



SAPERE AUDE

Revista do Departamento de Filosofia



Editorial – Sapere Aude Journal, V. 4, N. 7 (2013): DOSSIER DECONSTRUCTION AND ALTERITY: DIALOGUES WITH JACQUES DERRIDA

January- June 2013

Magda Guadalupe Santos*

Writing about the philosophy of Jacques Derrida is no easy task. His many books, his distinctive interviews, and the diverse collection of interpretive analyses around him, only begin to demonstrate the value and complexity of his work. His inquiries into the limits of philosophy offer us a certain direction to be followed here, in an introduction to this dossier dedicated to *Deconstruction and Alterity*.

As the philosopher tells us in his interview with Lucette Finas, published in *La Quinzaine littéraire*, in November 1972, with the inquiry into the limits of philosophy, as well as the possibilities of identifying a margin for textual analyses of metaphysics, such questions lead us to an idea of transformation, that which should be transformed. In fact, this inquiry requires a new questioning look and this look should return to the very notion of the text, so that new readings of the history of philosophy can take place, so that something can be transformed. To inquire, then, about sense and concept presupposes that the space of *difference* be investigated beyond conceptual resolutions. On breaking the “centuries-long series” that sustained the representations of western thought, with an emphasis on the philosophy of Hegel, what Derrida understands by *difference* is precisely to deconstruct the values and concepts, words and signifiers, and the transformation of our

* Professor of the Department of Philosophy of the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Brazil (PUC MINAS). Member of the Editorial Commission of *Sapere Aude*. PUC MINAS. Brazil.

surroundings. Derrida teaches us to criticize the “the very order of the concept” so that a certain fracture in the face of the metaphysical and homogeneous real becomes explicit and can be “effectively practiced” and is not reduced to specific semantic combinations, whose code of connotation is noted only in university theses.

This done, what Derrida proposes to us is a sharp look at our institutional dilemmas and a new possibility of rethinking our very systems of language coherence and thought that affect the university in relation to the knowledge that emanates from it and always returns to it. If our ways of knowing and our texts adapt themselves to established institutional norms, or in some way contribute to deconstruct an imposed order or the codes of every order in force, it is necessary to believe in, and always make it possible for, discursive criticism to take us outside the codified norms, the heterogeneous features of knowledge itself, in short, to an absolute alterity with respect to what is established in learning and questioning. As philosophy always proposed to query the *quidditas* of things and what surrounds them, a long metaphysical tradition was able to be established. Derrida knew how to propose to philosophy itself a break or a discontinuity in the same way of thinking. If the paradoxical logic of occurrences that surround us should have been transposed by a unitary form of knowing how to think, his proposal to “deconstruct the system of presence, of origin, of archeology” and not only, as he himself says, a possibility of thinking or uttering the occurrence or defining what seems to us serious and valid, though not in the sense of a new definition, it is because new forms of transgressing philosophical language are then introduced and need to be introduced.

In Derrida, it is precisely philosophical authority, which always proposes to subordinate itself in the classification and cataloguing of ontological questions, that becomes the object of displacement. And the philosopher helps us to perceive how much a text needs margins to cross the denominated metaphysical reality and clarify the relations of different forces in conflict, without some center of presence or dominance being accepted as unquestionable, so that writing can transform, advance, and be reshaped.

I believe that this delicate purpose is what we attempted to follow and discover in the set of texts that make up the dossier *Deconstruction and Alterity*. Thought of and developed in the margins of hospitality, welcoming all foreigners, rethinking the human dimension in all its varied possibilities, without judges to determine the official language or

the language of the other, it is in the name of the subtleties of language that this dossier was established. In fact, as Rafael Haddock-Lobo writes here, the deconstruction of the real “would be to show that reality is text, is textile, is fabric” and this would be the position to maintain at the limit of the text.”

What was demonstrated about deconstruction was in the margins of hospitality. But, above all, it is in the name of the dialogical relations that friends of the *GT- Desconstrução* participate here, honoring this dossier with their analyses and textual proposals, whether by way of the passions of literature in which, as Carla Rodrigues tells us, autonomy and heteronomy mix, or in search of the functions and a place that philosophy, starting from Derrida, always emerges as a “strategy of questioning the ethico-political tradition.” It is also about the future of discussions established with the tradition, affirming the contradictions, “making logic itself tremble” (Haddock-Lobo), but with a set of possibilities for meanings that are to be constructed along historical tensions, that, as Rangel mentions, a lot can be learned here.

But it is also the sense of friendship, gratitude, and honor this dossier demonstrates. It is both in the margins of the translations, kindly granted by their authors, Bingham and Burgos Días, and in the text of the interviews, that the notion of critical readings is sharpened. In the text of Elizabeth Grosz’s interview, the revision of the concepts of and for feminist theories emphasizes the link with the philosophy of Derrida and its impulse toward theoretical and identity questions. And, finally, in the interview granted us by Judith Butler, the ideas of change and dialogue, the relation between life and death, between honors and criticisms, deserve our consideration here. Such that, as Butler proposes, it is always worth honoring Derrida even when one cannot agree with him. In fact, one cannot but agree with Butler: the world really begins to take a new path starting from Derrida’s thought, which is always the occasion for new ways of thinking.

In this sense, we have only to thank the friends of *Deconstruction* for the fabulous readings they have brought here so that we may always a reality the purpose of *Sapere Aude* beyond enlightenment determinations, but always critical of our possibilities.