

Jean-Pierre Voyer.

Why in such a beautiful world, full of concentration camps and long-range missiles, is communication impossible?

What is at stake in this world can be told very easily.

*

Either the goal of existence is to satisfy the famous needs: eating, dinking, sleeping; all of this accompanied by some menus “additional pleasure” such as the culture of Mr. Langué. (The honor of Mr. Langué is evaluated at 500'000 francs.) In that case, everything in the world is organized as a function of that noble assignment. In that case, the famous “production”, that mysterious beast hidden in the midst of society, and which is supposed to command everything, has the goal of satisfying the famous needs, to annihilate hunger and scarcity in the world. Everything, in sum, is simple.

In that case, there are certainly rich and poor people; but the rich have in fact only that which the poor also have, in larger quantity. There is therefore actually an injustice, but it is minor. Rich and poor people are equally free, as it was taught to us in the republican and laic school; because in this case, liberty consists in the freedom to come and go. We are therefore far away of that despised Antiquity and the Ancien Régime where the slaves couldn't travel, nor change their profession at will.

One may in addition hope that, time passing by, the poor will have more and more from that which they have already, and, in that way, they will become less and less poor. The rich like Mr. Henry Ford, besides that, have they not permitted by their relentless activity to the poor to have beautiful new cars?

Nevertheless, there is something a little inconvenient about this whole situation. This evil production, instead of being in the service of the satisfaction of the nice needs, has – so they say, never stopped creating evil pseudo-needs. That is the famous consumer society. What a vile beast this production is, what a vile beast this capitalism. The litanies of the convivial left follow this narrative. But finally, this is just venial sin that the left will cure quickly. That is its occupation, sort of. The production in the service of needs; such goes the proud and exalted devise of the left, sage and generous (the situationnists included) and especially the imbecile André Gorz.

In that case, 1789 has well abolished slavery and Mr. Mitterand is a great friend of the poor. Mr. Montand also.

*

Or the goal of existence is communication and everything in this world is effectuated to secure, no matter what the cost is, this communication. (I insist on the no-matter-what-the-cost, since the masters of the world insist every day heavily on

this no-matter-what-the-cost. They've proven that with Auschwitz, Nagasaki, Bhopal, [Fukuhsima?] etc.

In that case, liberty does not consist in the freedom of going and coming, eating and drinking, but in the freedom to communicate. Only those who communicate are free.

Thus, what the rich have is not what the poor have, but in greater quantity. What the rich have, is that which the poor don't have, and which they're never going to have.

In that case, the rich are the masters and proprietors of communication. In that case, the poor are not only poor, they are slaves, because he who is not free is a slave. One must call the things by their name, even in the time of pressurized bottle beer and revolutionary grocery stores.

It is a sign of stupidity to confound mobility and liberty. Modern slavery is founded on the mobility of the slave, it is what distinguishes it from other forms of slavery. This mobility is greatly encouraged by the masters: habeas corpus. The slaves are like those modern dogs with an unrolling leash: the leash unrolls, unrolls as far as Greece, the Azores and other countries of dream; but on the fixed day, at the fixed hour, the slave is in the office, docile. Marx was therefore right on this point: the liberty enjoyed by the slave in the commercial democracy is purely formal; that is, if words still mean something, without content, because the content of liberty is communication, and the slave doesn't have access to communication. Communication is the substance of liberty. The liberty of traders is plainly substitution. The same sort of imbecile rants about the slave-citizen to behave more like a slave than like a citizen. I would like to make justice to the pretended individualism of which modern society is supposed to be a victim; a meme with which the politically correct thinking abashes our ears, either to rejoice about it (the arse-fucked Lipovetsky), or to complain about it (the socialist teachers). But in that case – where are the individuals? Where are the Alcibiades? I only see a mass of slaves on the highways and bourgeois vulgarity. In the liberty of commerce, individual and communication are opposed to each other, face-to-face: on one side, the global communication in the hands of the traders, on the other side the individual completely deprived of communication. Like the Canada Dry, this individual has the appearance of an individual, but it isn't an individual. It is a pacified slave. This world doesn't suffer from individualism, it suffers from slavery.

The fake-arse bourgeois objection that there couldn't possibly be slavery, because the property of persons has been abolished. If, however, I consult the Robert Dictionary on the word "slave", I read "Who is in the absolute power of a master" ["Qui est sous la puissance absolue d'un maître".] Certainly, the modern slave is not under the power of a personal master (and still!) The modern-day-slaves are not slaves of a particular master, but of the communication of their master.

The injustice is therefore well still the same as in Antiquity, the hypocrite *bonne pensée* also. The Romans took slavery for a fact, a result of a state of war. For them, slavery didn't result from a contract, but from an involuntary privation of liberty, a retreat that was suffered against one's own will.

With their characteristic hypocrisy, the bourgeois fake-arses draped in their *bonne pensée* pretend founding this fact on Law, and get really pussyficated about the slavery founded on brute force. If the modern slave is proprietor of his body, he is not in the same way proprietor of the communication. It is clear that the automobile industry wouldn't have known its rapid extension if the slaves weren't proprietors of

their body. They are thus allowed to go for a walk, outside of the working hours, well-understood, as far as their four wheels will allow them to dislocate. In his prison camp, Soljenitsyne remarked that this kind of promenade (by foot, in Russia, evidently) has nothing to do with liberty, since, captured he well knew a kind of liberty.

The fake-arse bourgeois pretend that the wage earner alienates his liberty only temporarily, for a limited time span. (Yes, this is still pretended in 1979, for example by the watchdog intellectual Barret-Kriegel who researches at the C.N.R.S.) But, on one side, this wage-earner, when the time of location of his pretended liberty is finished, is he then free, does he practice communication, like his masters practice it day and night? No, he watches television, he is stuck in traffic jams, museums and supermarkets, on ski runs and beaches, whereas the more young get drunk on cheap Wodka.

On the other side, the wage-earner, is he free to not alienate his pretended liberty, like the hoplites of the Anabases were free, to elect and depose their officers? What is a liberty which you are not allowed to not alienate, a liberty who needs necessarily to be alienated, by the penalty of death! What a sinister pleasantry. The modern-day-slave is therefore founded on the constraint, like the antique slave, no matter what the hypocrites and politically correct person thinks. Rousseau would have written: "These two words, slavery and law, are contradictory." One understands more well why it was necessary to suppress the first of these words, which has been done. This is why it must be re-established.

Contrary to antiquity, in commercial democracy, the laws are the same for everyone, masters and slaves, but they do not have the same effect on everyone. They grant the access to the communication for the traders, and they remove the slaves far away from it. In commercial democracy, the slave is a slave of right.

In Antiquity, the opposition between wealth and poverty didn't occur between masters and slave, but amongst the free humans, between aristocrats and demagogues or between patricians and plebeians. The poor weren't slaves, and certain slaves could even be rich without being free at the same time.

Today, there are no more aristocrats, but only demagogues (one needs to flatter the slave-citizen) and the opposition between wealth and poverty takes place between the free humans and the slave. Today, the poor is not only poor, he is also a slave. He concentrates on himself every bad situation which was divided on different groups of individuals in Antiquity.

The democracies have always been, up to this day, that of proprietors reigning on slaves. Why should it be different in bourgeois democracy. In 1789, in France, the bourgeoisie has taken the power that yet lacked them; and they have preoccupied them with constructing the government necessary for this power. Just as the word slave has pompously been suppressed, the word owner and proprietor has discreetly made silent. General Motors won't have any more proprietors, it seems, and no administrative council in addition to that. However, the sole actually rich people are the proprietors of capital, and not the superior employees, revocable at sight (here they are, those famous revocable delegates at any instant, so precious to the admirers of direct democracy), who exert a power they do not possess, and who tremble for their place. A manager is a slave who commands other slaves, the management is the commanding of slaves by other slaves. This has already been practised on the great Roman domains. Certainly, golden bridges are offered to certain managers – but to certain gladiators in Antiquity also. With a little bit of luck, they could go as far as

bedding the empress. "Those who are condemned to death greet you." As well as in the feudal system, one could say "No land without proprietor", one can say today: no capital without proprietor. Evidently, it is not the popular farce of capitalism which will contest this saying. Since the time of Balzac and Marx, the small rentiers always have it in the arse, well-done. The biggest fraud lies in the fact that a part of the financing of the grand commerce is assured by the saving of slaves.

The modern commercial democracy, supposedly representative, is in fact an oligarchy where the traders, covered by universal representation, are the only ones represented. The fraudulent bill is still the best voting ballot. Even with a parliament of socialist institutors, as it can be seen today in France, only the traders are represented in government.

One thing is certain, both the masters and the slaves are deprived of direct communication. The masters are therefore just as well deprived of humanity as their slave, they are just as well deprived of individual qualities. In a certain way, the masters are also the slaves of communication, but like one is a slave of a femme fatale in a movie by Sternberg, and this experience does not necessarily have to be unpleasant. Today, communication has been moved away so far that any kind of direct communication is impossible. The masters are only the inspired priests of communication. Like the pious Xenophon, they sacrifice each day. But there is no banquet like the one described by Plato and Xenophon.

I will summarize in a few words my vision of the world. The slaves are dogs. Their masters are pigs. But the world is beautiful. (At least on working days, since nothing is more repelling than the masses of unoccupied slaves, by foot or by car.) It is as though Stanley Kubrick and Francis Coppola had put it in scene! As piggish the masters may be, individually considered, the goddess to which they sacrifice is beautiful and they don't refrain from putting the world on fire for purely utilitarian considerations, but for a fatal beauty. Marx understood that money developed no quality in the individual, and that it also didn't require any. The bourgeois is the man without quality. The money has them all. Balzac has extensively documented that fact. What a trader can do, anyone could do. Marx has equally remarked that with money, solely, the zeal of working becomes unlimited; since money is exalting, contrary to the sad utilitarian teachings of the left. If the world needs to be changed, it is so only by the virtue of knowing something greater and more beautiful, more exalting than money. The big "revolutionaries", Hitler and Goebbels, had well understood this. They promised to the German slaves to be like gods. I rejoice from seeing people abandoning lamentably, one after the other, all attempts hypocritically founded on utilitarian precepts, and who finish always by submitting themselves plainly to the requirements of business. One can see finally, since almost ten years, what these famous socialists have done. Luckily nothing, absolutely nothing, besides letting feathers and advertise themselves with sweet and consoling words, in virtuous republican indignation. That is all their stupid electors will get, and this is the lesser of two evils. The bourgeois are already fake-arsed, the pink or rose-red bourgeois are double-faked-arses. Why are those republicans considered to be less enslaving folks than those of Rome. They are at it just the same, but in addition to that, they're hypocrites. Nevertheless, said socialists have done a lot for the freedom of commerce, and this is very well like that (taxes on non-distributed commercial benefits reduced to 35%, notably.) These enraged statist have been forced to mix water into their Château-Latour-Wine.

There are two dominating parties in the world, that of commerce and that of State, and everywhere in the world, the party of State is retreating. The State has well become what Marx said it would become, the auxiliary zealot and humble servitor of commerce. The only role of the modern State is to grant the liberty of commerce, and uniquely the liberty of commerce, and, associated with that, the liberty of traders. And this liberty has to be granted just as well

against the excesses of traders as against the protestations of slaves. The modern state is the police of the traders.

If they aren't careful, the slaves of the eastern countries will soon have access to motorized slavery, which they're going to be able to judge piece by piece. The people of the east block haven't recovered liberty, as pretended by the journalist canaille (if journalists say this, it must be wrong). They only have rediscovered the freedom of commerce; or, to be more exact, the freedom of commerce has been able to find them again, which is still better than nothing. I say *merde* to those who confound liberty, which is the common access of everyone to communication, with the liberty of commerce, which is the access of uniquely the traders to communication. I say *merde* to those who confound democracy with commercial democracy. Nevertheless, I am with Marx, a partisan of the freedom of commerce, since solely its final triumph may fundamentally pose the question of liberty tout court. Today, I.B.M. has won. In this new and planetary secession war (the enslaving U.S.S.R. has not succeeded at making secession from the rest of commercial humankind), the partisans of a modern slavery have won against those of an archaic slavery in modern clothes. What is good for I.B.M. is good for liberty, because it is today possible to assign a unique cause to misery. There's no convenient enemy anymore. Evil doesn't reside at Moscow or Johannesburg anymore, it is here, it is everywhere. Everywhere, from now on, reigns the liberty after I.B.M. One of the non-negligible consequences of the pitiful failure of anyone appropriating Marx, dictators of the East or little leftist arseholes is that it will finally be possible to read Marx – what I tried to do, for my part, since more than thirty years. Not everyone can read Marx, evidently. Mr. Peyrefitte is never going to be able to do so.

*

I've adventured into my research with the unique goal to respond to the question : why, in such a beautiful world, full of concentration camps and long-range-missiles, is direct communication impossible? I've arrived at the conclusion that what prevents the humans from communicating is communication itself (and, evidently, I don't want to talk about the arse-fucked concept of "communication by Séguéla).

Either the world is composed by different, juxtaposed things, the production, the consumption, the distribution, the means of production, the law, the culture, liberty, communication. In that case, one can well be employed and free. But the impossibility to directly communicate doesn't explain itself.

Or the production and consumption are appearances, and only communication is actual, communication is the only thing. Such was Hegel's insight which Marx didn't understand. In that case, one cannot be employed and free, the impossibility of direct communication is easily explained; the Hegelian notion of alienation takes all of its sense, misery has one single cause. Misery is, besides that, a truly big word, not everyone dwells in misery at will. In this world, even misery is a privilege refused to the biggest number of people. One would rather need to talk about dullness, since today the pacified slave doesn't even know about his misery. Freud has discovered that neurosis is the cause of misery that doesn't become conscious. In addition to that, since the commercial communication is just as well a spectacle of liberty, the slave doesn't see himself. The spectacle of liberty is identically the invisibility of slavery. A lot of slaves believe themselves to be free, some even want to appear like that, the "cool", well-connected slaves. The slave who knows he's a slave knows at least the nature of liberty without possessing it.

Jean-Pierre Voyer. L'Imbécile de Paris N° 1, juillet-août 1991. Les Editions Anonymes. Quoted after <http://leuven.pagesperso-orange.fr/imbe.htm>; 24.11.2017