

JOURNEY THROUGH THE VOWELS OF HUMAN TIME

Lucien Oulahbib, PhD

University Jean Moulin - Lyon 3,
FRANCE

lucien.oulahbib@free.fr

Abstract. An uninterrupted flow of thoughts (images, memories, analyses, desires, etc.)—content of human time in discontinuity/continuity. The discontinuous is suspended and thus becomes continuous when it emerges voluntarily: this is effort or duration; since in human time it is necessary to be and not just to exist, unlike non-human time: a stone exists, but it is not, any more than plants and animals, which seek only to reproduce, even if they are internally adapted by various modifications. But they are not the mainspring, unlike humans, who manifest this through gestures that are both mechanical (breathing, tingling, rubbing, crossing and uncrossing of limbs, touching of the face at each external and internal interaction) and, at the same time, through selected gestures assembled into attitudes (movements that are, however, ritualised according to the action and the place where they occur) at a given social-historical *moment*.

Human Time thus seems to be a Flow, either voluntarily organised into effort and/or duration, or involuntarily into subdued passion which nevertheless manifests itself through internal gestures (to the point of gurgling, coughing, breathing more or less loudly) or external gestures (yawning, tiredness, boredom, excitement, interest, moving in a geometry of perception). The whole thing can be tumultuous; the imaginary, this very movement of floating thoughts, comes up against the symbolism of internal and, above all, external conventions; it thus consists of creating and not just acclimatising, because human persistence also wants to refine and not just be powerful, and this within three limits: motivational finality or eschatology, goal-mean or teleology, result or “form” or eschatology; but the “waters change” defy, indulge in, for example, sophistry (or negative refinement), this dispersion aimed for itself.

The aim here is to reflect on these impressions/expressions of the human Time Flow; that of a Self-given from its three angles (Conative Subject: that of differential preferences, Political Actor: creator of relationships, Social Agent specialising in a particular skill) and which, at any given moment, can/wants to juggle between persistence alone (the game of the Same within the Identical, the Same, the Similar) and refinement through change (the innovative game of the Other within the Multiple, the Diverse), according to the chosen development factor (refinement, persistence, dispersion, dissolution), in a position of

reinforcement or reduction within each action undertaken by one of these three aspects of the Self.

Keywords: human time, continuity/discontinuity, imaginary, Pierre Janet, Joseph Nuttin, Alfred Adler, Freud

PREAMBLE

Being doesn't just fold and unfold any old way

Let us take these smiles, laughter, coughing, scratching, touching of the hair, ears, eyes, winding breaths of imagination and memories as distinct (but not separate) indicators of alarm signals (or 'noise')¹ because they are rather latent echoes or resonances which go beyond their strictly physiological aspect (as pathological psychology has shown in the study of paralysis (*See Janet* relying on Charcot), whether intestinal or linked to accelerations of the heart, various "pressures" seeking to evacuate not *just* the tension of accumulated energy as with Freud (Nuttin 1980²) but to express the demand to be, to achieve and therefore to grow, the opposite being neurosis, for Janet³.

In fact, even 'just' looking means doing something (Nuttin 1980), the trick being, of course, not to be satisfied with just looking, at least in a position of positive refinement, because even looking at a masterpiece refers us to other thoughts of the human Temporal Flow (internal/external, imaginary, symbolic, real interconnection) which can lead to the opposite of negative refinement, or even dissolution.

Hence, *a contrario*, the homothety of sublimations within Limits (motivational finality or eschatology, goal-mean or teleology, result or 'form' or eschatology) going rather, for example, into a position of negative refinement when they arise from the Flow towards the very political compensation of the 'pomp' of sumptuary expenditure, the display of prestige. This, however, has nothing to do with the notion of 'expenditure', such as that of the Potlach,

which aims to ward off Polemos, as Marcel Mauss has shown, and not to display sophistry or disperse itself as such. The display of a whole range of acts and objects shows the degree of development achieved in positive refinement, and not just in preservation/conservation.

Also, more ‘positively’, even in a position of refinement, the effort to be will need homothety, i.e. to materialise its angles of view in practices and objects: The result is a homothety that is not merely compensatory (because that would be purely negative conservation) but a translation into refinement towards this object in order to rest the Flow, to embody it in a desire for crystallisation (Stendhal), that of a request for an exchange with the designated being (if it’s a courtesan, this would tip more towards negative refinement or negative conservation) or this crucible of the imaginary (confidences over a drink), or on the pillow, oscillating between refinement and negative/positive conservation), viewing a painting, a sculpture, a homothetic mediation (such would also be the function of art), associating dreams and becoming a lively act, a thirst for, a dispersal of saturated attention, a need for the immediate evacuation of tensions in the event of anger or fatigue, in impulses that can also be neurotic if they procrastinate (Janet, *supra*: neurosis as a refusal to ‘grow up’; Adler, *idem*; Freud: frenetic sex as a pressure to sublimate a libido unsatisfied by its lack of self-development—specifies Nuttin for his part..

But why ‘grow’, why ‘do’, what is this selection pressure that pushes towards greater ‘performance’ in the context of urban competition between ‘experts’, for example? Or is it not the conation itself that demands it, the desire to go ever further in order to improve not only one’s prestige but also one’s power and wealth, whereas another conation will prefer simply to spend energy instead of concentrating it on an object; even if it means demanding it for some to avoid setting themselves up as a ‘master’, such as the hermit or the prophet, whose aura would increase one’s power prestige and wealth and, therefore, create ‘inequality’.

Or, again, the syndrome of the talented baker imposed by this fact, obviously compensated by the destiny of those well-born and, therefore, benefiting from everything, but compensating by saying the idea of obligatory sharing (the good baker giving to the bad). Sharing, however, is always insufficient for the bitter ones wanting to prevent the very source of creation from arising, speaking only of privileged production of which one hardly perceives the source for the good baker. And since their ideocratic desire is insatiable, they defend it electorally and intellectually in order to defend this position of power and prestige within the Agora, which is not without bringing some wealth to the second and third markets of Ideas⁴.

In any case, all these expressions and homothetic impressions resonate like so many signposts of ‘geodesic’ affirmation (not just homeostatic or ephemeral ‘equilibrium’, but the emergence of self-development, as Nuttin also emphasises⁵), that of a force of being that is not a random ‘construction’ that necessarily has to be ‘fragile’ (as certain nihilist currents advocate⁶).

So all these micro-wraps of human time, both external and internal, are permanently and at every moment enveloped in imaginary memories, which are themselves framed by frames of reference linked to the three Limits, if they are to be strengthened and refined, not just preserved, dispersed, and dissolved. This framing is permanent, especially when they are *constituted* to emerge as *attitudes or ways of being* that shape the flow interrupted within these given behaviours. In this sense, we don’t ‘melt’ a given gesture into any given attitude to be displayed according to the given environment and situation. In a word, these attitudes right down to posture, shoulder placement, full gaits, interweave thoughts and gestures sorted so as to appear in institutionalised behavioural rituals at individual *and* collective levels (family, various groups), and which also include their (possibly self-destructive) critics, at least according to what the Fundamental Law (or Constitution) in question allows, legitimises, in a word, rationalises, endows with meaning, or the

three Limits, which eschatologically sacralises this whole teleological mode of entelechy appearance.

A. LOGIC AND REASON

It can do so *if, and only if*, “a” has the “right” to do so, i.e. if it “must”, not only politically but also *ethically*, go so far as to want to appropriate “b” when, for example, it is itself in a relationship.

If so, then within the three Limits he would objectively switch to the functions of refinement, conservation, dispersion and dissolution in their negative, i.e. diminishing, dimension, such as negative refinement, because by pure egotistical sophistry *he, in fact*, breaks the supposedly exclusive eschatological bond, at least if he had previously officially granted it with his “partner”. Unless, however, they are in a “libertine union”. But even from this point of view, the four functions in their full positivity remain excluded, since it is assumed by morphological definition that they function in optimum, i.e. permanent durability, in the sense that one would be immediately available to the other in the event of teleological “need”. This is not the case for the libertine union, which can nevertheless escape full negativity or diminishment in an exceptional case: the fact that both have been single for a long time, widowed, divorced, of a certain age, and therefore wish to preserve their sovereignty by not living together under the same roof, for example. Which means that, in this case, while they certainly attain the positivity of the functions, they cannot fully attain them, in this case that of positive refinement, because the latter includes, by morphology validated by the three Limits, the objective *and* subjective necessity of *being* together durably in the same space-time, that is to say of being there permanently in order to share a “same” temporality, if not the same, at least similar, supporting each other identically.

Let’s start from another, more “obvious” scenario: should the adult take ownership of this child, even if, logically and legally

sanctioned, he or she could do so, particularly in certain countries where this is permitted by “arrangement”?

No, because even more identically than the previous case, the objective morphological analysis proper to the optimum development of the Self shows that this child has not fully reached his own freedom of maturity to be able to decide whether such a full relationship with an adult would suit him because the latter’s demands imaginatively exceed those of the child, still in his dreamlike symbolic envelope where physical desire in its jouissive consecration proves to be much more abstract and is much more satisfied with adequate homotheties given by play. The child turns out to be much more abstract and is much more satisfied by adequate homotheties given by the play and consumption of sensory objects than by entering into entelechy, which means symbolizations personifying power relationships, including desires to dominate, to be admired, or to objectify the other as a purely abreacted homothety. This means that the relationship between the adult and the child is necessarily tilted towards negativity in all its aspects, since the child will not necessarily be able to understand all these upheavals, which can become structuring and, therefore, focus the child like an addiction instead of devoting himself or herself to other aspects, such as positive dispersion.

So it’s no longer a question of asking whether ‘the name of the rose’ is indeed *the* rose or just its designation, but whether such a filling in of meaning or rationality replaces the so-called ‘natural logic’ that is consubstantial with its ‘political’ aspect in the sense that pairs of otherness such as man/woman, adult/child, truth/lies, borders/non-borders, human beings/citizens, maternal instinct/need for a father are clearly distinguishable. Otherwise, what is the point of the criteria of right and wrong? The answer is that they are relevant in the sense that they go beyond the exact and the bad of logic: so a doctor, a priest, cannot decide as a social agent whether or not a given other, a given human being, can ignore the borders that restrict his access to certain rights. On the other hand, as citizens of a given Constitution, they can issue an ethical and

political opinion without, however, having the authority to implement it fully.

In the final analysis, let us observe from the outset that Logic and Reason are already the two sides of the *same* coin, in the sense of being the bearers of conflict, of both logical *and* ethical meaning in the broadest sense (because political and/or religious lexicons can appropriate this connotation of ‘duty’ within various prohibitions) personified in this double connotation of the verb ‘duty’ in French, unlike English (to must/have to do/to need) and German (müssen/sollen); and all this (this particularity and singularity) is translated anthropologically within the three (oligomorphic) Limits given (eschatological, teleological, entelecheia) that punctuate these various dimensions in the form of institutionalized perceptions (such as the various rituals including ‘relations’ towards ‘oneself’ and towards others, as well as politeness) in order to hierarchize their *scope* (also in the sense of Platonic mediations) within the four Factors (conservation, refinement, dissolution, dispersion). This is what we should continue to explore here, in order to get a clearer picture of these carnal links between logic and reason, perceptible in their otherness as well as their alteration, and grasped first of all in all their cosmological breadth, but also at the ‘micro’ or kinesthetic level that we will now address.

B. THE KINESTHETIC ASPECT

A first, ‘classic’ series of observations shows that the apparently ‘logical’ choices of clothes, friends and objects in general, as well as the surges desire (more like homotheties or projections of impulses than abreactions or impulses) and also the juxtapositions of styles, the fortuitous or ‘well-ordered’ intermingling of clothes, records, books, letters and other objects used in the course of daily life, whether ‘branded’ or not. This means that it is possible to analyze them by studying not only their *deployment* of meaning, or logical *quantity*, for example socio-cultural, socio-psychological, to be

broken down by ethnic group, period, individual according to their sex, age, level of education, profession, “experience”, but also by *rational index* of their *development* (already indicated in an earlier work⁷), which implies that the latter is not necessarily adequate to what would be possible in the absolute precisely, as we can see, for example, when it is possible to identify the presence of high IQ among a population that is nevertheless said to be “disadvantaged” (Reuchlin 1997, 191)⁸.

I have noticed, for example (in introspection but also through observation over several decades), that sneezing is not just the result of a draught, but the fact, sometimes, that in the face of hesitation, the ego, not knowing in which attitude to appear, signals it externally so that the conative Subject takes note of it and, thus, becomes aware of it in order to distribute it in the operative poles of the Actor (decision) and the Agent (in search of a behavior).

The same goes for the cough, particularly the so-called ‘nervous’ cough, which seems to be an interface between psychic preoccupations awaiting their form, be they motivational, symbolic (referential), imitative or, in any case, in the imaginary search for an active transubstantiation: This would be the cough of the poet, of the sensitive/intelligible as an intuition of the (Pascalian) ‘heart’ of empathy (of the ‘mirror neurons’), in any case of a preoccupation knotting indecisions within the pulmonary alveoli whose rhinopharyngeal and cognitive links are not arbitrary. Far be it from me to go into details of any given specialisation, but to indicate interactional approaches that affect not only the political dimension at the macro level, but also at the micro level in the ‘unity of action’ of the Self.

Another example (we need at least two, Popper said somewhere): the left hand draws the shape of a light bulb on the face (imitation) and the body then breathes in to maintain the necessary demand for air, rich no doubt in various minerals linked to the different types of components (nitrogen, hydrogen, oxygen, etc.) and then exhales the surplus (carbon dioxide), while internally the matrixed whole

stabilizes or crystalizes in the manner of a glass shaped by the “glass-blower” (a combined part of the Self). This allows the emergence of a perception that settles “internally” (or ‘Thought, this “ocean” carrying the “lived” to a certain extent, homeostatically and also dynamically and pneumatically). This work at the heart of thought allows the intelligence or connection itself (as Pierre Oléron points out⁹) coming from the whole ‘body’ (this materiality emerged, condensed here *and* deployed elsewhere, which I won’t deal with here) following the lineament from capture to im/pression filtered into a feeling or regulating logic (Janet) arising in the expression of an ‘idea’: this ‘integral’ stabilizing (aggregating) its sum in a word, an image, and *therefore* a ‘force’ (*vis*). It creates the link between percept and concept, which, in concrete terms, will increase the points (like pixels) matrixing the vision, and thereby develop a better knowledge of the relationships linking the Self to its environment and to itself, falling back on the classical knowledge observing this new acquisition as an accumulator, which may be provisional until it has been validated over time, but can reach a certainty that enables us to move more quickly in the interaction and in the construction of an increasingly rapid rotation between intuitive capture, analytical and synthetic distribution, then crystallization or internal action, which is then propelled into external action in a given expression.

The whole of this process can be intertwined with various tingling sensations in the elbows, ribs, nose, the desire to go to the toilet, to take a break, thereby suggesting that the body in tension, including the stomach (this third brain, this Chyle, as Hegel would say¹⁰) *takes charge* of the following fact, summarized as follows: any reflection, any bending, requires the constitution of a ‘halographic’ body, including the notions of body proper and corporeity, but distinguishing itself from them by insisting on the extensive side of the ‘body’ taken as this integral or absorbing and also charming sum creating, for example, sympathy or antipathy or the negative/positive play: negative electrons that attract also tear away, and positive electrons or positrons that “seduce” and make beings and things *crack* in the literal sense sometimes. Thus, the wooden

furniture the cat scratches itself will reflect this movement of the “hylè” of the bodily “matter”, also unfolding as space-time agglutinated, of which the couple percept/concept leans to assert the seven principal Functions with a view to carving out action.

In other words, the hypothesis is that each attitude would be a simultaneous cut, at each (nano) instant, within various animal biophysical and biopsychological and geosymbolic layers, more singularly human; and that this, in order to be displayed, should unfold to take on the features of the animal, ancestor, friend, general referent (hero), all linked to a given volume of air breathed in and out in order to withstand crystallization (like a glass breath); this is what needs to be perceived more precisely: what each of the components of the air does as a functional support when it comes to deploying an action, even if it's only a single thought that the neural tracing by MRI will not be enough to extract the configuration assembling a set of their points of force until it draws the appropriate shape.

Also, and to frame what is important here, it could be argued that the conservation of species in our *human* DNA should not be seen as residues (and the unused sequences would not be a ‘dustbin’ as some would claim) but as behavioral ‘reservoirs’, allowing a given attitude to have as its halographic support a given form of animal or even plant, except that all this metamorphoses from second to second within the traits displayed. But behavioural ‘reservoirs’ enabling a given attitude to be holographically supported by a given form of animal or even plant, except that all this is metamorphosed from second to second within the traits displayed, as if the body needed a kind of mnemonic support. This means that, in a given situation, a given gait, a given facial expression or even a given morphology emerges, without the need to talk too much about the much-criticized ‘physiognomy’ that freezes, as it were, various animal traits within the humanoid and hominid species, whereas here it is more a question of phenotypic fluidity displaying a momentary congruence between various graphs within a given schema, into as many points of perception within the overall mesh

of the ‘body’, this interface that is both dense, compact and atomically deployed, and therefore cosmically¹¹.

Let’s just say here, to conclude this angle, that the “2%” that is supposed to separate us from the chimpanzee genome indicates not so much the strength of epigenetics alone— which a culture-nature feedback would fill quantitatively like a blotter or a wax or even an ectoplasm—but rather the presence of an *a priori* qualitative organization of call sequences, these requests for action-reaction at every moment. Which means we mustn’t forget that these call sequences can become interactions in the manner of perpetual waves of meaning if we don’t have a motif to serve as a boat. Or how thought—that is to say, all of our captures at a given moment—can only remain in the state of an ocean woven from Rimbaudian and Baudelairian transmutations. Indeed, the dream that moves the imaginary by linking past, present and future (sleep being its guardian and not the other way round, as Michel Jovet has shown in *Le Grenier des rêves*¹²) is no longer, for example, this active sediment of positive refinement within the imaginary, but its dispersion, which can be negative if it aims at negative refinement.

C. WHAT ABOUT THE OSCILLATION BETWEEN REINFORCEMENT AND REDUCTION?

Let’s add that these gestures must also be read according to the right hemisphere/left hemisphere split. Let’s remember that the first hemisphere groups together the immanent source of emotional and reflexive outbursts in space and time; let’s simplify the name by calling it immanent. The second hemisphere would group together the functions of language and decision-making logic; let’s call it transcendental.

So, depending on whether the left hand touches the chin, an eyebrow, the nose, the eyelid, an ear or the neck, it will be a question of deducting any other incidental cause, and, in parallel, of relating what each of these organs can express in terms of meaningful

information that the left hand, linked to the right hemisphere, or immanence, gathers and/or stimulates.

What happens, for example, if the left hand touches the right eyelid? Assuming that the right eyelid is controlled by the left hemisphere, and that this hemisphere groups together the functions of language and logic (or the transcendent), and that the eyelid as such expresses both the physiological capacity to protect the eye, and also the logical capacity to count vision, it is possible to conjecture that the left hand, as a sort of immanent emissary of emotions and spatialization (right hemisphere), reminds the left hemisphere (transcendent: language+ logic), which controls the right eyelid, to take into account, or take charge, of what in the immanence of visions and emotions must be logically studied and verbalized, i.e. put under impression until eventually conceptualization, in other words formal designation.

Or a given attitude: it can trigger, for example, a tingling sensation on the forehead, a given inhalation to knead and “inflate” the shape holding the whole together (crossbreeding of imitations that can go back to ancestral lineages) doubled by an exhalation expelling what would be “in excess” and, at the same time, there is a “call” from the sinuses to the dental roots, doubled abruptly by the crossing of the left leg (right hemisphere) over the right leg (left hemisphere). Which may mean that the sensitivity of the sensorimotor sensors (Piaget, Lorenz) allows itself to be carried away by the intelligibility of the motif sculpting the moment. When, suddenly, this breath thus *composed* and having in the moment crystallized a given attitude is broken by the alteration of another emitting an interaction in tension: a sneeze then emerges, the nitrogenous tingling to which suggests that its sedimentation into an attitude is not happening, or is happening badly: the sneeze signifying that we don’t know on which “foot to dance”, which attitude to display, in which humoral symbiosis (a system of Pascalian “liquors”) to situate ourselves.

Why is this? Is it because of a lack of cutting (of uncertainty about this interaction under tension from others) and, therefore, of

oxygen, a vector, and therefore of hydrogen? Is it because of these shortages that nitrogen, left to its own devices as it were, exceeds its own capacities and therefore signals this by sneezing? And don't these shortcomings come precisely from a narrowing of the breath in the literal sense? In other words, the hesitation means that the volume of air is not sufficient to inflate the chosen attitude, which itself expresses a way of being, i.e. a way of reacting, of judging, of deploying oneself in (the) world?

The same applies to coughing, as has been said, and sniffing, which too hasty a judgement reduces to being, systematically, no more than a pathological symptom (whereas literature, theatre and cinema have gone much further); this does not mean, however, that it is no longer a pathological symptom in certain circumstances, such as immunological collapse which, being there, and beyond the fact of knowing whether its origin is psychosomatic, needs to be treated in a way other than by simply being aware of its significance.

Let's insist. Just as sneezing cannot be systematically reduced to the effects of a draught or a cold—because it can also be perceived as the expression of hesitation—yawning, for its part, would only signify 'purely' physiological fatigue. Fatigue can *also* be psychological, as shown by Pierre Janet in his studies on neurasthenia, and by Liah Greenfeld in *Mind, Modernity Madness*¹³, when group pressure weakens the Self, pushing it to take risks with its own health.

Let's look at other examples. When the left leg (right hemisphere) rests on the right leg (left hemisphere), this may mean, for example, that the immanent relies on the transcendent to carry out a given action, because it involves counting and conceptualising. When, on the other hand, the right leg (left hemisphere) rests on the left leg (right hemisphere), this indicates that the transcendent relies on the immanent for action to take place. The immanent accomplishes what the transcendent decides, the transcendent decants what the immanent gathers.

If, for example, the right ear (left hemisphere) is scratched by the left hand (right hemisphere), this may mean that the transcendent is

not listening carefully enough or has not understood the requests for clarification coming from the immanent. Let's take the crossing of the legs again. In a conversation with another person, the fact of not crossing one's legs and leaving one's arms on the armrests, observation can show that this is a neutral position, i.e. more attentive than to attractive information, while, at the same time, emphasizing redundant information which perhaps involves both hemispheres at the same time but moderately, in the sense that neither of them needs to signal to the other the accentuation of its activity. It's a conversation that can be more technical than general or intimate.

On the other hand, when one of the interlocutors puts himself in the position described above, i.e. one of his legs crosses over the other, the observation can indicate, depending on the transcendent/immanent position of the interlocutors, what is going on between them in terms of meaning.

The analysis of gestures can go even further, to the study of organic movements, from the precise and fairly classic moment when we decide to go to the toilet before carrying out a certain action, or when we arrive in a new place (Paul Valéry used to say that if he didn't have stage fright just before ringing the doorbell of a reception, he knew that nothing would happen). Furthermore, observation of internal movements can show that the organs are not as silent as all that, or rather, that when they emerge from their silence it does not mean illness (to borrow from Claude Bernard's famous thought), or even stress, but that they come to mark out, to redouble, a certain action (like the burping, the squeaking of the spleen, of the intestines).

D. THE QUESTION OF RELATIONSHIPS

In this way, a given thought (p) or disparate and/or ordered set of images, sounds, memories, reflections, emerges at a given moment T by mixing a given question (q) with a given exhalation *and*

inhalation of the Self (subject, actor, agent) so that the air expelled (CO₂) and collected (nitrogen, hydrogen, oxygen) can irrigate the perceptive/conceptive 'moods' at play: nitrogen for kneading, oxygen for cutting, hydrogen for transporting, in order to provide or not provide the necessary stability for the elements that have been cut and connected. All of this can be translated into a set of auxiliary gestures that need to be counted (coughing, scratching, drawing fingers on the eyes, on this or that nostril). For example, what has just been written has given rise to an exhalation that creates a kind of geosymbolic stability, in other words, a perception that assembles the links of percepts/concepts, the drops of vis/ion that can be disturbed by scratching, for example, the area between the chin and the lower lip, the chin itself, the right groin—it doesn't matter here, because the point is simply to emphasize that the translated flesh also reflects energy electromagnetically, if only, for example, the link with the notion of 'appropriation' of the extension of the carnal space by smell and gastric stabilization, such as the fact of deciding, faced with a sudden question or the presence of another person, to go to the toilet at that very moment, even though your bladder is not necessarily 'full' or the liquids ingested (tea, coffee, beer) necessitate such an action. A gesture which may appear insipid, of the order of 'chance', or dismissed out of hand by the 'old' epistemology, eager to separate in theory what is nonetheless linked in practice, and which topples just as much into the order of the four Functions and their three Limits within the three aspects of the Self.

It is then the strong role of limits within the functions that makes it possible to regulate in some way this animal tension, which can be transformed into amiable discussion, friendship, without passing by its physical consumption, when this can have regrettable consequences on loved ones. But it seems that today, in certain circles, it is rather the triumph of the Negative in the sense that it is no longer dialectically creative but negatively destructive.

E. CONCLUSION

When someone like Austin asked himself, for example, “*How do you know?*” and “*Why do you believe? in “other minds”*”, in 1946 (a text that appeared at a symposium devoted to Aristotle¹⁴), these questions or “entelechies”—these distinct, even opposed “forms”—refer both to the “logic” of a technique or pragmatics that questions the “how” of a given “knowledge”, a “teleology”. And also to the ‘reason’ or ‘meaning’ of a stabilization of statements established in a given ‘belief’ or ‘eschatology’ broken down according to various levels of validation, broken down into logic (calculation) and reason, ethics and politics, but which does not have the same degree of acuity because the field of definition is not identical. For example, we can be convinced of Newtonian gravitational veracity without making it an irremovable “belief”, whereas testimonies to the effect that Jesus was able to perform miracles to prove that he is indeed God, and in this case the Figure or Angle of the Son, fall into the domain of belief, in the sense of a fixity which has nevertheless been validated by these testimonies and the fact that historically the real person of Christ has been indicated (for example Tacitus). So while there is a clear distinction between science and belief, the separation is not an antinomy but rather a differentiation in the modes of validation that exist, including, for belief, for example, the whole process of admitting a miracle or elevating a person to sainthood.

Everything depends on the “relationship” established between “logic and metaphysics”, as the young Hegel said in Jena (1804-1805), in the sense that while there is a distinction between the two spheres, the desire, for example, to achieve positive refinement posited as the optimum overcoming of a “metaphysics” or ontology of human development is also part of a logic (calculation) associating power (self-control), prestige (display) and wealth (internal satisfaction, ecstasy / external with a given notoriety). This also refers to Heidegger’s “k” in the “e-k”*si-stance*, or the relationship of the stanza to that which moves it, but which can come up against the Limits, because where does this relationship go as the

Place/tenant of that which is supposed to “be”? All the more since we know that this question has become locked in a reconstructed origin which, far from magnifying its mystery in positive refinement, has tipped over into its negative dissolution, reinforced today by its persistence in a kind of Kantian ‘negative greatness’ which, far from solving the Debt that transforms the marble in itself into a statue for itself, makes it worse. Unless this headlong rush is stopped by the even stronger desire of human Living to create Builder Time: like this expanding universe (*res extensa*) creating space, not falling into something already created, in constant search of refinement and not just emancipating itself from its conservative corporeality through the quantitative intoxication of power to the detriment of its quality, this permanent objective in the interaction of daily life, at least for some conscious, even more, animated by the Mystery of Human Time.

NOTES

1. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-rue-descartes-2022-2-page-1.htm>
2. *Théorie de la motivation humaine*. Paris: PUF.
3. See Oulahbib. 2009. *Actualité de Pierre Janet*. Paris: Harmattan.
4. Boudon, Raymond. 2004. *Pourquoi les intellectuels n'aiment pas le libéralisme*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
5. 1980, *ibid*.
6. See Oulahbib. 2002. *Éthique et épistémologie du nihilisme, les meurtriers du sens*. Harmattan.
7. 2022. *La qualité comme quotidien*. Paris: Harmattan.
8. *La psychologie différentielle*. Paris: PUF.
9. Oléron, Pierre. 1985. *L'intelligence*. Paris: PUF (*Que sais-je?*).
10. 1807. *The Phenomenology of Mind*.
11. *Être et vérité du réel humain*, op.cit.
12. 1997. Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob.
13. 2013. Harvard University Press.
14. Flew, A.G.N. 1973. *Logic and Language*, Second Series (1946, 1953), Chap.VIII. London, Oxford: Basic Blackwell Mott Paperback, 125.