

Cyclical repetition and the linear repetitive separate out under analysis, but in reality interfere with one another constantly. The cyclical originates in the cosmic, in nature: days, nights, seasons, the waves and tides of the sea, monthly cycles, etc. The linear would come rather from social practice, therefore from human activity: the monotony of actions and of movements, imposed structures. Great cyclical rhythms last for a period and restart: dawn, always new, often superb, inaugurates the return of the everyday. The antagonistic unity of relations between the cyclical and the linear sometimes gives rise to compromises, sometimes to disturbances. The circular course of the hands on (traditional) clock-faces and watches is accompanied by a linear tick-tock. And it is their relation that enables or rather constitutes the measure of time (which is to say, of rhythms).

Symbolically, (so-called modern) society underwent something that recalls the great changes in communications. It saw cylinders, pistons and steam jets on steam engines; it saw the machine start up, pull, work and move. Electric locomotives only present to the eye a big box that contains and conceals the machinery. One sees them start up, pull and move forward, but how? The electrical wire and the pole that runs alongside it say nothing about the energy that they transmit. In order to understand, one must be an engineer, a specialist, and know the vocabulary, the concepts, the calculations . . .

The same goes for our economo-political society. The visible moving parts hide the machinery.

Is there nothing left of the visible, the sensible? Is our time only accessible after patient analyses, which break up the complexity and subsequently endeavour to stick back together the pieces? It is not necessary to go too far: a truth pushed beyond its limits becomes an error. The gaze and the intellect can still grasp directly some aspects of our reality that are rich in meaning: notably the everyday and rhythms.

Everywhere where there is interaction between a place, a time and an expenditure of energy, there is rhythm. Therefore:

- a) repetition (of movements, gestures, action, situations, differences);
- b) interferences of linear processes and cyclical processes;
- c) birth, growth, peak, then decline and end.

The notion of rhythm brings with it or requires some complementary considerations: the implied but different notions of polyrhythmia, eurhythmia and arrhythmia. It elevates them to a theoretical level, starting from the lived. Polyrrhythmia? It suffices to consult one's body; thus the everyday reveals itself to be a polyrhythmia from the first listening. Eurhythmia? Rhythms unite with one another in the state of health, in normal (which is to say normed!) everydayness; when they are discordant, there is suffering, a pathological state (of which arrhythmia is generally, at the same time, symptom, cause and effect). The discordance of rhythms brings previously eurhythmic organisations towards fatal disorder. Polyrrhythmia analyses itself. A fundamental forecast: sooner or later the analysis succeeds in isolating from within the organised whole a particular movement and its rhythm. Often coupled empirically with speculations (see, for example, doctors in the field of auscultation, etc.), the analytic operation simultaneously discovers the multiplicity of rhythms and the uniqueness of particular rhythms (the heart, the kidneys, etc.). The rhythm-analysis here defined as a method and a theory pursues this time-honoured labour in a systematic and theoretical manner, by bringing together very diverse practices and very different types of knowledge: medicine, history, climatology, cosmology, poetry (the poetic), etc. Not forgetting, of course, sociology and psychology, which occupy the front line and supply the essentials.

One can classify rhythms according to these perspectives by crossing the notion of rhythm with those of the secret and public, the external and internal.

- a) Secret rhythms: First, physiological rhythms, but also psychological ones (recollection and memory, the said and the non-said, etc.).
- b) Public (therefore social) rhythms: Calendars, fêtes, ceremonies and celebrations; or those that one declares and those that one exhibits as virtuality, as expression (digestion, tiredness, etc.).
- c) Fictional rhythms: Eloquence and verbal rhythms, but also elegance, gestures and learning processes. Those which are related to false secrets, or pseudo-dissimulations (short-, medium- and long-term calculations and estimations). The imaginary!
- d) Dominating–dominated rhythms: Completely made up: everyday or long-lasting, in music or in speech, aiming for an effect that is beyond themselves.

The analysis consists in understanding that which comes to it from nature and that which is acquired, conventional, even sophisticated, by trying to isolate particular rhythms. It is a difficult type of analysis, one for which there are possible ethical, which is to say practical, implications. In other words, knowledge of the lived would modify, metamorphose, the lived without knowing it. Here we find, approached in a different way, but the same, the thought of metamorphosis.

In general, one does a portrait of someone who exists and who tempts the painter, the novelist or the playwright. Is it possible to do a portrait of someone who does not yet exist, and which would have to help to bring about his existence? Yes, if one finds the traits that inscribe themselves on a face of the future, which will cast aside false resemblances, thus enabling us to foresee the dissimilarities.

The rhythm analyst will have some points in common with the psychoanalyst, though he differentiates himself from the latter; the differences go further than the analogies.

He will be attentive, but not only to the words or pieces of information, the confessions and confidences of a partner or client. He will listen to the world, and above all to what are disdainfully called noises, which are said without meaning, and to murmurs [rumeurs], full of meaning – and finally he will listen to silences

The psychoanalyst encounters difficulties when he listens out. How is he to orientate his knowledge, forget his past, make himself anew and passive, and not interpret prematurely? The rhythm analyst will not have these methodological obligations: rendering oneself passive, forgetting one's knowledge, in order to re-present it in its entirety in the interpretation. He listens – and first to his body; he learns rhythm from it, in order consequently to appreciate external rhythms. His body serves him as a metronome. A difficult task and situation: to perceive distinct rhythms distinctly, without disrupting them, without dislocating time. This preparatory discipline for the perception of the outside world borders on pathology yet avoids it because it is methodical. All sorts of already known practices, more or less mixed up with ideology, are similar to it and can be of use: the control of breathing and the heart, the uses of muscles and limbs, etc.

People make gestures [gestes]; they gesticulate. Legs twitch. Gestures are sometimes made with arms, hands, fingers, the head: in short the top half of the body; sometimes with hips and legs: the bottom half. Each segment of the body has its rhythm. These rhythms are in accord and discord with one another. What does one mean when one says of a boy or girl that he or she is fully natural? That his or her movements and gestures are expressive or gracious? etc. Whence comes the effect? Where is the cause?

Nature can serve as a reference point. But one that is rather hidden. If one could 'know' from outside the beatings of the heart of such and such a person (the speaker), one would learn much about the exact meaning of his words. Respiration is heard, announces itself. Running and emotion modify it. The heart remains hidden, like other organs, each of which, we know, has its rhythm.

Gestures cannot be attributed to nature. Proof: they change according to societies, eras. Old films show that our way of walking has altered over the course of our century: once jauntier, a rhythm that cannot be explained by the capturing of images. Everybody knows from having seen or appreciated this that familiar gestures and everyday manners are not the same in the West (chez nous) as in Japan, or in Arab countries. These gestures, these manners, are acquired, are learned.

The representation of the natural falsifies situations. Something passes as natural precisely when it conforms perfectly and without apparent effort to accepted models, to the habits valorised by a tradition (sometimes recent, but in force). The age where it seemed natural for young people to act modestly, to keep quiet, to behave with discretion, respect, and imitate superiors, is not long gone . . .

One can and one must distinguish between education, learning and dressage or training [le dressage].²³ Knowing how to live, knowing how to

do something and just plain knowing do not coincide.²⁴ Not that one can separate them. Not to forget that they go together. To enter into a society, group or nationality is to accept values (that are taught), to learn a trade by following the right channels, but also to bend oneself (to be bent) to its ways. Which means to say: dressage. Humans break themselves in [se dressent] like animals. They learn to hold themselves. Dressage can go a long way: as far as breathing, movements, sex. It bases itself on repetition. One breaks-in another human living being by making them repeat a certain act, a certain gesture or movement. Horses, dogs are broken-in through repetition, though it is necessary to give them rewards. One presents them with the same situation, prepares them to encounter the same state of things and people. Repetition, perhaps mechanical in (simply behavioural) animals, is ritualised in humans. Thus, in us, presenting ourselves or presenting another entails operations that are not only stereotyped but also consecrated: rites. In the course of which interested parties can imagine themselves elsewhere: as being absent, not present in the presentation.

Breeders are able to bring about unity by combining the linear and the cyclical. By alternating innovations and repetitions. A linear series of imperatives and gestures repeats itself cyclically. These are the phases of dressage. The linear series have a beginning (often marked by a signal) and an end: the resumptions of the cycle [reprises cycliques] depend less on a sign or a signal than on a general organisation of time. Therefore of society, of culture. Here it is still necessary to recognise that the military model has been imitated in our so-called western (or rather imperialistic) societies. Even in the so-called modern era and maybe since the mediaeval age, since the end of the city-state. Societies marked by the military model preserve and extend this rhythm through all phases of our temporality: repetition pushed to the point of automatism and the memorisation of gestures – differences, some foreseen and expected, others unexpected – the element of the

unforeseen! Wouldn't this be the secret of the magic of the periodisations at the heart of the everyday?

Dressage therefore has its rhythms; breeders know them. Learning has its own, which educators know. Training also has its rhythms, which accompany those of dancers and tamers [dresseurs].

All different, they unite (or must be united), in the same way as the organs in a body.

The rhythms of dressage seem particularly worthy of analysis. One does not break-in a horse like a dog, nor a carthorse like a racehorse, nor a guard dog like a hunting dog. The origin (the lineage, the species or the race) enters into account, especially at the beginning. Certain animals refuse dressage. One breaks in ele-phants but not big cats (except in rare cases!). Can one break-in cats? or only educate them?

Dressage puts into place an automatism of repetitions. But the circumstances are never exactly and absolutely the same, identical. There are changes, be they only by the hour or the season, the climate, light, etc. Dressage fills the place of the unforeseen, of the initiative of living beings. Thus function the ways of breaking-in humans: military knowledge, the rites of politeness, business. Space and time thus laid out make room for humans, for education and initiative: for liberty. A little room. More of an illusion: dressage does not disappear. It determines the majority of rhythms.

What do these words mean? Do they speak of a day occupied by the media? Or of a day such as the media presents it? Both of these, because the one does not exclude the other.

The media occupies days: it makes them; it speaks of them. The term day can be deceiving: it excludes night, it would seem. Yet night is a part of the media day. It speaks, it emotes,²⁵ at night as in the day. Without respite! One catches waves: nocturnal voices, voices that are close to us, but also other voices (or images) that come from afar, from the devil, from sunny or cold and misty places. So many voices! Who can hold back the flows, the currents, the tides (or swamps) that break over the world, pieces of information and disinformation, more or less well-founded analyses (under the sign of coded information), publications, messages – cryptic or otherwise. You can go without sleep, or doze off . . .

The media day never ends, it has neither beginning nor end. Can you imagine this flow that covers the globe, not excluding the oceans and deserts? Is it immobile? It has a meaning: time. A meaning, really? At any given hour, your instrument can fish for a catch, a prey, in this uninterrupted flow of words, in the unfurl-ing of messages. Generally flotsam, with luck a monster: an order, a prayer. Communication? Information? Without doubt, but how can we separate that which has value from that which has none: know it from ideology, the absurd from meaning? But that has not the least importance, except for curious, paradoxical spirits, who stay awake and watch indefinitely. The important: that time is – or appears – occupied. By empty words, by mute images, by the present without presence.

It is necessary to come to an agreement over the expression: the mediatised everyday. More complex than it appears, which is to say more contradictory, it says that the everyday is simultaneously the prey of the media, used, misunderstood, simultaneously fashioned and ignored by these means that make the apparatuses. This enables us to note that everyday time is above all composed of weak times, but also consists of strong times: dialogues (including dialogues with oneself, when one puts oneself in the presence of oneself, and when 'one' asks oneself: 'so, what did you make of this day, of this time, of your life? . . .') Which is not at all repetitive). The repetitive monotony of the everyday, rhythmmed by the (mediatised) media need not bring about the forgetting of the exceptional. Although the worst banality covers itself in this publicity label: 'Here is the exceptional'. Whence malaises and questionings to untangle, each one having its own task each day in the hotchpotch of the privatised and the public, the bizarre and the unusual, the media and the immediate (which is to say the lived in the everyday).

What has not been written on time and space, generally defined as given, distinct, separate essences (or substances)? Up until the modern era, space was generously attributed to the human race, and time to the Lord.

This separation is in the process of being filled in, though more than one lacuna remains. The history of time and the time of history hold another mystery. The genesis of social time remains obscure. The history of time and the time of history should include a history of rhythms, which is missing. There are certain benefits, however. Time is at once fleeting, ungraspable (even in the self for psychology), and grasped, timed, timed chronometrically. A philosophical paradox, but one that goes further than philosophy: time, number and drama concern life. In historical time, what is the role of history in the forms of memory, recollections, narratives? Are there not alternatives to memory and forgetting: periods where the past returns – and periods where the past effaces itself? Perhaps such an alternative would be the rhythm of history . . .

Capital and life (the living)

It has often been said: ‘Capitalism makes masters and slaves, the rich and the poor, the propertied and the proletariat . . .’. This is not wrong, but it does not suffice for measuring the evil power of capital. It constructs and erects itself on a contempt for life and from this foundation: the body, the time of living. Which does not cease to amaze: that a society, a civilisation, a culture is able to construct itself from such disdain. This leads us to remark:

- 1) that the disdain conceals itself beneath an ethic (in the moral sense);
- 2) that it makes up for itself with ornaments: refinements in hygiene, the proliferation of sports and sporting ideology;
- 3) that if this contempt has played a big role in history, in the foundation of this society (in the nineteenth century, still the so-called Victorian period), and if some of it remains, it is fading, exhausting itself. It has transformed

itself in a way that is subver-sive and even revolutionary in advancing into the unknown: the exaltation of life.

The domination–exploitation of human beings begins with animals, wild beasts and cattle; the humans associated with these inaugurated an experience that would turn back against them: killings, stockbreeding, slaughters, sacrifices and (in order better to submit) castration. All these practices were put to the test and succeeded. The castration of beasts, what power! And what a symbol of anti-nature! Nature gave place to representations, to myths and fables. The earth? Those who cultivated it loved it; they treated it as a generous divinity. The living (except those who accepted domestication, such as cats and dogs) provided a raw material, a primary substance [matière première] that each society treated in its own way.

After which human beings separated themselves from each other: on the one hand the masters, men worthy of this name –and on the other, the subhumans, treated like animals, and with the same methods: dominated, exploited, humiliated. Whose fault is this? A bad question. Not that of the animals or their assimilated equivalents. Especially given the progress, the advances that there were through this situation: in knowledge, technology, world exploration and the mastery of the natural. Man made himself master and possessor of nature, of the sensible, of sub-stance. It was throughout this that he divided himself against himself, in realising himself. Thus did capitalism!

Capital has something more than maliciousness, malignance and malevolence about it. The wills, the wishes, of the property owners are not there for nothing: they execute. Through them, the death-dealing character of capital is accomplished, without there being either full consciousness or a clear intuition of it. It kills nature. It kills the town, turning itself back against its own bases. It kills artistic creation, creative capacity. It goes as far as threatening the last resource: nature, the fatherland, roots. It delocalises humans. We exhibit technology at the slightest suggestion. Yet technologies do not emerge from the living. Communication? It remains formal, we have seen; content? neglected, lost, wasted away. Technologies kill immediacy (unless the speed of cars, planes or automatic cameras pass for a return to the immediate; but that isn't saying much). The impact of technological conquests does not make the everyday any more alive; it nourishes ideology. Yet another paradox, which is to say an affirmation that is at once truthful and unexpected. Capital kills social richness. It produces private riches, just as it pushes the private individual to the fore, despite it being a public monster. It increases political struggle to the extent that states and state-apparatuses bow down to it. With regard to social richness, it dates from an earlier time: gardens and (public) parks, squares and avenues, open monumentality, etc. Investment in this domain, which is sometimes reliant on democratic pressure, grows rarer. What sets itself up is the empty cage, which can receive any commodity whatsoever, a place of transit, of passage, where the crowds contemplate them-selves (example: the Beaubourg Centre – the Forum in Paris – the Trade Centre in New York). Architecture and the architect, threatened with disappearance, capitulate before the property developer, who spends the money.

At no moment have the analysis of rhythms and the rhythmanalytical project lost sight of the body. Not the anatomical or functional body, but the body as polyrhythmic and eurhythmic (in the so-called normal state). As such, the living body has (in general) always been present: a constant reference. The theory of rhythms is founded on the experience and knowledge [connaissance] of the body; the concepts derive from this consciousness and this knowledge, simultaneously banal and full of surprises –of the unknown and the misunderstood.

Along with arrhythmia, isorhythmia (the equality of rhythms) completes this repertoire of fundamental concepts. With one reservation: iso- and eurhythmia are mutually exclusive. There are few isorhythmias, rhythmic equalities or equivalences, except of a higher order. On the other hand, eurhythmias abound: every time there is an organism, organisation, life (living bodies).

In this respect, thought could return to the Leibnizian principle apparently abandoned by philosophers, logicians and scientific types. Were there isorhythmia between two temporalities, they would coincide. Equivalence entails identity (and reciprocally, non-identity implies difference); polyrhythmia is composed of diverse rhythms. Eurhythmia (that of a living body, normal and healthy) presupposes the association of different rhythms. In arrhythmia, rhythms break apart, alter and bypass synchronisation (the usual term for designating this phenomenon). A pathological situation – agreed! – depending on the case; interventions are made, or should be made, through rhythms, without brutality.

It is, of course, in the body that we have situated the paradigm of rhythmological study. Music (notably symphonic and orchestral) could have provided another example. Under the direction of the conductor's baton (his magic wand), a rhythm falls into place and extends over all the performers, however many they may be. It is therefore a remarkable isorhythmia. Whereas the living body presents numerous associated rhythms (and we must insist on this crucial point); hence a eurhythmia, when in the state of good health. Pathology, in a word illness, is always accompanied by a disruption of rhythms: arrhythmia that goes as far as morbid and then fatal de-synchronisation.

Rhythmanalysis therefore essentially consists in the forming of these concepts into a work (which can change them, transform them)

isorhythmia –

eurhythmia –

arrhythmia.

Intervention through rhythm (which already takes place, though only empirically, for example, in sporting and military training) has a goal, an objective: to strengthen or re-establish eurhythmia. It seems that certain oriental practices come close to these procedures, more so than medical treatments.

Rhythmanalytic therapy would be preventative rather than curative, announcing, observing and classifying the pathological state.

A clear if not self-evident implication: once one discerns relations of force in social relations and relations of alliance, one perceives their link with rhythm. Alliance supposes harmony between different rhythms; conflict supposes arrhythmia: a divergence in time, in space, in the use of energies. The relationship between forces, which requires the domination of one force and draws on the relations of alliance as means (and not ends), is accompanied by a disassembly of times and spaces: of rhythms.