

ISSN 1751-8229

Volume Fourteen, Number One

The Syntropic History of Writing The Four Functions of The Signifier and Dawn of In-vent

Amir Šulić, Independent Scholar

Abstract: In this essay, I will try to elaborate the fundamental postulates of transdifferential ontology, developed through the inscription of some basic concepts of poststructuralist philosophy within the realm of general system theory. In this manner, a system/being will be conceptualized as set of elements which is organized as a functional whole, whose goal is not to establish a homeostasis but to manage and organize disruptive forces of lack/surplus, that represents non-mediated kernel of any system. Therefore, any system is fundamentally grounded on imbalance and radical incompleteness as inherent conditions of its possibility. Among different kind of systems, the complex self - organizing systems based on feedback loops are governed by the principle of syntropy and its transdifferential organization of reality. In order to explicate the syntropic movement of systems, the concept of signifier is expanded beyond the boundaries of language, and the process of writing, as a permanent invention of in-vent, is interpreted in the manner of never ending sublation of the system and subversion of the subject. The interconnection between the general system theory and poststructuralist philosophy will provide us with a conceptual apparatus which overcomes both linguistic and entropic limitations of above mentioned domains, in order to conceive, interpret, predict and govern processes of becoming in different levels of organization of systems.

Keywords: transdifferential ontology, syntropy, the signifier, system, in-vent

The main aim of this essay is to establish basic premises and foundations of the transdifferential ontology, grounded on dynamic and comprehensive conceptualization of being as a system of relations which operates on the basis of the fundamental imbalance, introduced by the production of an irreducible lack/surplus as a consequence of qualitative transdifferentiation of a system and convergence of separate orders of appearance. The concept of system within transdifferential ontology is not based on the principle of homeostasis, nor its destiny is confined by the law of entropy, but its functioning is governed by the laws of writing whose power of novelty, sublation, memory preservation and transcendence in-form the syntropic movement of time. The notion of syntropy was coined by Italian physicist Luigi Fantapie , and the notion of anti-entropoy was used by Erwin Shroedinger and Buckminster Fueller, among others. We will distance ourselves from all contemporary esoteric interpretation of the term which mirror Taoist pansexualism, and we will define syntropy as tendency of the system to increase the measure of order and to attain higher levels of organization through occurrence of in-vent. We will not prescribe to the notion of syntropy any form of temporality - at least not within the realm of physical linear unfolding of time - as it is case with the conceptualization of this term in the work of its creator, Italian physicist Luigi Fantappié, who thought that syntropy is characterized by reverse causality, and that causes of syntropic events are located in the future (Fantappié: 1993). For him, and for us, syntropy is the force opposed to entropy; it represents movements toward order and higher levels of organization of matter, in contrast to entropy which designates the second law of thermodynamics which says that every system gradually regresses toward chaos. Subject, being first and foremost the subject of syntropy, is rooted in the present cleared of toxic presence of eshato-teleological past and future; its time is marked by causes located in the subsistence of dislocated present, not future or past, and it's becoming is mediated by the signifier whose influence on the body is obtained through an infinite feedback loop. This form of present is opened by discontinuity of time, which is afterward perceived and conceptualized – but not symbolized - as trauma. There is an irreducible gap, introduced by the law of the higher - order system organization based on the principle of doubling – which is an inherent power of the signifier - that allows externalization of internal, its preservation, transmission and its subsequent overcoming. We will call the doubling power of the signifier the transdifferentiality; its force is the foundational principle on which an emergence of complex self-regulating systems based on feedback loops is established. The transdifferential ontology will not approach to its object in a traditional manner, asking what is being, what is that by what beings are etc. It will ask within which system of relations

beings appear to us as beings, what is a system, on which set of postulates it is formed, and what governs the emergence of systems. It will seek to underlay laws of organization of the reality as a complex interconnection of systems, operating at different levels of complexity, but following the same principle of syntropy. Hence, the transdifferential ontology will portray systems on the basis substantially disparate from the general system theory, but at the same time it will use some of its conceptual apparatus, applied and redefined in the broader context that transcends the laws of thermodynamics. The principles of nonlinearity, circular causation, equifinality, homeostasis, multifinality, isomorphism etc. will be conceptualized in relation to the postulates of syntropy, transdifferentials and the functions of the signifier as the bearer of “materiality of a system”. Of course, the concepts mentioned above, due to the limitations of this essay, will not all be thematised within it, but it will be important parts of theoretical apparatus of transdifferential ontology. Transdifferential ontology will be founded on the grounds of French poststructuralist philosophical conceptualizations (especially on the work of Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida and Gilles Deleuze), general system theory of Ludwig von Bertalanffy, theory of chaos and the concepts developed within systemic psychotherapy. This essay will be focused strictly on the relation between first two.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy, the founder of general system theory, has defined a system as “complexes of elements standing in interactions” (Bertalanffy: 1969). For him, a system is a set of elements that forms a functional whole. According to general theory of system, a system is more than simple sum of its part, its organization and relations between elements bring into life qualities of the whole which are not reducible to its parts. We cannot trace qualities, functions and products of the systems, as well as the roles and functions of its parts to the same parts in its initial states, i.e. before they were assimilated and informed by the ontological and organizational principles of a system. For Bertalanffy and the other scientists and theoreticians of the systems, we can find the same laws of organization of the systems across different and seemingly unrelated phenomena; in biology, economics, sociology, psychology, engineering, informational and computational sciences etc. The same principles are at work, governing biological, closed, opened, natural and artificial, regulated and self-regulated systems. The isomorphism between different kinds of beings is a testimony to higher principles of organization of reality, which cannot be assigned to its limited domains. Even when we isolate any being and try to investigate it, we will very soon come to conclusion that, what has been viewed as a self-identical, simple part of reality, is in fact a micro system. And if we go further into

investigation, as quantum physics has showed, we will not find the simplest elements, the building blocks of reality, but inconsistency, uncertainty, and waves of probability and lack of the foundation. This is why is necessary to ground transdifferential ontology – and to supplement general theory of system – on a constitutional lack, or surplus, of the being itself. To ground any kind of conceptual elaboration on a lack of its object, means to deliberately make the impossibility of the concept as such its inherent condition of possibility. Because, let us not forget, a being is ultimately a functioning concept, which means that what is considered as an object of some inquiry is already a constitutional, internal part of it, not independent, external part of reality to whom we can approach objectively. Being is a system, and every system is a form of conceptualization in itself. Even the most basic elements of perception, like color, sound, smell etc. are, as Kant and Hegel respectively showed, a form of conceptualization, or abstraction. To ground ontology on a lack/surplus, inconsistency and imbalance means to affirm a system as only “objective”, “material” ontological entity for which can be said that exist. This means that an ordinary notion of matter should be treated and understood strictly as conceptual, i.e. as elaborated and functional within a broader principle of organization of reality. Within the transdifferential ontology the notion of the subject plays an important role, and must be discerned from the notion of being. As we have said, the being is a system based on functional interconnections of its parts, governed by transdifferentiation toward the next level of syntropy, while the subject is the place within the system where the lack and surplus coincide, but never overlap, the point in which doubling of the production of the system meets its short circuit. The subject is, therefore, non-mediated, and non-exchangeable kernel of a system, and, at the same time, the condition of the any movement of a system. The production and exchange, the two main functions of systems, depend and relay on a constitutional imbalance of the system itself, an impossibility of both harmonious working and establishing symmetrical relations between particular parts. In a way, the impossibility of accomplishing the structural balance and stability within a system, as well as between systems, is the circular – or it is maybe better to say spiral - determination of syntropic movement. The imbalance and structural incompleteness are introduced by the signifier, but its action and influence goes beyond any symbolic representation of reality; the signifier is, before anything else, an in-former of reality itself.

The most elaborated depiction of emergence of signifier - and its multi-layer “bending” of reality - we can find in Kubrick’s “Space Odyssey (1968). In the first part of the movie called “The Dawn of Men”, we can see how, for the first time, the men’s ancestors had

used tools in their everyday struggle to survive. This assimilation of, to use Heidegger's terminology – which could have illuminating value in this case - present-at hand into ready-to-hand marks the first appearance of the signifier and the first redoubling of a thing; the place of pure presence was transformed through the usage and mediated to the other. Paradoxically, the thing itself did not exist before this redoubling, at least not as a thing; here, the event (not in Badiou's sense of the word, as it will be later elaborated) of the signifier have constituted its past, and a concept, present in the signifier, in-formed its ontic realization before ontological/conscious elaboration came. But what is ingenious in the depiction of the discovery of the first tool is an assemblage of post-mortal remains (a bone), which became a tool with whom a Homo Habilis commits a murder of another member of his species. The appearance of the Sun above mysterious black monolith marks a new dawn, never seen before, the birth of a men, while the murder committed with the bone as a weapon designates a radical brake within the world of nature; something new and unseen begins to intervene into process of evolution of the species. A new form of externalization of life, to use Bernard Stiegler's term. Life has found a more efficient way of transmission of information to the next generation of individuals, a superior form of writing in comparison to the inscription and communication via genome. A hand with a toll in movement is a gesture that forms time and space, exterior and interior, subject and object. As Bernard Stiegler pointed out;

“Because it is affected with anticipation, because it is nothing but antici-pation, a gesture is a gesture; and there can be no gesture without tools and artificial memory, prosthetic, outside of the body, and constitutive of its world. There is no anticipation, no time outside of this passage out-side, of this putting-outside-of-self and of this alienation of the human and its memory that "exteriorization" is“ (Stiegler, 1998: 152).

The other force had become the dominant principle of differentiation, the compulsion contained in a tool as the signifier, which modified the dead waste into additional artificial organ of, at first survival, and later of transcendence. The lowest form became the highest creation and addition who came to fulfill the lack (of skills, resources etc.). What remained of pure existence was, through practice, sublated - in Hegelian sense - into a supplement of existing individual; this process designates the death of what was actual as living body and the birth of being. We can, at this point, to discern two important definitions, namely the one of the signifier and the other of being. The signifier cannot be a simple index sign, or iconic sign; they are the precondition for appearance of the signifier, but they do not

have its arbitrariness and, especially, their materiality. The connection within index and iconic sign between a signifier and a signified is natural, and, what is more important, an individual for whom the sign is a sign is in the passive position toward this signs and its environment; there is no change in everyday habitual behavior of an organism. In the advent of the signifier, the practice of an individual encounters a radical brake, which irreversibly and qualitatively converts its mode of being from passive respondent to active co-respondent. The occurrence of the signifier always leaves its material consequences; its materiality is virtually-practical, it metamorphoses a pure existence into a being, and, in the case of the sophisticated system of signifiers, in other word language, into a subject. Therefore, the signifier is precisely what it is, not because its arbitrariness but because its productive forces and its concrete material consequences, and this materiality is the hypostasis of a concept. Here, it is important to discern habit from practice (the signifier based activity;) both of them have distinctive form of repetitive patterns, but in the case of practice we can identify novelty (some thing or behavior that has not existed ever before), sublation (transformation of elements and its functional reorganization), memory preservation (tool is also the simplest memory vehicle of a group of individuals) and transcendence (every practice reorganize and improve itself over time, and different systems of practice merge together in order to overcome its limitation). Habit is activity which is transmitted via genetic material of species to individuals, while practice uses another, more efficient form of writing, namely system of signifiers, which transmission is insured by communication of subjects. Habits itself and larval selves formed by them cannot be responsible for formation of complex forms of memory, as Deleuze stated (Deleuze, 1994). Habit must involuntary and by accident assimilate a part of material reality - in the form of difference between two repetition, (which, as we will see, takes form of the signifier) - which will, because it radically improved performance and outcome of a behavior, become an inseparable constituent of every future similar action. This is what is subversive within Lacan's version of the concept of death drive, and it is homologous with Deleuze's interplay between difference and repetition, as well as with Derrida's concept of trace; but neither of them has explicated how these forces produce something radically new and often in opposition with other forms of being. Subject repeats something which cannot be repeated, says Deleuze, and automaton of repetition/death drive protects life, Lacan states; we repeat something whose mode of existence have already been absence – according to Derrida - and that is present only in traces, reminders and shadows. Something that cannot be assimilated/ symbolized will make a place for something that will become a part of repetition, but not any kind of part.. It will at once become the most

paradoxical form of being, that which, in its materiality, designates an absence within existence and holds a formula for its overcoming. This foreign part will be responsible for emergence of difference within the same of the pure repetition. This enigmatic, magical thing which we call the signifier is responsible for appearance of difference within repetition, by something which we will call the feedback loop. It is the force of signifier what metamorphosed a bone into a tool. More importantly, a tool is much more than a practical item, it is the signifier which power of differentiation, reorganization, memorization etc. has consequences beyond scope of any of its users. The signifier is, ontologically speaking, an in-forming force which introduces subject as a lack within pure existence; this lack is the first supplement who will open the way for another supplements in the process of writing of concepts into living body of pure existence, forming increasingly complex systems which operates not on principle of reality (supporting homeostasis of a system), but on the principle of a lack. Subject is an agent of the self-regulating complex systems based on feedback loop; it is a point of convergence between life and writing, or existence and technique. Subject is the condition of possibility of cyborg as a juncture between life and machine, it is a mediator, an empty space which allows for different orders of beings to form a system of higher order. We have come here at the source of theory of value, that is to say the theory of value independent of its particular application within different areas (political economy, economics, linguistics, psychoanalysis), which will be later elaborated.

The four functions of the signifier

We have earlier identified four fundamental functions of signifier, namely novelty, sublation, memory preservation and transcendence. In the realm of repetition, an agent, as Deleuze put it, repeats what cannot be repeated (Deleuze, 1994). Every repetition aims at restoring something lost, to bring back a part, to reconstruct a whole, to fill the gap or to make present something which has been past. This reactualization can never be accomplished, mainly for two reasons; firstly, that which is perceived as a lost has never existed before, and secondly, its successful resurrection would mean the end of repetition itself, which can never be its true goal. Therefore, repetition, in order to sustain itself, repeats an impossible event which has never been actualized before and which can never be fully attained. In other words, a system strives to achieve homeostasis which is not possible and never was present within it; moreover, an absolute homeostasis would mean the end of a system, for it is operational exactly through a constitutional imbalance between him and his environment. This imbalance is visible through the automaton of repetition, where, in the light of striving for homeostasis, an exchange of a lack and surplus

takes place. Deleuze states that repetition is not generality, which is characterized with exchange, but exchange, and more generally the possibility of every economy as an interchange of value, is precisely the result of repetition. When a system operates on the basis of repetition, it inevitably produces something new. When an animal repeats instinctively some behavior, it will - with time - create a memory, a qualitatively different form of organization of experience which will, through feedback loop, create different kinds of behavior. The death drive, in context of preserving life, inevitably transgresses the existing boundaries and creates novelty. Thus, difference is an immanent part of every repetition, and repetition is the modus operandi of difference. A value created by the automaton of repetition is that what is exchangeable; it is not the original quasi-content of repetition which it tries to restore, but novelty produced by structural impossibility of pure repetition itself what takes place as a value. This repetition, or death drive, is a driving force of every system inherently based on producing and maintaining imbalance by means of transcendence as an immanent organizing principle, but a negative one; it is precisely an impossibility of stability and homeostasis what ensures the possibility of existence of a system, and what sets in motion death drive and its principle of transcendence. To go beyond the limits of existing order, to produce, reorganize and elevate, is a consequence of a structural imbalance present on the lowest degree of organization of reality, or, to put it differently, the difference is intrinsically present at the heart of identity itself, there is no immediate correspondence of a being to itself. Death drive, in its movement, is a death of a thing, but it is by the same its preservation at higher level, or to be more precise, its invention which cannot be reduced or traced back to its previous condition. This violent, but at the same time the most creative act, is a systemic shift to a higher order of organization that is dialectical "in nature". As Hegel stated;

"Whatever is confined within the limits of a natural life cannot by its own efforts go beyond its immediate existence; but it is driven beyond it by something else, and this uprooting entails its death. Consciousness however, is explicitly the Notion of itself. Hence it is something that goes beyond limits, and since these limits are its own, it is something that goes beyond itself" (Hegel, 1979: 76).

This "something" for Hegel is "the necessity of progression" (Hegel, 1979: 76), a dialectical movement toward absolute knowledge in which we can discern Lacan's death drive; the death of a thing, its sublation in the form of the signifier, and transgression of the existing boundaries. This kind of functioning of repetition and difference does not leave the space

for elucidation of systems as structures based on principle of homeostasis. The difference between these two concepts is, of course, the remainder, which is not, at least explicitly, present in Hegel's understanding of dialectics. This is the reason why the real dialectical movement within Lacan's teaching is not within the realm of desire, but in the circular pulsation of the death drive. Thus we should read Lacan's elaboration of Freudian death drive as dialectical. Žižek is right when he emphasizes that Lacan is not Hegelian in his direct references to Hegel (Žižek, 2014), but in its conceptualization of the functioning of the death drive and its interconnection with the signifier. In the first phase of his work for Lacan – and for Kojève before him - desire has the structure of dialectical movement in the form of subject's demand for recognition from the other. We must be very careful and precise here; there is a substantial difference between a true dialectical movement and quasi - transgression of desire described as desire for recognition. Namely, desire, conceptualized as previously mentioned, do not produce a surplus/lack imbalance, unlike the death drive. Desire normalizes relations between two major transgressions of the death drive, it thrives on established order of relations. For example, within the market economy, the financial sector transgresses almost all social – and sometimes natural – boundaries, at the same time keeping masses distracted by unlimited and endless proliferation of desired objects produced by industrial economy. The death drive leads the pleasure principle beyond establishing homeostasis, disrupt the system (in this case the subject as auto-poetic system) and create constitutive imbalance;

“Now this search is in a way an antipsychic search that by its place and function is beyond the pleasure principle. For according to the laws of the pleasure principle, the signifier projects into this beyond equalization, homeostasis, and the tendency to the uniform investment of the system of the self as such; it provokes its failure. The function of the pleasure principle is, in effect, to lead the subject from the signifier to the signifier, by generating as many signifiers as are required to maintain at as low a level as possible the tension that regulates the whole functioning of the psychic apparatus”(Lacan, 1992: 119).

Here we can see that the death drive is at work already within the pleasure principle, exactly as we have elaborated it previously - as repetition which assimilates a foreign, material element in its functioning, an element for which Lacan uses the term the Thing in his “The ethics of psychoanalysis”, and which will later be designated as object small a. Only after introducing the notions of object small a (Lacan, 2017), and latter jouissance (Lacan, 1997), desire becomes a part of dialectic movement. The object of desire is,

paradoxically, the only truly material element, but at the same time it cannot be any concrete object; it is an obstacle, a formal impasse, an imbalance of a system that secures its perpetual movement toward higher levels of syntropy. The Thing is the materiality of repetition itself, and its materiality should not be understood as temporal, factual or punctual. It is not confined by bounds of space and time; it is the condition of their appearance. Its "nature" is rather paradoxical, it subsists between moments of factual time and space, it haunts present and presence, and when it takes form of concrete appearance it makes an order of things - established before its actualization - obsolete. The Thing is a result of repetition which allows for any given object and its concept to appear and functions as its negation within a superstructure which operates on a higher level of organization and conceptualization. The Thing is an empty signifier which hypostatizes emptiness as the condition on which are founded its utilitarian as well as signifying function. It is an organizing principle of a system that is based on structural lack of harmony and impossibility of homeostasis. Moreover, the symbolic order is grounded on imbalance, on impossibility of harmonious, balanced relational order between these particular elements. This inability of cordial functioning is particularly noticeable within self-regulating complex systems, as the system of social relations. We could say that, the famous Lacan's statement in which he claims that "there is no sexual relation" could be read in Derridian manner, namely that the impossibility of relation is the condition of possibility of any relation. Precisely non-existence of relation is an immanent structure of every possible social bond; there is no balanced social tie, without any conflict, imbalance or inequality. For, if harmonious relation between elements would be possible, it would not be a relation anymore but one being, a whole without discernible constitutive parts. Every relation is a guarantee that the status quo is not here to stay, and that stability of the world is an ideological illusion per excellence. We can see here how repetition and difference creates novelty, a novelty which is an elevated object within a system of higher order. In this light we need to read Hegel when he speaks of consciousness and the movement between the Object and the Notion; what makes possible a dialectical movement in which the Notion comes at the place of an object is a different system of organization in which the Notion can be elaborated, questioned or put into circulation as an object. A bill can be an object of exchange inside the monetary system in which its notion as the bearer of value is defined. It can be the object of manipulation, speculation etc., but this object owes its current and actual materiality to the operations of the system, not to paper on which is printed.

A produced value as novelty inherently brings the second characteristic of the signifier onto the scene, namely sublation. Here we employ Hegelian dialectics in order to elaborate a segment of functioning of systems of higher order, namely auto-referential, auto-poietic systems based on feedback loop. A mere reminder, assimilated through operating system based on automaton of repetition, is sublated on the level which is not contained within its existential or material predispositions. As we have seen in the example described above, a bone becomes a tool or a weapon; this possibilities are not present in the bone itself, but the bone gained status of a tool o a weapon by displacement into higher level of existence within system, it gained its new functions by structural shift which sublated its former properties and, at the same time, preserved it. The difference which came into existence is external to sublated thing; it is structural, relational possibility of a system. What is truly material here is not a concrete sublated part of reality, but difference itself, respectively its virtuality which has consequences broader, profoundly “real” and more material then what we conventionally consider as empirically existing entity . In the words of Samo Tomšič; “A non-material thing which has material consequences.”

Sublation for us means a trans-existential move form a lower to higher order of relational interchangeability within the broader process which we will call syntropy. The concept of syntropy will be elucidated simultaneously with its relation to time end general economy (economy which transcends its particular application in the field of economics, linguistics and psychoanalysis). Novelty which has been invented through the process of sublation is, thus, a part of virtual reality, of dislocated and disavowed present, which possibility was not present within actual present situation; its causes cannot be located within preexisting system or systems of relations. It is possible to understand dialectical process as diachronic form of systemic transformation of reality, but, as we well see later, its time is not linear, common sense nor scientific time. By dialectical movement novelty comes into being, and, if former correspond to diachronic transformation, novelty has properties of synchronic operation. A novelty is a higher-order organizational principle that uses a particular part of material, lower-order reality to impose on it its own laws. This would be homologous with Lacan’s conceptualization of desire; the level on which desire is grounded corresponds with everyday functioning of the subject based on imaginary identifications and divisions founded on formations of identities. Desire leads the subject from the one object to the other without ever reaching its satisfaction. The synchronic organization, immanent to desire, has its function in stabilization, normalization and concealing the imbalance and instability of the system. Its time is subalternated time of the subject consumed by demands of the big Other, reduced to desiring machine impossible

for stepping out of the circle of petty personal considerations. Even if we consider desire as essentially desire for universal recognition, it is not possible to conceptualize the path of social – and systemic – change on the basis of affirmation, simply because it is an affirmation confined within the same system of relations. A universal recognition would affirm and strengthen the existing form of organization of life, even if the absolute recognition without remainder would be possible. Moreover, an attempt to accomplish an absolute affirmation and representation of all layers of society would end up in a catastrophe which name is fascism. Desire does not have the capacity for transgression, nor it is its goal the subversion of phantasmic frame of its pseudo - realization. Hence, we should not locate in desire the dialectical potential, nor see in it the means for radical emancipation of the subject. Desire is always desire of the Other, and the Other is an established system of relations which goal is its endless reproduction, using multiple form of incompleteness located in the subjects, symbolic foundation of the system, imaginary supplements and concrete reality.

Sublation, therefore, does not have its roots in generalization of particular moments of some notion – which negate one another - in order to gain knowledge about it and to discover its higher meaning, independent of concrete content, which would be a dialectical movement on the path toward the absolute knowledge. In this way, we get purified knowledge of higher order, in contrast to previous imperfect definition of some notion. As Hegel explains, there are many moments which we have called “now”, or “present”. But, when we get rid of concrete contents of those “now”, we can define its true meaning. This would be the conventional understanding of Hegel’s dialectics. A sublation elucidated from the perspective of a system does not operate in this way. If we carefully observe the relation between a notion at the beginning and after dialectical process, we can notice that between them exists a gap which cannot be bridged. Something new is appeared and we are not able to reduce or even trace it in the previous conditions. If we take Hegel’s example, an abstract notion of present does not have anything in common with concrete notion of “now”. The latter simply designates perceptual impressions that are experienced in this moment (even this definition exceeds a meaning of concrete now). But “present” as notion implies an existence of a new order within which an object-for-itself became an object-in- itself. In order for an abstract meaning of “now” to appear, the whole system of interconnected concepts is needed for its emergence, or, to put it differently, the new form of organization of life – or for Hegel, the new form of consciousness – is required for the sublated notion to function in its transformed form. The bearer of this new, sublated form of

the notion is the whole system of relations, and a concrete function of the notion is its new materiality. The movement of sublation is a diachronic leap which leads to radical reconstruction of the ontological conditions of the emergence of being. For what being is and how it can appear within the world – and, after all, the limits of the world itself – are defined by the dominant form of organization of particular elements.

The diachronic leap described above is what makes possible the formation of memory; in this sense, memory is not merely a chronological recording of events, a historical account of linear unfolding of being, its different forms and constellations. Memory preservation is a creative process which goes beyond and beneath that what is experienced as an apparently coherent history, its force is the condition of possibility of any kind of consistent encounter of our world and past. Its power is responsible not only for creating that which we call memory, but as well for the emergence of phenomenon which is represented in our experience as oblivion. The creation of memory is based on processes of displacement and condensation, described by Freud (1997) and re-inscribed by Lacan within the field of psychoanalysis as metonymy and metaphor (Lacan, 2017). The conventional understanding of history, memory and spatio-temporal consistency of our world is depended on subversive and radical movements of cutting and connecting contingent, unrelated, distant parts of our experience, in order to construct a consistent, meaningful and intelligible world with established temporal and spatial coordinates. In Deleuze's terms, memory preservation would represent a mode of intensity which underlies and establishes the realm of extensities (Deleuze, 1994); but what Deleuze misses is a concept of transition from intensity to extensity, which is provided by the function of the signifier which we have described as memory preservation. And what Lacan misses is that the signifier goes beyond language; in fact, it goes beyond the phenomenon of life. Having this in mind, we could say that the inscription transcends life, and that different forms of writing dominate distinct levels of organisation of reality, in-forming systems of relation as principles of their functioning.

Being a transitional phenomenon, the signifier makes it possible for empty repetition to elevate itself to the level of the creation of memory by incorporating within its functioning the signifier, which introduces difference through displacement and condensation of experience, connecting otherwise independent, separated and unrelated parts of our past. Once established, a dominant line of memorization homogenizes the hermeneutical horizon of being, including and excluding elements in order to form a consistent, functional

narration of the world-sense. On the other side, the forms of organization which have not been actualized will subsist below the threshold of appearance, forming the disavowed knowledge, an aggregate of unrealized possibilities who waits for the emergence of a new contingent element in the form of signifier, who would open the space for their actualization.

In this context, the dominant form of organization of system or systems would be the Freudian unconscious; it is rather external phenomenon, hypostatized in institutional structures, cultural rituals, conventions etc. We observe particular identities of material objects and social agencies as pre-given and independent of surrounding environment, not realizing the conditions of their appearance; those conditions remain inaccessible to our consciousness. But let us not be too harsh, the reason for that is that our own conscious is just a part of the dominant system of relation, whose feedback loops are limited and functions within the given system. On the level of consciousness, we still do not deal with the subject; what is required is the recourse to the signifier, a mediation of foreign, but ex-time element of transformation from a human individual to a subject. The signifier makes possible a higher-level feedback loop which we call self-consciousness, an auto-referential process of transgression which creates memory (in the sense elaborated above, not in the sense of biological recollection by association, characteristic for the empty repetition of habits), as well as the broader spatial-temporal frame of possibility of memory. This transgression, introduced by the signifier, does not simply mean going beyond boundaries of the dominant system; the transcendence of a given set of relations can be characterized as transgression only if, at the same time, makes previous system obsolete and unsustainable under the new paradigm. The transcendence is motivated by the force of syntropy, which permeate every system and introduces possibilities for reaching higher orders of organization. What we perceive as mere breaking the rules and laws, is one or several actualizations of broader set of virtual possibilities within which exist those cases who could, eventually, lead to transgression in the real meaning of the word. We can see how the transgression is at the same time destructive and constructive force, leading from lower to higher system of organization and increasing the level of syntropy. What remains constant is the place of coincidence of a lack and surplus; the ever present imbalance and impossibility of harmonious relations within any system, regardless of a level of its complexity. The kernel of functioning of the system is the place of radical disparity and contrast is the place where the subject within the system is located; around the subject, the network of interrelations of different parts of a system is organized in order to manage

the disproportion of the forces toward the most higher level of complexity. Via the feedback loop, a system corrects itself and maintains balance; but this balance is far from homeostasis; it is a minimum of coherence in order for a system to actually exist. What brakes this fragile composition and initiate a movement of transgression toward higher order of organization is the inscription of something which has not been inscribed before. This new element is subversive not because it brings some new meaning or sense into ordinarily monotonous fluctuation of a system, but because brings a new form of inscription itself. A new form of inscription is, in fact, the only true event, a phenomenon that radically changes the way in which material or social reality organizes itself, it connects previously disconnected registers of experience and allows for new forms of existence to emerge.

Writing and history

The ordinary way of thinking about past and history is that events happen, and we remember or record them in written form. Wars, conquests, migrations, constitutions of empires take place, and historians record them more or less in neutral and objective fashion. In this view, writing is secondary event, moreover, it is a product of “real” events within the global development of human civilization and, thanks to these events – which have marked progress of human civilization - we are able to write and to do many others remarkable things. Scientific, technical, artistic and political development have enabled humans to accomplish things that are more complex and significant in comparison to mere writing. But, if we investigate deeper into phenomenology of different forms of being and their emergence, we will find in their roots precisely a form of writing specific to the level of appearance of given beings. We should emphasize that writing is understood here in the sense much broader than its conventional definition. Writing is a process of in-forming and organizing that which we usually experience as beings, with its fixed properties, identities and places within the world. The foundational writing shapes the space of becoming, within which certain forms can be actualized. What has not been a part of linear time, which I have called subalternated in my previous work, and what subsists within time of dislocated present as unrealized possibility, will be actualized once the conditions of its appearance are established in the form of specific structural organization of a system, in-formed by particular mode of writing and inscription. We can easily identify several modes of writing through the process of development of matter, from basic and simple to complex and multilayered. From the first subatomic particles to atoms, we can see how matter is organized on most basic level; the space within which particles are organized to form

nucleus, and others to circle around it, is structured by in-forming power of writing. The movement of particles witnesses of an internal syntax of organized space and time on atomic and subatomic level. The rules of interaction between subatomic particles are inscribed in them, and in space itself by its positions and status within the system of specific atom. Atoms are arranged, within the compounds, by different sets of rules which govern their functioning and interaction, and organic compound are produced by cells within broader systems of plant and animal life, who represent systems of higher order of organization and who are governed by their specific modes of writing and transmission of information. The communication via DNA – between generations of complex life forms - is the basis of the process of evolution and, as any form of writing, it has its disadvantages, namely randomness, limited capabilities of communication, and a long period of time in order for a change to take place. There is no way for one generation of specific species to transfer knowledge to the next generation, except of formation of limited number of habits. A change within particular species is a result of contingent mutation which is selected by the environment via successful adaptation. Any form of complex knowledge cannot be formed or transfer in this way. For a higher system of organization to emerge there must be an assimilation of a foreign element by the existing system; subatomic particles are assimilated within the atom, atoms are assimilated within compounds, and organic compounds are absorbed by cells within the larger systems of plants and animals. In all these cases, a foreign, contingent element is included within the system, and a new form of system has originated, with its characteristic form of writing, in-forming and functioning.

We can see how, in these examples, a transition from lower level of organization of a system to a higher one is determined by contingent assimilation of a foreign element into a system, which has for the consequence its transdifferentiation that introduces a new mode of writing and functional organization of a system. The foreign element plays a role of the signifier, with above mentioned functions that constitute the foundations of transformative genesis of a system. A foreign element at the dawn of human kind had the form of a tool, a contingent element taken from the environment and used, within the structure of habit, as an element which has improved, but, more importantly, transformed a simple habit into complex, planned action. A tool had the status of signifier, who has transferred the in-forming power of one mode of writing – in this case from DNA – to the symbolic system of cultural production. The previous dominant system is not, of course, dismantled and abandoned, as it is not any previous system of organization (atoms, molecules, compounds, living organisms etc.); they became the parts of a larger order of appearance,

and they have new roles and functions which cannot be consequently extrapolated from the former organizational principles and capacities of a system. If we can name “concrete”, visible “physical” actions and behaviours as events, then we will call usually invisible, but more material and effective happenings of writing as In-vents. In-vent is a new mode of writing, which allows for new forms of beings to emerge, or, to put it differently, it creates conditions for transdifferential elevation of systems within a new paradigm of functional organization of reality. Everything within the previous system is sublated and transformed, except the place of lack/surplus coincidence, which is non-transformable kernel, a place without its location, an arch-source of transdifferentiation, a form of divergence that does not allow for identity’s to be fully assumed and realised, i.e. it disables systems to gain the state of homeostasis. It is “I”, which is “the other” when “I” came into existence - in the process of self-referential feedback loop as self-consciousness - back to itself. The in-existent, non-localizable, pure but dislocated space-time of tensions, contractions, disruptions and possibilities is non-linear mode of temporality and non-spatial form of space. This traumatic point of any system is what propels them to obtain higher orders of organization, and what secures its perpetual and constitutional incompleteness. The transdifferentiation is a syntropic principle which tries to restore a balance – which has never existed – and to actualise a state of ontological completeness, harmony and balance, which cannot be realized. Its realization would mean the end of every form of system, and would lead to the same consequences as entropy, which means a total chaos and disorder. Writing, thus, is the foundational principle of any organized whole. From atoms, to living organisms and technology; atomic structure, DNA, human writing, binary language of machines, they all are different forms of writing that have in-formed and enabled emergence of different forms of beings. Thus, the only change that really takes place – and which creates its own place and time – is the in-vent of writing! Wars, revolutions, uprisings etc., are not events which produce the artistic, political or any other kind of fidelity, to use Badiou’s terminology. It is precisely the other way around; the emergence of different modes of writing - in the form of in-vent - creates conditions of possibilities for different practices and modes of production to appear. The structures imposed by writing are already here when masses march the streets! Any social unrest, war or simple everyday social functioning is a reflection of structures which are pre-established, whether or not we are aware of them (and mostly we are not). For, any practice, action or passivity is in-formed and organized by the signifier; if it is not, then it cannot be designated in that manner; it would be a pure chaotic burst of events, which is not possible according to the theory of chaos. Truly unrelated, patternless happening can

only be an observation which is inaccurate due to our inability to grasp complexity of the emerging pattern. In this way, concrete events are merely ripples on the surface of in-vents, which cannot be called contingencies, for contingency is something far more profound. Contingency is a principle of emergence of a new writing, a new mode of organization of systems, which means that a system of higher organization cannot be explained by reduction to a lower level system of organization; the qualitative difference – or to say transdifference – is an irreducible principle of construction of that which we call reality. At the origin of every system stands contingency, and on its end is multifinality. We never know what is about to come into existence, and how it will end. The in-vent, which is the beginning and the end of every form of writing, is before and after us, in truly Deidian sense of time “to come”. But its time, in the form of dislocated present, can be grasped in the moments when the pressure of the past and future lose its strength, and when the space of possibilities is open. But in-vent does not require our testimony, nor presence. An in-vent could already happen, but we, as invited guests, might have arrived too late at the party! One thing is only sure; a change will always happen, weather or not we are able to recognise it.

References:

- Bertalanfy, L. (1969). *General System Theory*, Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition*, trans. By Paul Patton: New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fantappiè, L. (2011). *Che cos'è la sintropia. Principi di una teoria unitaria del mondo fisico e biologico*, Roma: Di Renzo Editore.
- Freud, S. (1997). *The interpretation of dreams*, trans. by. A. A. Brill. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Hegel, F. (1979). *Phenomenology of spirit*, trans. By A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lacan, J. (1992). *The ethics of psychoanalysis*, trans. by Dennis Porter. New York: Norton.
- Lacan, Z. (2017). *Formations of the Unconscious: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book V*, trans. by Russel Grigg: Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Stiegler, B. (1998) *Technics and Time*, trans. by Richard Beardsworth, George Collins: Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zizek, S. (2014). *The Most Sublime of Hysterics: Hegel with Lacan*. Available at: <http://www.lacan.com/zizlacan2.htm>. Accessed January 15th, 2019.