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, J. and Stiegler, B. (2002) *Echographies of Television: Filmed Interviews*. Cambridge: Polity.

Feder, E.K., Rawlinson, M.C. and Zakin, E. (1997) *Derrida and Feminism: Recasting the Question of Woman*. London: Routledge.

Fulcher, J. (2015) *Capitalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, G. (2004) 'Why You Can't Do Cultural Studies and Be a Derridean: Cultural Studies After Birmingham, the New Social Movements and the New Left', *Culture Machine,* 6, [Online].

Available at: https://culturemachine.net/deconstruction-is-in-cultural-studies/why-you-cant-do-cultural-studies-and-be-a-derridean/ (Accessed: 14 June 2019).

Habermas, J. and Derrida, J. (2003) 'February 15, Or What Binds Europeans Together: A Plea For A Common Foreign Policy, Beginning In the Core of Europe', *Constellations*, 10(3), pp. 291-297.

Herbrechter, S. (2004) 'Plus d'Un: Deconstruction and the Translation of Cultural Studies', *Culture Machine,* 6, [Online]. Available at: https://culturemachine.net/deconstruction-is-in-cultural-studies/plus-dun-deconstruction-and-the-translation-of-cultural-studies/ (Accessed: 14 June 2019).

Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T.W. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press

Kamuf, P. (2004) 'The University in the World it is Attempting to Think', *Culture Machine,* 6, [Online]. Available at: https://culturemachine.net/deconstruction-is-in-cultural-studies/the-university-in-the-world-it-is-attempting-to-think/ (Accessed: 14 June 2019).

Kellner, D. (2009) 'Media Spectacle and the 2008 Presidential Election'. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 9(6), pp. 707–716.

_____, (2017) *American Horror Show: Election 2016 and the Ascent of Donald J. Trump*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (2000) 'The German Ideology', in McLellan, D. (ed.) *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 175-208.

Miller, J.H. (2001) 'Derrida, Benjamin, the Internet, and the New International'. *Parallax*, 7(3), pp.6–11.

Naas, M. (2008) *Derrida From Now On*. New York: Fordham University Press.

_____, (2012) *Miracle and Machine: Jacques Derrida and the Two Sources of Religion, Science, and the Media*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Peeters, B. (2013) *Derrida: A Biography*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Redfield, M. (2009) *The Rhetoric of Terror: Reflections On 9/11 and the War On Terror*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Roberts, B. (2012) 'Technics, Individuation and Tertiary Memory: Bernard Stiegler's Challenge To Media theory', *New Formations*, (77), pp. 8-20.

Smith, A.P. (2014) 'Review: Miracle and Machine: Jacques Derrida and the Two Sources of Religion, Science, and the Media by Michael Naas'. *Derrida Today*, 7(2), pp. 230–236.

Spivak, G.C. (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak', in Nelson, C. and Grossberg, L. (ed.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313.

_____, (2000) 'Deconstruction and Cultural Studies: Arguments for a Deconstructive Cultural Studies', in Royle, N. (ed.) *Deconstructions: A User's Guide*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 14-36

Stiegler, B. (1998) *Technics and Time I: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2001) 'Deconstruction and Technology: Fidelity At the Limits of Deconstruction and the Prosthesis of Faith', in Cohen, T. (ed.) *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities : A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 238-270.

_____, (2010a) *Taking Care of Youth and the Generations*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

_____, (2010b) *For A New Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge: Polity.

_____, (2015) *States of Shock: Stupidity and Knowledge in the 21st Century*. Malden: Polity.

_____, (2018) *The Neganthropocene*. London: Open Humanities Press.

Stuckler, D. and Basu, S. (2013) *The Body Economic: Why Austerity Kills, and What We Can Do About It*. London: Allen Lane.

Trottier, D. and Fuchs, C. (2014) *Social Media, Politics and the State : Protests, Revolutions, Riots, Crime and Policing in the age of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube*. London: Routledge.

Wortham, S. (2006) *Counter-Institutions: Jacques Derrida and the Question of the University*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Žižek, S. (2009) *First as Tragedy, then as Farce*. London: Verso.

Zylinska, J. (2004) 'Guns n' Rappers: Moral Panics and the Ethics of Cultural Studies', *Culture Machine,* 6, [Online]. Available at: https://culturemachine.net/deconstruction-is-in-cultural-studies/guns-n-rappers/ (Accessed: 14 June 2019).