# The Shadow Optics of Hazel Lillian Patton

## 1AC

#### Sometime shortly before May of 1945, a young women works at the Glenn L. Martin Company Plant located in Bellevue, Nebraska. She, like many women at the time, enlisted her labor to help the war effort overseas; she installed rivets on bomber aircraft. It is at this plant that the triage of planes tasked with flying in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are produced – Enola Gay, The Great Artiste, and Necessary Evil. It is almost inevitable that she passed into direct contact with the metal used to craft these planes - some say she even carved her name into the left rear corner of the Enola Gay. With this, a factoid lost to the depths of history, a molecular web between this women and the obliteration of approximately two-hundred thousand people was formed, both as a metaphysical cog in the machine of total war and a material fabricator of the weaponry used to enact its devastation. This women’s name is Hazel Lillian Patton; she is my great-grandmother.

#### The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, equipped with the force of nuclear power, tested the human body in never before seen ways. Light, as it blasted through the bodies, produced both hypervisibility and invisibility – illuminating the material body while repressing the non-material being– a regime known as avisuality. A perceptual paradox forms a rift at the level of representation itself - language and its ability signify the subject is ruptured. This forms the basis of a liberal repression of difference that cannot be understood within preconceived models – this is a phenomenological violence.

Akira Mizuta Lippit, 2005

Lippit is the Vice Dean of Faculty in the School of Cinematic Arts, and Professor in the Division of Cinema and Media Studies at the University of Southern California. “Atomic Light (Shadow Optics)”, University of Minnesota Press, pg 108-111.

Slightly more than a decade after Tanizaki's reflection on shadows, another form of radiography claimed the Japanese body. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 initiated a new phenomenology of inscription, testing the capacity of the human body to sustain the searing force of atomic radiation. A singularly graphic event, an event constituted graphically, which put into crisis the logic of the graphic. Follow- ing Tanizaki's rhetoric of the body as a fantastic surface, atomic irradiation can be seen as having created a type of violent photography directly onto the surfaces of the human body. The catastrophic flashes followed by a dense darkness transformed Hiroshima and Nagasaki into photographic laboratories, leaving countless traces of photographic and skiagraphic imprints on the landscape, on organic and nonorganic bodies alike. The world a camera, everything in it photographed. Total visibility for an instant and in an instant everything rendered photographic, ecstatic, to use Willem de Kooning's expression, inside out. The grotesque shadows and stains- graphic effects of the lacerating heat and penetrating light- the only remnants of a virtual annihilation. Virtual because. as Jacques Derrida says, the atomic bombing did not effect a total, irreversible destruction: it did not, to use his phrase, "destroy the archive?" Following Derricla's logic, the atomic destruction at Hiroshima and Nagasaki is haunted by the specter of total war, of total destruction. By the shadow of total destruction." Under the shadow of annihilation only the trace remains, a phantasm of the archive, haunted by its own writing. In the remainder, a dark writing was born. A secret writing, written in the dark, with darkness itself. In the atomic night and on the human surface, a dark, corporeal language appeared. At Hiroshima, then Nagasaki, the human figure served as the site of an impression whose syntax defied the conventional modes of understanding. That is, the atomic inscription remained, and still remains, largely illegible. **Against the proliferation of signs they initiated**-the various idioms and symbols that have come to stand for the unrepresentable event itself- the atomic blasts also caused a fissure in the corpora of language and signification. On writing in the space of disaster, Maurice Blanchot specu- lates: "To write is perhaps to bring to the surface something like absent meaning" Disasters do not, for Blanchot, annihilate meaning ("The dis- aster ruins everything, all the while leaving everything intact"), they render it atomic, inaccessible, secret." The atomic bombings destroyed a certain order of language, a flow of meaning, and forced the topology of language to undergo a radical mutation. Atomic writing, unlike the shadow script described by Tanizaki, does not originate in the body; nor does it arrive, strictly speaking, from the outside either-it **comes from nowhere** and is, in this sense, atopical. Corporeal and atopic, an atopic corporeality: an atomic anatomy. Just as Tanizaki imagines the shadow to originate from within, atomic writing only appears to arrive from the outside. The surface on which both scripts are formed-the human skin-is a tissue that erases the boundaries between inside and outside. Everything that happens on the skin's surfaces represents an unresolved encounter between interior and exterior elements. Tani7aki's image of an interior darkness spreading outward and staining the Western other like black ink on white paper returns in I945 as black rain, in his 1965 novel Black Rain (Kuroi ame), lbuse Masuji approaches the unfigurable event through a symptom, one of its aftereffects. Yasuko, Ibuse's ill-fated protagonist, describes the black rain that fell from the irradiated Hiroshima sky. In a diary entry from 9 August 1945, she writes: "I suddenly remembered a shower of black rain. . ..Thundery black clouds had borne down upon us from the direction of the city, and the rain from them had fallen in streaks the thickness of a fountain pen.""' The black rain materializes, makes visible, the atomic violence, serving as a writing instrument that transforms the radiation into a script, Yasuko's body into a writing surface. She finds that the dark streaks had stained her skin: "I washed my hands at the ornamental spring, but even rubbing at the marks with soap wouldn't get them off. They were stuck fast on the skin."'7 The body and world fused together, like Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, in a painting. The image of black rain, liquid atomic ash, falling on Yasuko's face in Imamura Shohei's 1988 film adaptation of lbuse's novel seeks to ren- der the displaced point of contact between the atomic blast and its victims. The secret archive of the atomic referent. As an aftereffect of the Hiroshima bombing, the liquid inscriptions remain on Yasuko's skin as a visible mark of the radiation-an unabsorbed trace of the violence; an emulsion "stuck fast on the skin." The blending of the world and body, which for Merleau- Ponty makes the human body possible, is not complete on Yasuko's body. Her body cannot absorb this dark toxin; the humanity of her body is suspended on the surface. The survivors of the atomic bombings experience this suspense, says John Treat, "forced to live in a compromise state of both life and death at the same time," dead and alive, in-between." Yasuko's stain is a temporarily visible sign of the radiation that will eventually destroy her. lnscribcd on her skin as an initial sign of violent exteriority, the mark of radiation eventually vanishes into Yasuko's body, remaining in it as the imperceptible origin of her sickness. A design. Atomic radiation rendered avisual; first on the surface of Yasuko's body, then inside. There but invisi- ble, radiating darkness. Yasuko has interiorized the black rain; she has brought the world inside her. She has become an environment inside out, radiating darkness, like Tanizaki's Japanese body, outward from within. Black rain pours from Yasuko's body. 'I'anizaki's fantasy of an essential. interior darkness and the avisual phenomenon of black rain frame a specific topographical problem. In both instances, there is no fusion, synthesis, or sublation at the place where inte- riority and exteriority converge-only an uneasy stasis. Tanizaki's Oriental physics suggests the impossibility of ever merging the light, or auras, that surround Eastern and Western peoples into a harmonious whole." The black rain, as a literary trope, underscores the impossibility of understanding the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: it is a signifier that indicates the inability of language to absorb and stabilize the atopicality of atomic destruction. An exsign or design, no longer a sign, an exterior sign, a sign on and of the outside, an exscription. X." A sign that erases or crosses out- antigraphic. Black rain, like Tanizaki's shadows, can be seen as a figure for the limits of language: a form of writing that is, at the same time, not a part of language, unabsorbed, and unassimilated by the archive. An elemental language, wet and impermanent, is absorbed or evaporates, leaving no in- scriptions, only traces. It forms an inscription on the skin of a secret archive. The idea that certain elements can never mix (races and cultures, for exam- ple) may have already been part of a Japanese self-consciousness prior to 1945; the atomic assaults on Hiroshima and Nagasaki developed that notion into a philosophical crisis. The atomic bombings created a conceptual emul- sion." An idea that opens inside and alongside another, that takes place inside another, within the crypt of another, but never blends with the world that frames it.

#### While the West has erased the bombings, they have had a prevailing visibility in Japanese thought as a phantasm that haunts social consciousness. Consider our tracing of the atomic webs of Hazel Patton to the bombings as a revolt against Western avisuality.

Akira Mizuta Lippit, 2005

Lippit is the Vice Dean of Faculty in the School of Cinematic Arts, and Professor in the Division of Cinema and Media Studies at the University of Southern California. “Atomic Light (Shadow Optics)”, University of Minnesota Press, pg 101-103.

"One particular cell," one atom, that is, particle or building block, inside a body composed of many. The invisible man's identity, his nameless and unnameable identity, unfolds inside a phantasmatic body that is not his. "Maybe I was just this blackness." The blackness that he is, which he plunges into and dives below, the "film without volume which envelops" him, to use Deleuze's phrase, constitutes and bewilders him. He is a phantasm, an avisual phantasm, indistinguishable from the blackness that surrounds him, that he moves into and out of. His voice formed from this blackness, not as the negation of whiteness but as the avisuality of a sonic tremor. Born in the "summer of 1945," Ellison's unnamed invisible man enters the world at the end of World War II, traversing its final moments and erupting from the shadows of history. From the shadows, a shade that forms on the surfaces of history as an atomic trace. An atomic trace of the col- lapse of anatomy; a crack on the anatomic surface. An end of deep biology. He is a phantasm of a phantasm, a shadow of shadows, who plunges into and out of history, forward and backward into a timeless history, a history without history. At the end of history, the never-ending end of history, of a history without end, infinite and divisible, the invisible man leaves an atomic trace. The invisible man is the figure of this history, its angel. He represents an inverse visuality that arrives with the war's end; a hypervisibility that renders the world blind, for an ecstatic instant colorless, making in that photographic moment and punctum, "angels out of everybody." An atomic tRace, to use Dragan Kujundzic's idiom. On the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the World War ll, two spectacles scratched the visual surface of the war, the surface of its specularity and spectrality. As the Smithsonian Institution's erasure of the Enola Gay exhibit commemorating the end of World War II rendered the atomic bombing of Hiroshima politically and phenomenally invisible, two avisual echoes of World War II shook Japan in 1995. The Kobe earthquake, on 17 January, and the 20 March sarin gas attack on Tokyo's subway system by members of the Aum Shinrikyo (Supreme Truth) cult projected a shadow of the war at the epicenter of the anniversary. Seen as a return of the repressed atomic bombing, the displaced or deferred spectacles forced the nation to revisit the primal scene of postwar Japan. The Kobe earthquake, Shinoda Masahiro remarks, reintroduced long-dormant images of war- time Japan. The magnitude of destruction sent tremors through the historical and mnemic archives, provoking a nervous anamnesis across Japan. The use of invisible sarin gas by Asahara Shoko, the cult's blind leader, evoked not only the Nazi genocide of World War II and Japanese war crimes but also the threat of an invisible toxin, released into the atmosphere, into the air. The two disasters seemed to force their way into the visible world, returning like memories that were simultaneously familiar and foreign, traumatic, unheimlich. Fifty years later, the return of these displaced catastrophic images, along with the Smithsonian Institution's decision to erase Hiroshima, rendered the atomic arena phantasmatic and avisual. Since 1945 the specter of invisibility has haunted the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The unimaginable nature of the destruction U V has produced a proliferation of concrete and abstract, literal and figurative tropes of invisibility that move toward the atomic referent. The visual materiality of the tropology is marked by erasure and effacement, by a mode of avisuality that destroys the lines between interiority and exteriority, surface and depth, visibility and invisibility. Avisuality is the possibility of the spaceless image, the impossible figure of that which cannot be figured, an image of the very facelessness of the image. It opens onto a site of the atomic spectacle that is irreducibly ecstatic, other-archival. Avisuality is, perhaps, the only true semiotic of the archive. Its only figure, or sugata, in the archive of atomic destruction, at its center, in the place where it takes place, inside and out, transparent and invisible, the spectacle of the impossible signifier burns, cinefied: radiant, specular, avisual.

#### Therefore, we affirm the prohibition of nuclear power through the resistance method of the “shadow archive”.

#### Western interpretation operates through making everything visible –to illuminate and reveal all. Atomic light is an unequivocal form of exposure which threatens to destroy the very archives in which thought resides. In defiance, literature operates against this, requiring darkness. Literature relies on an imperceptible subjectivity to create an imaginary at odds with the real. This is the process of the shadow archive – a creation of subjective space that thrives on divisibility rather than homogenization. Divisibility uses difference as a weapon, constantly splicing into divergent perspectives, eluding totalizing histories. The shadow archive combats avisual repression through an atomic and secret language in which darkness can reside, hidden from the light.

Akira Mizuta Lippit, 2005

Lippit is the Vice Dean of Faculty in the School of Cinematic Arts, and Professor in the Division of Cinema and Media Studies at the University of Southern California. “Atomic Light (Shadow Optics)”, University of Minnesota Press, pg 24-27.

In the electric Western archive, in the arkheion, radiation descends from above and assails the body like a fever. It burns away the shadows, the virtual archive of an Oriental science. Total illumination. The blinding heat dispels for Tanizaki the phenomenon of an interior "visible darkness" (akari ni terasareta yami, an illuminated darkness), "where always some- thing seemed to be flickering and shimmering, a darkness that on occasion held greater terrors than darkness out-of-doors." The terror of shadows is replaced, in Tanizaki's account, by the blinding, burning force of light. Tanizaki concludes his discourse on the house, the arkheion, by summoning another domicile, his proper dwelling; "the mansion called literature" (bungaku to iu dendo, a palace). I would call back at least for literature this world of shadows we are losing. In the mansion called literature I would have the eaves deep and the walls dark, I would push back into the shadows the things that come forward too clearly. I do not ask that this be done everywhere, but perhaps we may be allowed at least one mansion where we can turn off the electric lights and see what it is like without them." Tanizaki conceives of literature as a residence, private and public, individual and national, imaginary and material - a fantastic mansion or archive. A shadow archive and an archive of shadows, the literary architectonic demands a resistance to excessive illumination. Against the drives of light and exposure**. Tanizaki imagines a shadow archive, a literary archive of the Orient. To write literature, in Tanizaki's idiom, is to extend darkness, or at least to increase shadows, to introduce a visible darkness without light.** A peculiar but precise logic permeates Tanizaki's discourse: **to write is to expand darkness, to inscribe darkness, which forms in the end an archive.** **The archive is possible only as such a shadow architecture. Like Freud's mosaic thesis**, itself **a theory of the Orient and an Orientalist revision of Judaism, Tanizaki articulates a complex theory of writing and interiority, secrecy, and visuality.** At the threshold of a limit, **an abyss from which the very idiom of light would change irreversibly and forever**, Freud and Tanizaki perform two acts of secret writing, two forms of shadow writing, which seek to protect two archives under assault in the 1930s. In 1945 a Western force greater than electricity descended on the Japa- nese arkheion. **The atomic assaults on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States unleashed the heat and light of atoms, which threatened not only the Japanese archive but the "mansion called literature," the literary archive. It threatened to destroy the trace, to destroy even the shadows. The possibility of nuclear war**, Derrida writes, "**is** obviously **the possibility of an irreversible destruction, leaving no traces, of the juridico-literary archive-that is total destruction of the basis of literature and criticism**." Derrida consigns the nuclear war to the archive, literature, and the human habitat as an absolute referent. **The fable of nuclear war (the story of a possible history yet to come) serves as the limit against which the archive survives: "If, according to a structuring hypothesis, a fantasy or a phantasm, nuclear war is equivalent to the total destruction of the archive, if not of the human habitat, it becomes the absolute referent, the horizon and condition of all others.""' The hypothetical referent of a "total and remainder- less destruction of the archive," Derrida insists, remains a fable, a fabulous fiction, which aligns it in some fundamental manner with literature**, the arkheion or mansion of literature, the law of literature. **If "literature" is the name we give to the body of texts whose existence, possibility, and significance are the most radically threatened, for the first and last time, by the nuclear catastrophe, that definition allows our thought to grasp the essence of literature, its radical precariousness and the radical form of its historicity.** In this light, in the light of a searing Western heat, Tanizaki's anxiety over the vulnerability of the literary mansion, its fragility, appears prescient. Tanizaki trembles before a light still to come, under the first waves of catastrophic heat. A light that has already begun to appear, but has yet to reveal the full extent of its radiance. **A radiation that arrives as atomic light and brings absolute destruction. Yet, as Derrida notes, the "explosion of American bombs in 1945 ended a 'classical,' conventional war; it did not set off a nuclear war." The last war, which divided all wars from future wars, from the impossibility of war; the last conventional war was a divided war, no longer one, a war that can no longer be one. In the end, the mansion remained, remains, manere, still stands and stands still in the smoldering embers of the archive. "Trace destined, like everything, to disappear from itself, as much in order to lose the way as to rekindle memory. The cinder is exact: because without trace it precisely traces more than an other, and the other trace(s)." The "total and remainderless destruction of the archive" remains a hypothesis cast beneath the shadows of the archive**. When the smoke dissipates, the incinerated archive resurfaces, an archive in ruin, of ruins, of ashes. "Il y a la cendre," "Cinders there are." From Cinders: "--What a difference between cinder and smoke: the latter apparently gets lost, and better still, without perceptible remainder, for it rises, it takes to the air, it is spirited away, sublimated [subtilise er sublime}. The cinder- falls, tires, lets go, more material since it fritters away its word; it is very divisible."" Derrida's distinction between smoke, which dissipates into the sky, and cinders, which fall to the ground, remaining divisible and material, illuminates a paradox, perhaps an irreconcilable contradiction in the visual economy of the concept and trope of cinders. Cinders are, in Derrida's idiom, what remains of a body that has vanished without a trace. "It is a trope that comes to take the place of everything that disappears with- out leaving an identifiable trace. . . . Everything is annihilated in the cinders. Cinders is the figure of that of which not even cinders remains in a certain way. There is nothing that remains of it."5" Divisible, then, until nothing remains: cinders incite an absolute divisibility. Nothing remains, no trace whatsoever, except divisibility as such. When the object of incineration has disappeared without a trace, only the cinders, which disappear themselves without a trace, remain. There, in the pyroprosthesis of the archive, are cinders. "Il ya la cendre." "Nothing will have taken place but the place." Of the place of the archive, its Dasein, Derrida poses the following question: "How are we to think of there? And this taking place or this having a place of the arkhe?" For Derrida, the topology of the archive, its geography, requires one to think and write atomically. "From this point on, a series of cleavages will incessantly divide every atom of our lexicon." In the archive, or toward it, language becomes atomic - microscopic, deconstructed, splitting incessantly into near imperceptibility. Atomic writing produces another site of writing, another scene, space, or archive in which another writing, secret and di- vided, hides. A genre of the other trace, atomic writing moves only toward the indivisible point, the end of divisibility, toward an irreducible figure, the fantastic subject of atomic writing, "you." The "archiving trace," Derrida concludes, "its immanent divisibility, the possibility of its fission, [is] haunted from the origin."57 Against the archiving trace emerges the atomic trace, or cinders, which threatens to reduce the immanent divisibility of the trace to an irreducible, indivisible, invisible afterimage: it threatens an atomic reaction that will incinerate the archive.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote who best methodologically activates imminence – a model of the world in which things are imminent, always impending – never fully coming to an end.

#### Transformation – be it social, metaphysical, or political – must be understood as a process. When viewed as imminent, decision-making and ethics become a constant interrogation of our past inheritance and future goals. This creates a stasis of present-tense action. Binaries become frustrated as the unknowability of our future collides with the necessity to act. This compounds into a simultaneously abstract and material singularity, rather than a calculable planning.

Nicole Anderson, 2012

Anderson is the Head of the Department of Media, Music, Communication and Cultural Studies as well as an Associate Professor at Macquarie University, she is also a co-founding editor of the *Derrida Today Journal*, published by Edinburgh University Press, and the Director of the Derrida Today biannual conference, an international fellow of the London Graduate School, and a member of the Biocultures Project at University of Illinois, Chicago. “Derrida: Ethics Under Erasure”, Continuum Studies in Continental Philosophy, series editor: James Fieser, Continuum International Publishing Group, pg 106-108.

Transformation is traditionally defined as a radical change or alteration: radical because what is changed is replaced or substituted, in a word, transformed so completely that the previous ‘thing’ (object, event, concept, word, experience, and so on) is unrecognizable. In contradistinction, for Derrida, transformation is not a radical alteration of a ‘thing’ or break with inheritance. Instead, transformation is a process involving interpretation, which in turn, is always already iterative. To transform, then, is a repetition of the past (and thus an acknowledgment and recognition of that which we inherit) but with difference. Transformation is the process of becoming something other to that which has gone before, and out of which it has arisen. Analogously, under erasure is the material and/or abstract marking of the transformative process. In rendering inheritance illegible, while retaining its legibility (and thus its analysability) via the metaphorical and/ or graphical mark of the chiasm, under erasure repeats with difference. Under erasure is an iteration, and thus a transformation, of a metaphysical tradition or inheritance. 14 In the same way as iterability, as that which enables but perturbs analysis by resisting binary oppositions, under erasure does not erase a concept entirely, and nor does it perpetuate a binary between that which is erased and that which the erasure points to: between the illegibility and legibility of a word, concept, experience. Instead, like the iterative process, under erasure contaminates and thus haunts this potential opposition so that what is produced is transformation rather than ‘binary and hierarchized oppositions’ (Derrida 1998, 31). Because transformation is both iterative and a consequence of iteration (which is always already contretemps), then this means that every event, every inheritance, is singular. And because transformation produces singularity, a future event or an outcome can never be absolutely calculated. In other words, interpretation involves choosing, it means ‘deciding’ between inheritances, between other interpretations, and so on. Yet in choosing we cannot ever calculate or have absolute knowledge (in the Hegelian sense) of what the material or abstract outcomes will be; we cannot ‘know’ what it Ethics Under Erasure 107 means for the future, ‘for the future is no future if it corresponds to conventions and can be indicated by means of a conventional code’ (Hamacher, 1999, 189). And we cannot know, because tracing through the materiality of our choices and decisions is the immateriality, the unknown, an alterity that involves any decision-making process in a ‘reckoning-with’, in a process of responsibility. Behind every decision and interpretation is undecidability and thus spectrality (Derrida 1994, 55). Decisions and interpretations are spectral because they are haunted by that which makes them possible: undecidability. This spectrality that haunts interpretation, and that produces iteration and thus transformation, is not simply ‘metaphysical’ and ‘abstract’ (Derrida 1999c, 244). 15 Rather, transformation, because made empirically manifest in and through the material ‘who’ that interprets, is able to ‘produce events, new effective forms of action, practice, organisation, and so forth’ (Derrida 1999c, 245). Moreover, this is why Derrida insists in ‘Marx and Sons’ that the ‘spectral logic I appeal to in Specters of Marx and elsewhere, is, in my view, not metaphysical, but “deconstructive”. This logic is required to account for the processes and effects of . . . metaphysicalization, abstraction, idealization, ideologization and fetishization’ (Derrida 1999c, 244–5). Derrida is not denying abstraction because, as he also argues, he is attempting to account for the possibility of abstraction, and therefore ‘we should not shrug off abstraction as if it were nothing to speak of (“that’s just an abstraction”)**, as if it were the insubstantiality of the imaginary**, and so on’ (Derrida 1999c, 245). Given this, **we can think of transformation as simultaneously empirical and transcendental, and therefore as quasi-transcendental: transformation involves the evolution from the old to an** uncalculated **coming to presence (that is, to the materiality) of the ‘new’**, which is inhabited by a contretemps, a spectrality, **that makes the transformation process absolutely other, and that which is transformed, singular**. It is in this iterative process of transformation, which produces the singular, that **there resides the ‘promise’ to the future to come**, a notion that will be elaborated on shortly. As we have seen, **inheritance does not involve a ‘passive’ transmission of information or objects from one heir to another in a genealogical-teleological line. Rather, what is received is not only already interpreted and translated by a tradition and context, but continues to be ‘actively’ translated and interpreted in the receiving, making interpretation a performative act.** Derrida’s notion of the performative act is neither the metaphysical-philosophical-scientific notion of ‘action’ discussed earlier in relation to ‘play’, nor does it entirely conform to the traditional definition as ‘“form[s] of rhetoric”, “affectivity”, [or] “tone”’ (Derrida 1999c, 230). Performativity is this, but it also contains an excess that deconstructs its traditional role. Derrida confesses that his book Specters of Marx is performative in this traditional sense. Yet despite this confession I would suggest that his notion of the performative takes his text beyond merely aesthetic form or a rhetorical game because there is in the act of performativity, a call or promise to the future and thus to the other to come that exceeds any traditional interpretation and definition. In other words, the performative act is not simply behaviour or conduct, or a textual procedure or form operating within the limitations of a ‘theoretical determination within the categorical frame’, that is, within and by certain rules and conventions (Hamacher 1999, 193). Rather, as the following paragraphs will elucidate, the performative contains a messianic promise: **a call to the unknown future and thus to a disjointed, unknown time of the other. Consequently, like inheritance, the performative is not a structure of cause and effect following the form of a traditional linear trajectory.**
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