

FOUCAULT'S FABLE: UNDER THE WINGS OF INTER-DISCIPLINARY RUMINATIONS

LOPE FLORENTE A. LESIGUES

*May pumukol sa pipit sa sanga ng isang kahoy;
At nahagip ng bato ang pakpak ng munting ibon.*

LEVI CELERIO

Keep writing! It's the best thing during exile.

MANNY GINETE, CM

It is not always recommended, but I will start my presentation with an *apologia*, for committing myself to parodic allusions that puncture sanctoral sensibilities and for reckless recyclings of impersonations and improvisations that impinge upon strict philological upbringing. Indeed, many share Eliot's or Jameson's view that parody is a vacuous exercise, an anatomy of ridicule and mimetic satire done in a non-critical or 'shallow' manner.¹ Nothing is ever achieved by parody, they claim, than it being parasitical, feeding upon its host event for its own identity and survival. This burlesque of the 'moral currency' (*Eliot*) threatens to blight the fibers of civilized discourse, smirching humanity's treasured tapestry of modesty and eminence. And I say they are entitled to their own opinion. For indeed, there are others (*Bakhtin, Hutcheon, Dendith*) who believe in the positive criticality of parody, if but as a tool for the "cultural renegotiation of the present moment."²

1. Here parody seems to fit the description of "sheer heterogeneity, random difference, a coexistence of a host of distinct forces whose effectivity is undecidable". Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991).

2. Simon Dendith, *Parody* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 184.

The typical repertoire of 'double-coding' in parody is set to highlight the plural layers anterior to any unisonal characterization of things. Parody, then, is less the depreciation of character than the resurfacing of eclectic universes that demolish our fetish for a single interpretation of the world. While there is some fictiveness in parody, it is not all fiction. And the single, most important relic of 'non-fiction' in parodic essays is its comic relief, weighted to counter every 'sacred word' (*Bakhtin*) by an equal deflating of self-importance (including our own). The aim of every parodic foil is 'writing back', knowing that in every page of the book there is always the legible and the illegible, the classic alphabets that meet the eye and the hieroglyphics announced by the 'silences between the lines', which only *certain* eyes may be able to discern and decipher. With that preface, let me begin:

It all started with a slight *Sugbuesque* inflection: the theme 'interdisciplinarity' was mistaken to be the rallying credo for what the avian hierarchy believed was the arrival of a long-overdue pursuit: 'enter disciplinarity!' In the wake of the postmodern linguistic turn, is this a case of *lapsus linguae* or *licentia loquendi*?

Whatever – the discrepant readings cannot totally capture the flourish of a disturbing fable, which starts with a 'once upon a time'...in the Kingdom of Birds,³ a coterie of red-plumed cardinals and other royal wings held a meeting. Reports have reached the palatial Aviary that a covey of loons and robins who, by the way, call their hybrids 'loobins', have been acting strangely this late migration period. The bigwigs were never strangers to the buzzword 'globalization' for so long as it only meant flying off to some wintering locations or nesting on islands unperturbed by predation. The currency of a different migration that intimates the 'transfer of seductive ideas' to the Birddom, however, is what creates the stir. No wonder, the demeanors of these loobins – at least, when observed from the panopticon of the Aviary – have been wayward, errant and erratic. Such conducts include, for instance, flapping their wings on the murky waters of *Fons Sapientiae*, alluring unsuspecting fowls to the nectars

3. Those tooled with the skill of decipherment are four: some members of the fowl family – i.e., *da* loon, a chick, a francolin – and of course, a *Mann*.

of philistine adventurism, provoking the excavations of desire, or preying upon the flesh of obscene ‘isms’ contained in the *Index*. The outburst of unrestrained desire is only kept at bay by a vow made under cloistered habits. Upon closer scrutiny, the experts diagnose these erraticisms as symptoms of a far malignant pathology: the strain of *aphrodisia*.⁴ The signs are ominous, and the malignancy, atrocious not only because of its consequences, but also because of its touchedness with desire and raw instincts; thereby contaminating the Aviary with potential vulgarity. If the hierarchs feast on *ambrosia*, it is because it is ‘food for the gods’ and, like *pharmakon*, an anti-serum to *aphrodisia*.

Now, the loobins’ close proximity to clay and ‘materiality’ requires fuller investigation. That most loobins do not soar high is premised on the pervasive lore that they are offsprings of the Fall.⁵ Living in aeries and cloud nine, Seigneur N’ Owl insightfully suggested that they needed somebody ‘a troposphere below’ to validate their aquiline observation. Strangely enough, a volunteer came forward – not of their ilk, but shares with them some peculiar characters: *grace* and *flight*. This volunteer is an expert female deer whose gracefulness and swiftness in the wilds put a touch of aesthesis on an otherwise uncouth surrounding. This doe camouflages as a *cervus* or a stag, for reasons of survival. The aerial potentates baptized her with a gendered oxymoron, *Monsieur Doe* or, as s/he was employed among the ranks of the winged *venerabiles*, they facetiously called the Doe ‘*cervus cervorum*’, at least, ‘in the minor key’. At last, they have found

4. “The *aphrodisia* [trace their roots in] acts, gestures, and contacts that produce a certain form of pleasure. When Saint Augustine in his *Confessions* recalls the friendships of his youth, the intensity of his affections, the pleasures of the days spent together, the conversations, the enthusiasms and good times, he wonders if, underneath the seeming innocence, all that did not pertain to the flesh, to that ‘glue’ which attaches us to the flesh.” Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II (New York: Vintage Books, 1986), 40, in reference to *Confessions* IV, chapters 8-10. Needless to say, “aphrodisia” are viewed as those “pleasurable acts situated in an agonistic field of forces [too] difficult to control” by the hierarchs. *Ibid.*, 250.

5. “In the Christian doctrine of the flesh, the excessive force of pleasure had its principle in the Fall and in the weakness that had marked the race ever since.” Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 50.

somebody allegedly rounded in the knowledge of all – including a familiarity with the ‘aeries and the prairies, the fauna and the flora, the cumulus and the humus’ of existence (or so, s/he vouches) – to spy upon the loobins.

There is a subtle glitch, however. If the avian hierarchy took these credentials to be veritable claims of the volunteer's expertise, they may have gotten it only partly right. For despite other sterling traits, Monsieur Doe has an Achilles heel. S/he has a weakness with words, language games driven to forked meanings, hearsays and gossip, baseless allegations put forward as dogmatic truths, and they have a way of getting inside sacred forums. The *pleasure* drawn from these exercises is simply hard to miss. These discourses are broadcast in a form of commentary whose only role, in Foucault's sense, “is to say *finally* what has silently been articulated *deep down*.” Its paradox consists in “say[ing] for the first time what has already been said, and repeat tirelessly what was, nevertheless, never said.”⁶ This allows the mystification of the commentary's politic of *dissimulation*: allowing the whole avian world “to say something other than the text itself but on condition that it is the text itself which is uttered and, in some ways, finalized.”⁷ The ‘other readings’ of the event with all its thickness and manifoldness are transmuted to a single commentary, which equates official statement with the *only* stance worth repeating. A good number of occupants in the Aviary were annoyed and up in arms to address this unsettling malaise on the part of MD. Imagine getting information from the misinformed, and making a case out of it? Horrible! Yet, *Diis aliter visum*; and the rest simply sing the chorus line, *Amen*.

One day, in a conference with the cardinals and other royalties, Monsieur Doe filed a routine report about the lesser avians. S/he confirmed news that the intoxication with *aphrodisia* is indeed causing disturbance around the *aviapolis*. ‘Desire’ has become a buzzword, even as it is elevated into lofty language, like ‘desire to learn’, ‘desire

6. Michel Foucault, “Discourse on Language,” in *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 221.

7. Michel Foucault, “Discourse on Language,” 221.

to know', or 'pleasures of existence'.⁸ Conjoined to this are some libidinal manifestations, like 'profane chirping', irreverent companies, indulgent studies, risqué colors, and promiscuous meanderings in offsite spaces. In fact, these are precisely the instinctual desiring that needs stifling because of the danger of accessing secrecies and silences⁹ that preserve the mystique of the Aviary, the Doe contends. Since there is no conceivable way to arrest the migration of desire, a scheme has to be contrived to banish the unwanted birds either, by way of exhaustion or 'clipping of wings' or even 'forced migration' outside the Aviary. This interdiction did not go without protestation, but the assembly of cardinals and Monsieur Doe made a forceful case to sequester desire, and the truncheon for implementation is *discipline*.¹⁰ One summer day in October, *Year of the Dog*, Monsieur Doe scaled the lofty Aviary to report that the ploy of instilling discipline all over the Birddom seemed to be working as planned. In fact, s/he received reliable news that loobins all over were hatching a reunion *cum* Birdtalk, centered upon a touchy topic. Guess what? 'Discipline!' Monsieur Doe announced it like breaking a delicate secret: "So I heard they dubbed their bird-conference: *Enter Disciplinarity in Ornith(e)ology?*" And the reason why the loobins are holding such conference within Zebu territory and curiously within earshot of the avian-masters is, in the Doe's perceptive reasoning, for the royalties to hear the loobins' pathetic concession and capitulation. That same summer day, Monsieur Doe, emboldened by the apparent acquiescence of the loobins, volunteered to present a paper for the conference, taking no less than the infamous *philosophe* of discipline, Foucault the Cuckoo, as a dialogue partner.

8. "The attraction exerted by pleasure and the force of the desire that was directed toward it constituted, together with the action of *aphrodisia* itself, a solid unity." Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 42.

9. The peril of silence is not its intimacy to secrecy but its *pure exteriority*, an exilic outsideness where counter-discourses continually abound. See Michel Foucault, "Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from Outside," in *Foucault/Blanchot*, trans. Jeffrey Mehlman and Brian Massumi (New York: Zone Books, 1966), 7-60, 22.

10. To add: not once did the hierarchs ever consider the paltriness of their action, blinding them of the far-reaching infectiousness of *aphrodisia* that infiltrates even their own *desire* to discipline! We will come back to this in the later part.

DISCIPLINARITY AND ITS GRAND ENTRANCE

Here is an excerpt of Monsieur Doe's tract: *'by discipline, we do not mean the violent apparatuses of rifles and traps, but the subtle modalities and inconspicuous procedures calculated to normalize recalcitrant tendencies in most loobins. To ensure education and submission, we need a system of thinking, which invokes the powers inherent upon our calling; that is, the power over grammar and the power to name, so that whatever issues from our lips engender what we intended that word to be, as it were, creatio ex nihilo. That word is 'discipline.'*

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE

As Monsieur Doe was writing these lines, Foucault's inebriated spirit jolted out of the pages of *Surveiller et Punir*.¹¹ Their conversation is prefaced by the Doe's recognition that, indeed, 'disciplinarity' is plural-voiced, reiterating what many already know about discipline – that is, it refers, among other things, to both a means of organizing knowledge and a benchmark for power.¹² As one systematizes knowledge into some form of discourse, the protocols of control, compulsion and discipline are co-produced alongside it. More than this multi-voicedness of discipline, however, Monsieur Doe's misreading of 'inter' adds ruckus to an already chaotic situation. Linguistic specialists may laugh at the steeliness of it, as 'enter' becomes a rogue term in the lips of the emissary-deer, pronounced 'inter' by force of lingual habitus. But the guffaws fade when everybody realizes that the root from whence 'interdisciplinarity' originates boils down to the deer's intuition.¹³ And there is no insecurity

11. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1995 [1977]).

12. Keith Hoskin, 'Foucault Under Examination: The Crypto-Educationalist Unmasked,' in *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*, ed., Stephen Ball (London: Routledge, 1990), 30 [29-53]. See also Michael Moran, "Interdisciplinarity and Political Science," *Politics* 26 (2006): 73-83, here 74.

13. For Moran, interdisciplinarity is only understandable within the tacit acceptance of 'discipline' and its correlates. In fact, Monsieur Doe's plea for discipline's comeback is actually a recall of the originary *locus* from which to start all talks of interdisciplinarity. Michael Moran, "Interdisciplinarity and Political Science," 73.

whatsoever: just as the wayward ‘a’ in Derrida’s *différance* acts as a trickster that deflects claims of linguistic orthodoxies,¹⁴ so Monsieur Doe’s anomalous pronouncement of ‘inter’ as ‘enter’ goes beyond auricular hegemony. To render it flexible and motile is consistent with how Bennington adjudges ‘inter’ to be a joiner (as in *intercourse*), a breaker (as in *interval*) or anything in-between.¹⁵ A note of caution though: the Doe’s usage of the term is that s/he fixates it to mean only one of its ambivalent ways.

‘Enter disciplinarity’ is a call for the re-imposition of order, control and moderation upon aphrodisiacal excesses.¹⁶ The summon to discipline appeals to a ‘disciplinary core’ which corresponds to a body of beliefs involving the use of *certain* language games, *certain* gestural proprieties, *certain* interpretive schemas in order to organize, codify and evaluate the ‘general rules of conduct’ appropriate for the Birddom. For instance, at the center of “the regimen of the *aphrodisia*” is a bodily “health precaution [and] at the same time, an exercise – an *askesis* – of existence.”¹⁷ Here, both body and soul are ‘reined in’ to meet at a core, where hierarchized systematization occurs. The practice of *askesis* becomes *the* norm and *the* rule for the subjugation of baser instincts. The ‘disciplinary core’ organizes the whole system as being both *within* and *beyond* it. The core system to subdue aphrodisiacal excesses is capsulized in the catchphrase: ‘will to knowledge’. Contrary to Monsieur Doe’s naïve belief, the ‘will to knowledge’ is not a living testament of a dying avis; rather, it is a justificatory theory that arrests and positions everything (say, the wiles of *aphrodisia*) within the template of discursivity and knowledge-production. By a sleight of hand that can only be termed “the

14. Jacques Derrida, “Différance,” in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 3-27.

15. Geoffrey Bennington, “Inter,” in *Post-Theory: New Directions in Criticism*, eds. Martin McQuillan, et al. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), 104 [103-119].

16. “In the domain of pleasures, virtue was not conceived as a state of integrity, but as a relationship of domination, a relation of mastery. This is shown by the terms that are used...to define moderation: “rule the desires and the pleasures,” “exercise power over them,” “govern them.” In short, discipline. Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 70.

17. Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 126.

imperialistic claims of a single discipline,"¹⁸ knowledge is sacralized and invested with a sense of ubiquity and divine legitimation.

To recall, the cardinals' (and by extension, Monsieur Doe's) claim to 'ubiquitous knowledge' is vitally linked to their proprietorship of a 'birds-eye view', a panoptical knowledge, a rationality of an all-encompassing gaze that penetrates every crag and cranny of the avian universe. Such knowledge provides an official account of what it means to be avian. In the Cuckoo's sense, the foundation of such claim occurred at a time when avians signified themselves "as both that which must be conceived of and that which is to be known."¹⁹ To repeat, one of the most ingenious ways in which to control and discipline the winged initiates is to authorize 'knowledge' to decide which constitute normalcy, belligerency and deviance. Such knowledge is justified by a cluster of legitimating protocols called *discourse*²⁰ – those historically-contexted 'proper statements' that authorize and officialize how an avian must be defined.

Corollary to the 'bird's-eye view' is the claim to 'heights' and the invention of perspective. The 'view from above' is chosen as the 'standard' discursivity of looking at the rest of the world. Discourse then arranges the outside world like an impersonal observation point, asserting that any viewer placed in that point will see the spatial relations between objects in exactly the same way.²¹ The ordering of an avian's cultural world, once discursively (re)constituted within panoptic and hierarchic frames of reference, become convenient for control and administration. The myth of the Fall is believable not only because everyone is implicated in Adam's apple, but because the ground below is magnified as the negative spatiality against which to deduce the positivity of one's lofty position. In fact, it is no secret that the force of dominance in knowledge-production, according to Foucault, has always sought "a vantage point from which to reduce

18. Michael Moran, "Interdisciplinarity and Political Science," 74.

19. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Tavistock, 1970), 345.

20. It must be noted that 'desire' *per se* is not the aim of Foucault's early theorizing, but the tracing of its emergence as product within discourse itself.

21. Barbara Bender, ed., *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives* (Oxford: Berg, 1995).

the multiplicity of past events to a single, authoritative version.”²² Under this regime of knowledge then, is the dissemination of power clad in celibate benignity. The seemingly ‘innocent power’ lies in the right of the hierarchs to pattern the loobins according to the mode in which the latter’s subjectivities can be constructed. At this point in the discussion, Monsieur Doe waxes Pascalian: ‘the cardinals have reasons which Reason itself does not know’. “Reason’s political power”²³ is readily invoked here. Indeed, power infiltrates the politics of reason so much so that the privileged authority can make rules, pass judgments, shape blueprints or formulate sanctions even on the ground of the arbitrariness of reason, giving ‘unreason’ a legit status as a form of odd reasonableness or divinely-sanctioned rationality (a curious sort of “logophilia”)²⁴ decipherable only to the privileged few.

THE GENEALOGY OF POWER

How knowledge *is* power finds its manifest example within the premises of the academia – supposedly Reason’s home base. ‘Back to the basics’ is the clarion cry of the authorities, putting ‘discourse of the rule’ back to the center and, in doing so, creates a matrix for the production of power. The hierarchs put out a (literal) ruler, and instruct loobins not to step beyond it. This is meant to temper the over-determination of intellectualist (spelled: unorthodox) adventurism among some winged professors, which are, again, lingering signs of *aphrodisia*’s contamination. Such tempering necessarily situates the academicians as both objects and instruments of the discourse’s disciplinary sway. Monsieur Doe, in a surprisingly inverse mode, cites the Cuckoo to bolster the hierarchs’ ‘non-rationality’ stance, not because they seek to “vindicate a lyrical right to ignorance or non-knowledge” and attack the concepts and methods of academia *per se*, but rather because they fear “the effects of the [seemingly] centralizing powers which are linked to the institution

22. Joe Moran, *Interdisciplinarity* (London: Routledge, 2001), 136.

23. Lawrence Kritzman, ed., *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Lawrence Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 1988), 58.

24. See Michel Foucault, “Discourse on Language,” 228.

and functioning of an organized scientific discourse²⁵ held by academicians allegedly in utter disregard to the 'rule'. The hierarchs fear the phantoms of *aphrodisia* which, for Lacan or Zizek, may be nothing but the 'fear of one's shadow'. For many loobins, the authorities may be stressing a point, but that point is ultimately bred in *fear*, or, in the Cuckoo's haunting phrase, "a very ancient fear" indeed.²⁶ And the perilous thing with owning a 'discourse' in fear is that one equally owns the cudgels to implement it with false bravado. Discipline comes in handy, surveilled to penalize shows of aphrodisiacal lapses; or where there is the sheer *likelihood* of dissent, to 'normalize' the situation by ensuring and enforcing the 'rule of law'.²⁷ The art of subtle regulation and monitoring, feigned to normalcy in collective psyches, is part of the disciplinary cache. Claws latched onto the 'ruler' are more constrained than the loobins' casual perch on the wire. All of this is to drive home the message: back to the basics, and *askesis* is commissioned as the legitimating discursivity, a traditionary root to outlaw all rogue wire-sittings and hyperbolic yearnings, and school them to the temperance of the rule.²⁸ In reaction, some critics in the Aviary may have been intimating a counter-discourse. For them, they'd rather choose 'back to the basis', sensing the danger of associating 'basics' not with its *radix* but with a *certain* fearful tradition, ordained and sealed with the stamp of normativity.²⁹

25. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 84.

26. Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 16-17.

27. "The tendency to rebellion and riotousness was the 'stasiastic' potential of *aphrodisia*; [in the minds of the Cuckoo], the tendency to exaggeration, to excess, was its 'hyperbolic' potential". Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 49-50.

28. "Askesis was an important exercise in the direction of souls...It is an exercise in self-control;" a formidable institution of discipline. Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 74.

29. Little effort is made to put to open discussion about the "inventive character of tradition," which could have broached the healthy debate between respect of tradition and tradition of certain respects. By invention, Tanner does not imply arbitrariness but that "traditional materials are never simply found, even were they to be genuinely old and purely self-generated by a particular group of

Needless to say, this type of exploration on the part of loobins is highly offensive to sacred ears because its motivations seem to be desirous at best, probing a little too much *beyond* the rule. For the hierarchs, questioning it ultimately redounds to questioning the foundations of the *Sacred Phoenix*. To secure *this* part of the argument, the hierarchs invoke the ‘power to name’,³⁰ thereby, arresting a privileged vocabulary to back up, not only its claims, but its originary position in all discourses. What remains unchecked is that this claim of priority (i.e. ‘a discourse *above* discourse’) is enmeshed within the contingency of discourse itself! For some loobins, authority needs to tiptoe when making such claim only because to do so would imply the claimants’ capacity to jump out of their own skins. Or, exempting themselves from the implicatedness with language, they begin to mistake faith-expressions of the sacred firebird for the *Sacred Phoenix* itself.

Poised against ‘discipline’ is the invocation of ‘freedom’, appealed to by the loobins. Even Foucault reiterates that “we are not free to say just anything, that we cannot speak of anything” without flirting redress or invoking responsibility. What the loobins do not know and cannot imagine, however, is whether their ‘wings can be clipped’ for not even beginning to ‘chirp’ at all. Or is posing the ‘rump-first-crown-last’ syntax³¹ in classrooms commensurate to some form of mutiny as to merit curtailment of freedom? Is it, perhaps, the case that one’s positionality in a *certain* space, just by virtue of being a loobin, already constitutes the forebodings of dissent and anarchy? At least, Foucault clarifies for the aggrieved avians what has long been a silent dictum of exclusionary discourse: “speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but that

30. See excerpt of Monsieur Doe’s speech above.

31. In classic ornith(e)ology, the body is a hierarchical arrangement of parts, starting with the crown, mantle, scapulars, down to the rump, invoking Plato for this justification. The loobins may have made a blunder by engaging the proprietors of language in their own turf by asking: ‘couldn’t we just start putting the rump *first*, and the crown *last*?’ This ‘little question’ merited strong objection from the winged gurus. To uptilt the globe south-north would be unthinkable, the latter argue, for that would mean a cloud of intolerable implications, like, cardinals walking on slimy earth. But more importantly, they cannot let go of this detail because mutiny happens in the failure to arrest details, as we will learn shortly.

it is the very object of conflict itself."³² Hence, the avio-potentates are right all along to 'nip it in the bud' by jutting their mandibles to the source of all seeds: 'the power to name'.

The 'power to name' historicizes itself by way of dominating, say, the body – the seat of desires, dreams and demons. The body is neutralized as a totem of docility.³³ Of course, once this logic of power is set, the *diktat* over details follows. Foucault the Cuckoo reiterates, "discipline is a political anatomy of detail." For the disciplinarian, "no detail is unimportant, but not so much for the meaning that it conceals within it as for the hold it provides for the power that wishes to seize it."³⁴ In the experience of some loobins unshaken by the 'rule of the ruler', this fetish for detail is best concretized in the word *flight*. For one, discipline can be executed by way of 'forced migration' – a creative ploy because then, as the commissars of power would say, 'we do not have the body'. *Non habeas corpus*; hence, no responsibility. To repeat the Cuckoo's observation: there is a subtle logic, a stringent economy whereby the decisions rendered as discreet as possible are, in fact, exercises of power to control. In this case, the most sophisticated exercise of control is to 'invisibilize' the body³⁵ from the site of contention, to sequester it from the register of concrete time and place, and to diffuse the loss with innocent, or even noble, apologies that could only mean 'doing the will of the Sacred Phoenix'. Indeed, the 'arrest of the minutiae', which extends to the body politic of the lesser

32. Michel Foucault, "Discourse on Language," 216.

33 "A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved...[T]here was the scale of the control...of exercising upon the [body] a subtle coercion, of obtaining holds upon it at the level of the mechanism itself – movements, gestures, attitudes, rapidity: an infinitesimal power over the active body." Michel Foucault, "Docile Bodies," in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 136-137.

34. "Every detail is important since, in the sight of God, no immensity is greater than a detail, nor is anything so small that it was not willed by one of his individual wishes." Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 139, 140.

35. "Disciplinary power...is exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility." Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 187.

avians, is given divine legitimation; that is, the official pronouncements from the Aviary stand on an unquestioned access to some sacred calculi. The nitty-gritty of *what*, *when* and *where* may be spelled out but, by writ of sacral authority, no body questions the cardinals or Monsieur Doe about the details of the *why*. Some simply find themselves exiled outside the borders of the Aviary. *Flight* is meant to be a symbol of *askesis* – a purification, a loss of the desiring body, and, at the same time, a justification absolving guilts.

As The Cuckoo elaborates, banishment, be it forced or induced, only brings to recognition who the master of space is. The threat of loobins sharing close spatial proximity with the cardinals and Monsieur Doe is simply unbearable. For one, the former's access to 1425 ornith(e)ology may perpetuate 'profane chirpings' more than sacred earlobes could endure; and for another, the sway of ominous contamination and contact leaves the latter desiring for utmost caution. Hence, part of the discipline is a mandate over spatial decisions, arrangement and distribution. Under this seemingly hostile dispensation, a mystification of space provides a semblance of freedoms and plural realities *within* enclosures. The taxonomy of confinement is euphemized by concessionary substitutions that seem to lighten the burden – and hence, suggest to forget – the *fact* of banishment. Yet, there is no escaping the fact that exilic departures, despite the accoutrements of diasporic promises, ascetic renewals, and first-class flights, are contemporary translations of *amende honorable* whose lineaments center on a key word: 'discipline'. A formal letter with imprimatur is what it takes to make one invisible. Is it not the case, however, that *flight* is only one letter away from *fright*. The sanctioned banishment of an errant body becomes the purifying regulative against intrusions into the sanctum of the holy Aviary. But then, *flight* is also an item employed in fancy and fantasy. To recall, Monsieur Doe, equipped with the knowledge of the 'grounded terrains', has been employed by the residents of the Aviary as a welcome balance to their otherwise lofty positionality. With expectations running 'high', the Doe scrounges from the top of its head what it could have superbly supplied with its nose (called nosiness) – which amounts to nothing much really, except a few figments of imagination. The problem is the arrogation of something that is not there except as a semantic drift: 'flight of imagination' is

mistaken for 'actual wings'. The truth of this Pegasian mirror-image is limited to the deer's virtual wings – that is, those unwarranted fantasies officialized as facts, a.k.a., *chikas* – leveraged to poise oneself as an 'insider' among the ranks of the winged. When confronted to account for the facts of the matter, flight takes on another turn: 'escape', 'deflection' or 'evasion'. 'Ducking' would be a fitting description of the Doe's instincts, as the emissary-deer is never able to get the story straight. (The only merit the doe gets is being accorded the honorary, 'duck' membership among *familia Anatidae*). In the process, however, *flight* becomes more suspicious, as circumvention of accountability is transmuted into accountable circumspection, a positivity to reinvent trust among the powerful, not much on the grounds of veracity, but on the basis of a shared indictment against common nemeses.³⁶

Since disorder and dissent betray vestiges of aphrodisiac infection, it is not hard to jump to the conclusion that indeed many loobins are 'compromised'. The Doe instructs the hierarchs not to look too far. In the loobins' nesting places are parchments of unwanted manifestos, one of which is akin to a Borgesian lexicon 'irruptively' cataloguing birds as follows: (a) those perched on the wire, (b) tame, (c) with muddied plumes, (d) all of the prior classifications, (e) feeds on worms, (f) featured in the encyclopedia, (g) those with ticks, (f) cardinals.³⁷

True, there is something enigmatic and anomalous about this catalogue, because it defies any recourse to a unifying principle. What is ultimately transgressed is not the connectedness of those listed but the very ground of possibility on which such connection

36. Yet in the case of Monsieur Doe – and this is Foucault's point – to elevate any pseudo-winged capacity to the heights of veracity and then, give it credence in the court of cardinals seem tragic because first, misprisions and unchecked biases are enthroned alongside claims of divine warrants, and second, judgments drawn from the first are given the imprimatur of authority and believability, based on the simple logic that the Doe is one with the cardinals, and never with the loobins.

37. See semblance of this Borgesian random categories in Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, xv. In a separate instance, Jay's and the ore-keeper's joint manuscript, entitled *Cooing Ornith(e)ology*, was outlawed from the faculty's librocopia in Zebu.

can be set.³⁸ But then, from the view of the avian hierarchs, this ‘heterotopia’ is neither a sketch of the ‘postmodern condition’ nor a matter of critical engagement with ‘questions of knowledge’ but rather a dose of heterophobia, a siren call announcing mutiny to the order of things, an unbridled desiring that endangers the comeback of the Fall. *Fear*, or what Bakhtin calls the ‘great interior censor’,³⁹ dictates the warrants of discipline and the execution of power. Desire is not a suspect; it is the culprit. The confidence in the exactness of this diagnostics (through knowledge/power) requires a precautionary, almost ‘pugnacious’ rebuttal.⁴⁰ The correctness of the diagnosis is not an issue; it has been *won over* by the ‘power to name’. Hence, the detailed assault of the ranks is matched only by a careless un-meticulousness, or even a trifling dispassion, to give profound reasons – and hence, only misimpressions – for censures, like ‘clipping of wings’ or ‘de-clawing’ or forced migrations. Who needs the legitimacy of a *why* when, because of the privilege of language elevated as language of privilege, one becomes both the progenitor and the definitor of power, constricting body and reason within the thrall of one’s self-made logic, “defin[ing] how one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes.”⁴¹

The discourse of discipline, however, is such that it does not only punish, it also rewards. A good number of sympathetic parakeets pass word about the system of indulgences – a reciprocity

38. The author borrows this citation from his paper: ‘*God Beyond Thinking: Bakhtin, Otherness and Apophasis*’ delivered during the Vienna International Conference: “Gottdenken in Europa Heute – Theologie im Globalen Dialog” (Katholische Theologische Fakultät, Universität Wien, 19-29 May 2003), 1-14.

39. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968), 93-94, 137-138.

40. “One could behave ethically only by adopting a combative attitude toward the pleasures [and desires]. As we have seen, the *aphrodisia* were made not only possible but desirable by an interplay of forces whose origin and finality were natural, but whose potential, by the fact that they had their own energy, was for revolt and excess. These forces could not be used in the moderate way that was fitting unless one was capable of opposing, resisting, and subduing them... The relationship to desires and pleasures is conceived as a pugnacious one.” Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 66, 67.

41. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 138.

of gains and debits that one inherits for the price of unwavering loyalties, unquestioning obedience and ascetic temperance. The demands of *askesis* are never easy, but the rewards of the hereafter (or 'heir-after') are dangled in the air. The imposed penalties for the hardened are meant to neutralize, exclude, and differentiate them from the general economy of the assimilated. Woe to those who do not 'play the game' of sanctity for they shall be called 'names'. The rewards, on the other hand, are rather enticing, wrapped in the form of plentitude or, say, a red plumage earmarking the making of a loobin into an honorary cardinal, or one of the lesser Does. Here, disciplinary reward is a 'normalizing act', a gesture to solemnize homogeneity and familiarity onto the avowed differentials of alterity; in short, the subtleties of symbolic violence and micro-domination. In all, the 'disciplinary core' becomes an assurance of in-group cohesion and understanding, and a marker of distinction differentiating the pristine from the unwashed. The politics of exclusivism is rooted in the *desire* for posterity because, indeed, the handing over of self-perpetuating habits and cultural capitals from one generation to another along the line of discipline warrants a never-ending circularity of justifications and redemptions; in short, immortality.

THE 'INTER' IN DISCIPLINARITY: ECHOES AND VARIATIONS

The plea for the grand entrance of disciplinarity is critically engaged, among others, by two camps, namely: the deconstructionists and the integralists. The first camp calls for the dismissal of disciplinarity or *that* type which epitomizes the position the Doe and some among avian hierarchs embrace. They cry to *inter* disciplinarity. The second camp is more creative and accommodating of discipline, seeing interdisciplinarity as a 'space of encounters'. If in the former, *inter* separates; in the latter, *inter* merges. We shall elaborate their positions below.

THE COUNTER-DISCOURSES: INTERMENT AND EXHUMATION

Outside the Aviary, a good number of the exiled loobins busy themselves with digging gravesites to bury both grudges and hubris, and then to subtly inflict upon their tormentors a foil of their

own – ‘*inter* disciplinarity’. This time, it proceeds to deconstruct by way of reinscribing back that which is lost by the *Sugbuesque* flair while introducing a ‘semantic crack’ to originary intentions. This ‘crack’ does announce a form of *enterrement* of that type of discipline that Foucault has intimated as equally bred in pleasure. *The desire to discipline!* Of course, in the later part, it will be realized that the alleged interment of discipline is whimsical. It effectuates nothing but the unwitting reproduction of it. To ‘discipline’ disciplinarity presumes an invisible cudgel made from fairly the same mold. However, all of this is getting ahead of the story.

In earlier times, a strand of loobinesque realism believed in interring disciplinarity as a sign of dissent against existing dispensation. There is a basic forgetfulness about *jeux de verité* on the part of the hierarchs – that in fact, the exercise of power and discipline may be nothing but the surfacing modalities of repressed desire, oftentimes bridled under strictures of ‘better use’ (*chrçsis*), mastery (*enkrateia*) and moderation (*sôphrosynç*).⁴² Yet, during unguarded moments, might it be possible that its silenced ontology, namely *aphrodisia*, juts its sinister head and confronts its hermetic masters? It is not only possible, but real! In fact, in this inaugural excavation, some loobins hear both a requiem and a cantata dedicated to ambivalent silences. One silence is complicit with repressive discipline, while another translates its muteness in enacted desiring and fleshly decipherment. Hence, the act of interment is simultaneous with the promise of exhumation, a sort of genealogic retrieval of ‘other’ discourses that could be disinterred along the path of interring. It should be noted that to ‘crack the ground’ is a provocation unparalleled for the avian hierarchs. And we ask: why do they care at all when they live in the luminosity and obliviousness of lofty space, sipping *ambrosia*? Deeper inquiry reveals their stake, showing how sacred aeries, no matter how distant, are still perched on the foundations of humus. The ‘crack’ on durable ground is therefore a gynecological provocation, reminding them of births, angst and hatchings long before they were made haloed creatures!

42: Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, esp. Part I.

But the undertakers see much more, namely, specters of muted silences. These are silences that are paradoxically interred by exhumation or shall we say, palimpsestic quietus whose only revelation is by way of erasure. For the dissenters, the 'crack' announces its opposition to the silence complicit with disciplinarity. Many loobins align themselves with the Cuckoo's criticalness of 'silent assumptions of history' by allowing secrecies to surface and be opened. They reckon quite correctly that these silences safeguard caches of 'assumed unities' within discourse that dictate the official view of the whole Aviary. Once congealed in thought and practice, many of these 'unities' are preserved and frozen into ice-cold dogmas. It is this preservation that stifles their being seen as interlocked within the network of multiple discourses and therefore, stand as privileged, *a priori* categories unquestioned in their claims. Silences... complicit in their revolt, and yet, revolting in their complicities! The silence of the 'crack' is overwhelmed by the 'crack' of silence.⁴³ And the shrillest of all the silenced is no other than *aphrodisia* – zombied desires, dionysiacs of passion, dissimulators of wanton imaginings, tabooed from the vocabularies of propriety. For the avian hierarchs, castration is one solution; for some Lacanians among the dissenters, castration only veils the wound that unconceals it by hiding. The face of desire is writ large in its haunting absence.

And it is here that the loobins tread an unwieldy contradiction, realizing the near-impossibility of discipline's interment. To do precisely that entails disciplinary power. According to the Cuckoo, the inter-permeation of power is possible because power is not hierarchic, but capillary; therefore, it is neither dictated by the logic of social hierarchy nor derived from the clear opposition of the ruling-ruled binary. Resistance is in fact, the 'other translation' of power, its flipside secures the very properties it seeks to debunk. Might this be another reading of the equation: "where there is power, there is resistance?"⁴⁴

One subtle display of power is the loobins' capacity to represent Monsieur Doe and the cardinals in their schema of things,

43. Foucault talks about the "edges of language", when silence emerges as a "positive unconscious of knowledge". Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, xi.

44. See Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. I (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), 92-97.

and to elevate such representations in discursive spaces totally incomprehensible and cryptic to the latter. It is a game some dissenters resort to, dabbing paints and allegories onto immaculate egos of the dominant powers. The loobins become painfully aware that even their gesture is power-saturated, fueled by desire of some sort. Under such a spell, the 'dominant other' is redeployed as an 'example', an 'instance', a 'logic' appropriable and exploitable within the loobins' meta-commentary which, as we have seen earlier, was a domain reserved for those who had the 'power to name'. Eventually, the loobinesque inflections of resistance create an imagined world where the rebels are *allegedly* fearless, where the battlecry is pure and lofty, where terrains are constructed to fit the scenario of betrayals. Indeed, innocence is lost forever, and castrated desire pokes its head out to give an account of its power. The desire to capture the 'molten lava of experience' (as Bakhtin would say) is transgressed by an irrecoverable wound of coming only with a 'secondary narrative'. Here, voices are allegedly heard, but the interlocutors are wooden and unresponsive – or, they talk back at whim, all fabricated in the vision of the now enlightened loobin. Having interred discipline, the pathology worsens because the necessity to 'rein in', to temper one's wanton, imagistic ruminations, with a whip of disciplinarity, is purchased at the price of remembering the death knell one has brought to discipline itself. The route of exhumation has left a ground for modest self-renunciation while allegorizing the 'gaping crack' as decipherable mysteries via a self-acquired panopticon. The guilt borne out of desire is dually dealt with, namely, the diminishment of the *I* and the enlargement of the *Eye*. The seemingly modest self-abandonment is charged with a powerful ocularity, which renders everything 'under its light' observable and hence, alterable by one's chosen account. The experience is almost orgasmic as one ejaculates the prayer of penetration of souls. One realizes that surveillance is far from being a singular property owned by avian hierarchs, but – in Foucault's sense – an available apparatus for all through which power is produced, reproduced and distributed in a given field. If pathologies and guilt complexes afflict some loobins, they are driven by an aphrodisiacal ritual almost self-destructive in its reversal – that is to say, a desirous probe into the secrecies of the Aviary, knowing from experience that the only penetration accessible is a gaping

trauma. In the end, disciplinarity's committal to the ground is more symbolic than anything else, as it is haunted by the resurgence of neglected domains and relations that it took part in repressing in the past.

INTER-COURSES OF DISCIPLINARITY: EXPLORATIONS AND QUERIES

Some loobins interpret 'inter' in disciplinarity as a joiner, forging connections across the different disciplines. Still, variant meanings abound. It may mean 'reciprocal accountability' of scientificity; or the establishment of a free, unfettered space in the interstices between disciplines. Others think of interdisciplinarity as a momentary 'rest station' where *certain* disciplinary ideologies launch to fly after recouping spent energies and lost credibilities. Still, while some speak in terms of a transcendence of disciplinary boundaries altogether, others cannot dismiss "disciplinary hierarchies" that create the condition of possibility for interdisciplinarity.⁴⁵ In connection with the latter, some loobins in dialogue with the Cuckoo ask: might it be the case that interdisciplinarity is not only the benign conjunctions of disciplines that arrive at a balanced symphony but that each discourse in this interdisciplinary space "installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination;"⁴⁶ hence, concealing a boiling cauldron underneath its pacified appearance?

Indeed, there is the lingering suspicion that interdisciplinarity is nothing but an amorphous synchrony, a huge systematization which legitimizes a disciplinary ideology that has *won over* the rest of the discourses. Moran elaborates that "[t]he power of the modern cult of interdisciplinarity derives from the way it functions as a legitimizing ideology for very different constellations of interests."⁴⁷ Perhaps, in

45. "Interdisciplinarity is only possible in a disciplinary world. The notion only makes sense as a reaction against, or an attempt to unify, modes of knowledge presently separated into disciplinary domains." Michael Moran, "Interdisciplinarity and Political Science," 73-74.

46. Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 151.

47. Michael Moran, "Interdisciplinarity and Political Science," 79.

the event of discipline's loss of credence, interdisciplinarity provides the strategic space for the reinvention of the cultural template where *that* discipline resides. The space becomes the momentary port for discipline to recuperate its lost energies until the next launching.⁴⁸ In support of a chosen discipline, a hermeneutics may operate where discipline draws its legitimation from interdisciplinarity and that interdisciplinarity structure provides a horizon for discipline.

As was clarified with the later Foucault, the loobins realize that power is not the sole commodity of the powerful, but is dissipated in the whole social field. This makes loobins share in *desiring* power, not so much as dispensers of it, but as themselves caught up in the web, such that the marks of power coalesce in the loobins' gestures of resistances, pathetic disobediences or panoptic reprisals. Power, in this sense, is a tactic, a maneuver, an amalgam of interlocking force relations, which may be intentional but diffuse.⁴⁹ Hence, resistance is a strategy of power, written in the whole body, which materializes into a network of power configurations that reveals techniques and partial accounts of irregularities in the field. In the process, these rituals of resistances turn their practitioners into 'subjects'.⁵⁰ I would suggest, however, that in interdisciplinarity, the account of subjectivization may not happen in a linear way. This implies that the movement from 'subject' to 'subject' is in fact, a narrativity of fluctuating subjectivities. In Foucault's sense, it may be the case that *subjects* as objects defined by dominance can be transformed into *subjects* as definitors of objectification,⁵¹ but the path is not always progressive. That loobins have the capacity to construct their own living histories is rigged by narratives of their objectivization and ongoing struggles to meaningful existence.

48. Ibid.

49. Barry Smart, *Michel Foucault*, 70.

50. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 115. See also Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 208.

51. See Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 212.

Or, might it be the case that interdisciplinarity is a correlate of intersubjectivity? Here, subjectivities are gained or shaped *from outside*, as only through the others (as 'co-subjects') will the subject allow itself to become the object for its own cognizance. Bakhtin is one social thinker who hails the anteriority of intersubjectivity to intrasubjectivity.⁵² Might this originary site of intersubjective matrices be what Foucault refers as a 'presystematic' order outside the "thin surface" of subjectivity; one "that belongs to an essential silence[?]"⁵³ Are we again treading here in the domain of desire? Does not subjectivity remind us of a basic lack, a missing fragment, an originary 'crack' that ambivalently yearns and spurns the encounter of the 'other'?⁵⁴ As Carrette notes, Foucault's intuition debunks the 'sovereign subject' – rational, disciplined, self-contained. The devaluation of the 'transcendental subject' decentralizes the hierarchs' social position with a view of dispensing recognition to multiple subjectivities across the spectrum of the discursive field.⁵⁵ This is an important lesson to both avian hierarchs (and some loobins) who are continually tempted to objectify their subjects and subject them to disciplinary objectification, unmindful of a truer type of otherings as simultaneous subjectivities. In interdisciplinarity, a 'third subject' always looms large.

52. V. N. Vološinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (New York: Seminar Press, 1973), 39. See also Tzvetan Todorov, *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*, trans. Wlad Godzich (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 30.

53. "Behind the completed system, what is discovered by the analysis of formations is not the bubbling source of life itself, life in its uncaptured state; it is an immense density of systematicities, a group of multiple relations." Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*, 76.

54. Aristophanes gives us an explanation why the living are so fascinated, yet so intimidated, with the 'other'. Originally, all living are spherical beings whom the irate gods chopped into two on account of unruly demeanors. Thereafter, every one is in search of the broken fragment to complete one's life. "Every individual is a fragment or a *symbolon tou anthropou*." But the process of finding is fraught with fear and insecurities at realizing the truth of un-wholeness. Plato, *Symposium*, 191d. Quoted in Hans-Georg Gadamer, "The Relevance of the Beautiful: Art as Play, Symbol, and Festival," *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*, ed. Robert Bernasconi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998 [1986]), 32.

55. Jeremy Carrette, *Foucault and Religion: Spiritual Corporeality and Political Spirituality* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 108.

Beyond Kant's plea, we find that there is not only the Subject who imposes the law and the subject who obeys it; there is also a thirdness who becomes *intermediator* of the law. Indeed, "the problem resides in the supplementary figure of the Law's executioner/executor, who interposes itself, mediating between the subject as the Law's author and the subject as, precisely, the Law's subject."⁵⁶ The trauma happens right in the middle, puncturing it with an incurable tear or a 'double bind', namely, the identification with the Law whilst transgressing the Law by their inherent constitution. The crack opens up to other spectral supplements. The executor of the rule "bridges the gap between the transcendental and the empirical by way of terrorizing the empirical in *its own name*, on behalf of its own transcendental destination."⁵⁷ Meanwhile, terrorism breeds terrorists...or martyrs.

The thirdness⁵⁸ reminds us as well of the 'surplus' fields that 'silences and secrecies' provide to the richness of discourse, that is, unexplored fields that may not be fully decipherable even by interdisciplinary tools of research. While they continue to wade through the dense thicket of discourse, trying to outwit the compelling narratives of the self by a remembrance of the long forgotten counter-discourses, there is something in interdisciplinarity that is worth exploring: the priority of the social to the individual. Bakhtin's 'decentered subjectivity' finds resonances in the Cuckoo's thematization. It is not the 'displacement' of subjectivity (as in the case of Gadamer), but its de-prioritizing in deference to the social. This means that the development of discourse, whence dialogue is expected to spring, is not as much from the individual to the social (or self to other) but more the other way around, from other to self. Bakhtin's point is: if the dialogics with the social environment – be it, the 'known' or the unsurfaced – is constitutive of the definition of selfhood, then the 'content' of this social environment *does* matter.

56. Slavoj Žižek, *On Belief* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 138.

57. *Ibid.* 139.

58. Bakhtin calls this 'exotopy' or 'transgression', a decentered othering that transcends the simple self-other duality. See Mikhail Bakhtin, "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences," in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996 [1986]), 159-172.

The subject cannot glory in its own ipseity or simply 'apply the ruler' to what it deems contrary to one's selving, but must continually relate dialogically with fields of 'thirdness' and excess, like desire.

**POST-SCRIPTUM:
OF CRACKS, APHRODISIA AND 'GREAT TIME'**

In the end, we cruised along the terrains of interdisciplinarity, each odd element borne out of language, although their worth is more than just lingual sophistication. Monsieur Doe subjects it to falsification; the undertakers subject it to deconstruction while the rest of the loobins ruminates in its potentials and risks. Suffice it to say, that its language is truly possessed by power brokers, although no single language – even the 'power to name' – ever dominates the linguistic field, as there will be oblique counterpoints or tangential accents to every signification. Indeed, chirping never truly exists outside the context and conditions of why and when avians chirp at all. It is with this understanding of language and discipline that loobins refuse to be patronized as 'victims' and better recognize themselves as 'survivors' in the open field. They do have a stake, somewhere, somehow. Let it be said, however, that 'survivors' are not passive haloed creatures, exempt from the malice, interests and tactical ploys of their own practices. They too weave their nests partly from the feathers of cardinals, or in spaces just beyond reach of Monsieur Doe's comprehension. That loobins are able to 'survive' at all bespeaks a sociodicy of having to live with creative tensions and unwitting collusions among the winged, the antlered...or even worms.

Then there is the 'crack', that gaping chasm which has become more than simply the site of exhumation of loobins' kindred spirits here inferiorized by lofty cardinal virtues and obscured by arbitrary disciplinarianism. It has also proved to be a fertile trauma whereby the tabooed *aphrodisia* becomes a category for lived desiring and erotic resurfacing of discourses that titillate the rigid orthodoxies of the present. Up until this time, many are still left wondering what is the connection between the loobins' banishment and the fable's lurid undertones, between disciplinarity and the 'flaring up' (Walter Benjamin) of undisciplined upheavals. The ultimate response lies in Foucault's diagnosis of the "principle of isomorphism between sexual

relations and social relations.” It is worthwhile to cite lengthily the Philosopher Cuckoo:

What this means is that sexual relations – always conceived in terms of the model of act of penetration, assuming a polarity that opposed activity and passivity – were seen as being of the same type as the relationship between a superior and subordinate, an individual who dominates and one who is dominated, one who commands and one who complies, one who vanquishes and one who is vanquished. Pleasure practices were conceptualized using the same categories as those in the field of social rivalries and hierarchies: an analogous agonistic structure, analogous oppositions and differentiations... And this suggests that in sexual [and social] behavior there was one role that was intrinsically honorable and valorized without question: the one that consisted in being active, in dominating, in penetrating, in asserting one’s superiority.⁵⁹

The hieroglyphics of Eros are written all over the social body politic although, by stroke of *askesis*, some claim asexual, transcendent or epistemic bypass. The avowed ‘isomorphism’ holds fast, verifying not only its fact, but its *necessity* as well. The experience of avianness confesses that a significant part of its ‘inner terrains’ is submerged underneath the inarticulateness of the body and the groaning of the Spirit. Desire is either integrated into a higher desiring or subsumed by even more sinister recuperations. Without telling this part of the story, the Doe believes the rest of the loobins are blinded in hypnopaedic ignorance dreaming in broad daylight and, hence, is emboldened to continue – *via sola disciplina* – trashing treasured ashes underneath cracks, forgetful that firebirds arise out of their ashes. By legacy of the *Sacred Phoenix*, the nestlings bring dust back to life, but resurrections are not always welcome. Inhospitability notwithstanding, every frontal façade is perpetually “haunted by the spectral shadow of its obscene uncanny doubles.”⁶⁰ Hence, the ghosts of the repressed always come back in the haunting, and those who survive the haunting never truly realize their embrace of this enigmatic phantom. Many enact, embody and live out this

59. Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. II, 215.

60. Slavoj Žizek, *On Belief*, 137.

haunting, as if it were both a constant battle against (self)-possession and an exercise of ascetic contradictions. No wonder many a social act are inscribed in the mantra of exorcism – that is, driving the *demons* away while becoming the *daemons*⁶¹ they aspire to be. Ambivalence never truly stops, for the silences and cracks become the un-silencing there is left to survive.

What makes this ‘crack’ redemptive, however, is its timeliness (*kairos*). Here in this interstitiality is the advent of ‘great time’: a belief in the comeback of stunted virtues, muffled voices, weighted secrecies, and unsurfaced trump cards, hitherto hidden from the current dispensation and yet, an even deeper conviction that, in a different set of context and futurity, they will be *differently* understood and embraced.⁶² Among those banished from centric orbits and sanctifying grace include ghosts, martyrs, libidos, heretics, Smeagols, prophets, Kaballah, and yes, even dragons. Ghosts are, in a way, less intriguing than the ‘outsiders’ that breathe fire. After all, ghosts only haunt because ‘something’ is not buried right, but the case of dragons is different. In the famous motto of Hogwarts, *draco dormiens nunquam titillandus!*

Lope Florente A. Lesigues
Graduate School of Religion & Religious Education
Fordham University, New York, USA

61. Remember the Greek *eudaemon* (good angel) and *eudaemonia* (happiness, total well-being)!

62. “There is neither a first or last word...Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of *great time*.” Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996 [1986]), 170.

1 Game Differences 1.1 Fable/Fable: The Lost Chapters 1.2 Fable Anniversary Edition 1.3 Fable II 1.4...
The colour and shape of the wings are based on the Hero's alignment " from white and pristine (good), black and ragged (evil), or even eagle-like white wings (neutral) and the size of the wings depending on the amount of followers the player has from small wings (few followers) to large wings (many followers). If the player begins to take their morality to the utmost extremes, then they begin obtaining special visual effects.
Performing expressions under the "Scary" category will usually increase how scary a character is, and performing expressions under the "Fun" category will usually increase how funny a character is. The "sop for Children. A List of the Fables. The Frogs & the Ox. Belling the Cat. The Town Mouse & the Country Mouse. The Fox & the Grapes. The Wolf & the Crane. The Lion & the Mouse. The Foucault pendulum or Foucault's pendulum is a simple device named after French physicist Léon Foucault and conceived as an experiment to demonstrate the Earth's rotation. The pendulum was introduced in 1851 and was the first experiment to give simple, direct evidence of the Earth's rotation. Foucault pendulums today are popular displays in science museums and universities. The essay of Lope Florente Lesigues, "Foucault's Fable: Under the Wings of Inter-Disciplinary Ruminations," not only promises to amuse those familiar with Foucauldian discourse but also offers an insightful analysis of the state of disciplinary processes in social institutions today. A REFLECTION ON EMERGENT ISSUES AND QUESTIONS These papers generated quite an interesting and spirited discussion. We will try to bring out some of the emerging concerns, issues and questions in the Conference and reflect on them vis-à-vis larger contexts and general trends in interdisciplinary studies, both in theology and other sciences.