

## Editorial

*Derridasísifo*

Today I decided to consider, in this tribune, the feasibility of a scientific writing hopefully of rupture and criticism, aiming at getting closer to one of the senses I'd be very pleased to witness in future trajectories of Sísifo journal. I am therefore writing some words; taken by the purpose of better figuring out the way the *thing* will some day be able to identify itself with the *name* it has recently been given.

Derrida and his well-known deconstruction exercise suddenly came to my mind. Used for the first time in *Grammatology* in 1967 and stemming from the world of architecture — meaning the exercise of deposition and decomposition of a structure —, this term would then impose itself in all his texts as a synonym of a systematic exercise in questioning every inherited hegemonic system of thought, a scientific way of resisting to the tyranny of the One and of the *logos* in Western metaphysics. As if in its essence and destiny intellectual work were the work of opposing a signature to another signature, though without the omnipotent traditional misunderstandings underlying the Western notion of author which contributes to assimilate it into the notion of authority. Deconstruction would then be this inflexible struggle against *doxa*. For Derrida, who used to see life only in places of dissidence, rather than destructing what is dominant, what matters is reinterpreting, criticizing, moving, dragging this or that heritage, inverting this or that hierarchy, unfreezing this or that dual opposition. In such a call for never-ending analysis — which once again evokes Sísifo's works and lifetime — I see the

ideal condition for an intervention capable of rousing any changes worth the name. Therefore, I think some considerations can be forwarded regarding our scientific practice.

The writing issue takes the lead. It seems to me decisive that any gesture to be taken should start from an understanding of the limits of discourse and words whereas the strategy of textual work should begin by lending itself to words and fragments in circulation. I am convinced that the text some of us seek to deliver is always inscribed in another text taken as a referent and where its roots are grounded, while simultaneously tending to outbid it. What will be named as new conceptualization will therefore tend to emerge either from demarcation, unfolding and breaking or, as seen from another angle, from tracks, edges and reading between the lines. This is the way we get absorbed in a textual work that according to Derrida can be perceived as simultaneously “insistent” and “elliptical”. This is also why we often see ourselves dragging each concept in a “never-ending chain of differences”, or building our analysis through a network of “precautions, references, footnotes, quotations, pasting and supplements”<sup>1</sup>. “Since there is no homogeneous text (this became to me a sort of absolute axiom, the recording of all interpretations)” — Derrida explained in one of his best known interviews — “it can be legitimate, and inclusively always necessary, to read it in a divided, differentiated and even apparently contradictory way”. Active, interpretative, performative, signed, such reading should be and

can't help being an invention of rewriting"<sup>22</sup>. Understood this way, authorship would then be the locus of heteronomy.

In my opinion, a second type of considerations should refer to another idea that can be related to this *unfinished condition of a forthcoming book* as founded by Derrida and others. My point here is to suggest that all motivations that converge to build a scientific work might also converge to its subsequent and perpetual division. The way I see it, the plea is for an ethical discussion on academic work around a fundamental hindrance: the constitution of a *corpus* of knowledge, of a unitary sum, of a homogeneous configuration. I think the value of such an interdict is mainly performative, since it imposes incompleteness as a matrix value as well as the open-ended dimension of all scientific writing. From the perspective of the Greek myth we have been dealing with and symbolically hosting us in this periodic publication, the claim for a state of *difference* appears to me as necessary, a difference representing the link between unity and discontinuity. From this assumption, which contradicts the old idea of methodic search for a solution, *problematizing* will then be our major task, rather than that of problem-solving. Instead of "reforming", we will perhaps be allowed to be more modest and at the same time more ambitious. How? By setting up forms of uncommitted criticism through a fundamental understanding that any answer to any question will

always be the raising of a new problem and that because of its scattered multiplicity this problem will always change each time the question moves. In this context, an exercise in criticism is nothing but an exercise in throwing into crisis the memory of the moment we are living.

Assimilated into the theme of Derrida's deconstruction, likewise my interpretation of Sisyphus experience leads me to this new relationship between social thought and truth. It appears to me as materialized in a vocabulary where *discontinuity, difference, multitude* and *problematization* are its major words. I discover here an instigating and huge territory of belonging.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Jacques Derrida (2001[1971]). *Posições*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, p. 21.
2. Jacques Derrida & Elisabeth Roudinesco (2001) *De que amanhã... Diálogo*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, pp. 205-206.

JORGE RAMOS DO Ó

(Lisbon, March 2007)

Translated by Filomena Matos