

PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-117-6-4>

NOMADOLOGY AND THE RHIZOME

Gosteva O. V.

*Postgraduate student at the Department of Art History
and General Humanities*

Ovchinnikova A. P.

*Doctor of Arts, Professor,
Head of the Department of Art history
and General Humanitarian Disciplines
International Humanitarian University
Odessa, Ukraine*

What does an individual who is fed up with senselessness of the surrounding world of simulations and who is scared and unwilling to drown in the virtual environment do? He sets off for a journey. In other words, he escapes from the simulation and goes as far as the eye can see hoping to find genuine sense and reality. Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) and Felix Guattari (1930-1992), the authors of the nomadology conception, see a person's existence as non-linear, lateral, subject to haphazard deviations, and thus reminding of a rhizome, (from Ancient Greek ῥίζωμα, *rhizōma*, "mass of roots"), an offshoot of a plant which lies along the ground and which the roots grow from (or a group of tubers of the plant (e.g. those of potatoes)). Countless factors that influence a person's live and activities are entangled in these roots, starting from rational operations and linguistic play on words to unconscious acts and use of mimics in communication. The rhizome gradually expands and goes deeper in a completely unpredictable way; it has its start but does not seem to have the ending. The form is predetermined; there are no two identical tubers and the stem going from each of them can grow in almost any direction. In this maze of unpredictability of a non-linear, lateral rhizome there is a hidden prospect of self-organization and creativity. And process here, according to the authors, is more important than the result. This model of «nomadic» existence is stated to be holistic. However, it is opposed to the «structure» which, for some reason (perhaps, due to the traditional understanding of this term in French philosophy), is only perceived as a centred, one-direction, absolutely linear system.

To make a comparison between two visions of existence, G. Deleuze and F. Guattari refer to the differences between the games of chess and Go (a game played by nomadic people). Possible ways of moving pieces on the chess board, though there is a great number of variants, can be predicted in the essence, however, the same cannot be attributed to Go. Originally Go was played in the open air on the grids of lines drawn on the sand. In this game the pieces (called stones) are all of the equal value and are placed on the vacant intersections of a 19 x 19 squares board. Randomly positioned pieces may each time get the new value which is dictated by the situation and which changes in the next game. Interestingly, the number of legal board positions in Go has been calculated to be approximately 2.1×10^{170} ! In this case the traditional prediction imposed by determinism proves to be unattainable. The vision of the world by nomadic people is of this nature, which is why historians found it almost impossible to understand their culture, or way of thinking.

The analogy between humanity and social subjects and the subjects of non-classical science is obvious and on many occasions this was highlighted by the creators of the synergy paradigm [1]. However, what are the conclusions that the analogy leads to? The value and methodological validity of this philosophic approach for the humanity disciplines cannot be doubted.

Nomadology pays attention to the formation of so called «tribal psychology» that can be seen in the development of particular groups that oppose themselves to the rest of the society and create their distinguishing symbols and rituals (for instance sub-cultures). According to the authors' opinion, which was presented in chapter 12 of the treatise «Anti-Oedipus» (1980), the tribes of anarchists who go up against the coercion and repression practiced by the State apparatus and civilization are similar to the nomads of the ancient world. Overall, nomadology can be seen as the synonym to postmodernism in Deleuze and Guattari's interpretation.

The rhizome is one of the essential notions in nomadology. The rhizome is a metaphoric expression of postmodernism thinking, a network including a number of lateral anti-hierarchic connections that are opposed to the linear structures of the mind and existence.

From the philosophic point of view, rhizome is contrasted with a straight tree-root or the arborescent structure that is associated with classical way of thinking. A root has its central line and goes deep down, while a rhizome has no sense-bearing centre and it grows wider or broadens. From the point of view of ethnography rhizome is nomadic culture whereas a root is a representation of traditional settled culture. In other words, the nomads are opposed to the state as they do not share the space, being in the strict frames, they get separated in the unlimited and endless space. According to Deleuze

and Guattari, rhizome is characterized by the following features or principles:

- * the principle of heterogeneity and connection, rhizome does not have either beginning or ending, so it can be interrupted, broken at any point and then connected to any other part of it; so rhizome ceaselessly creates «connections between semiotic chains and organizations»;

- * the principle of multiplicity (a unity which is multiple in itself): there is no unity which could become the kernel of the object and no subject that can be separated into clear identified structures;

- * the next principle was the principle of «asignifying rupture»: should the rhizome be broken at one or another point, it would start growing again on along one of its old lines or along a completely new line;

- * another principle of rhizomatic philosophy was «cartography» and «decalcomania» instead of using «structural or generative models» which were still based on «a logic of *tracing (calque)*», the authors propagated the use of a map. While traditional tree-like logic is mainly based on tracing and reproduction, the rhizome is absolutely incompatible with any kind of the genetic axis and profound structure; «the rhizome is altogether different, a *map and not a tracing*», «the orchid does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp»; it forms a map with the wasp, in a rhizome. The map is open to alterations while the tracing always refers to the same.

The rhizome, seen by Deleuze and Guattari as the only reality and the new unity, resembles a mycelium which does not include the main root or the arborescent structure. It is a form in which the smaller root offshoots grow or disappear in any places in a really unpredictable way. Why is this process so unpredictable? Because, according to the writers, the rhizome is a lateral progression which consists of instant and random branching that may go in any direction. Thus, they reject any connections that lead from reasons/causes to results. The rhizome is flat, so all the events take place on the surface, without going into the depth. It does not involve any structures with the settled centers or connections. It only has the randomly appearing, starting anywhere and at any time quasi-structures which either disappear almost instantly or move continuously on the surface of the rhizome, along the evasion lines. However, the evasion lines are not the connecting skeleton of the rhizomorphic reality. Its unity is determined by the fact that the evasion lines can haphazardly connect any parts of the rhizome for a short moment. In this concern the unity of the rhizome (as opposed to classical vision of a structure) is structureless and causeless. At the same time, Deleuze and Guattari do not go as far as to completely deprive the rhizome of its causal logic and meaningfulness. They state that similar to synergy, where there may be some junctions where events are linked by causative

relations, in the rhizomorphic world such zones might be found as well. As the rhizome extends, any multiplicity may be connected to other multiplicities by superficial stems forming a kind of structures called plateaus. On these plateaus on the surface of the rhizome the focuses of meaningfulness may appear. Thus, each plateau can be read starting anywhere and can be related to any other plateau, and all the person's knowledge can be seen as assemblage of heterogeneous texts (plateaus).

Beginning with the second half of the 20th century the negative effects of the anthropologic pessimism were becoming more and more noticeable. So the works in which the authors tried to give theoretical grounding to the necessity for an individual to be in opposition to the mass stereotypes began to be published. A person was encouraged to rebel against the stereotypes that were imposed on him by the mass culture; however, from the theoretic point of view, a fragmented, fractured linguistic perception of a human in the postmodern world barely had any chance of doing it successfully. As all these attempts were taken in the scopes of postmodernists' paradigm, they did not succeed in reaching the goals, at least no valid, in terms of modern science, theories were developed here. And only the concept of nomadology by Deleuze and Guattari provided a more or less plausible explanation of the new tendencies in the spiritual life of the modern Western world. In the essence, the new tendencies are characterized by turning from the society's life to private life, to religious and spiritual issues, to some forms of religiousness. As it was said by Michel Serres «when twenty years ago I wanted to interest my students, I talked to them about politics, if I wanted to make them laugh, I talked about religion. Today, if I want to attract their attention, I talk about religion, and if I want to entertain, I speak about politics» (Mortley:1991, p. 48).

Marginality in all forms of its representations came to the surface of public consciousness, which was compatible with the interests of macro-groups and which was referred to as «tribes» and «tribal psychology». So, the departure from the formerly prestigious «social person» in the minds of the western people resulted in the interest to micro-groups, small-scale tribes linked to each other by social-cultural and bio-cultural relationship. Western sociologists and culture researchers connect such attempts to form a specific tribal culture or even cultures with the attempts to achieve so called «group solidarity» on the new level. As Guattari emphasizes, the «tribe» in its social life has the tendency to be «transversal», to metaphysical horizontality with regards to the traditional views, to multiplicity of the rituals, to omnipresent dualism and ambiguity, to the play with the obvious. People begin to live in tribal society as opposed to mass society. The neo-tribalism (modern tribalism) postulated by Guattari and Deleuze ruins, explodes traditional

distinctions and borders between magic and science, which encourages the appearance of so called «Dionysian sociology» that allows to study these tribes as an elaborate complex of the restricted structures which replaced the myth of the linear direction of historical development (historical progress) by the idea of «the polyphonic vitalism». Sociologist M. Maffesoli also highlights the paradox of the mass opinion of the 80-s: constant vacillations between its excessive massification and development of ethical and aesthetic mind of the small-scale groups. Like J-F. Lyotard, who stated that the mistrust to meta-narrative as the explanatory systems (which were used for self-indulgence and self-justification of the bourgeois society (religion, science, history, art, etc)) is the prevailing tendency of postmodernism, Maffesoli admitted that he preferred only mini-conceptions, as at the time, he considers, any strong unified ideology common for the whole society seemed to be impossible.

According to Carmen Vidal, as social organization came to an end and there was the feeling of satiation by politics, appeared «the vital instinct» which, making us forget about narcissism, enabled the sense of rebellion in the mass. There appeared a chance that the new social structuring containing a number of small interconnected groups would allow us to avoid or at least to make more relative the oppressive impact of the bodies of power.

The question arises: how was the nomadic culture formed? Another question: why did it become so popular in the works of the thinkers of the 80-90s? For the first time this concept was coined in the treatise by Deleuze and Guattari «The Thousand Plateaus» that was the second part of their renowned work «Capitalism and Schizophrenia». The first part «Anti-Oedipus» was published in 1972 and was full of references to the events of 1968, the second volume appeared in 1980, and its 12th chapter was titled «The Treatise of Nomadology : The War Machine». It is clear that the initial notion of nomadology has been undergoing significant changes as, due to its popularity with the intellectual ones and its definitions by different theorists, it got and is currently getting various interpretations. Their aim was generally defined by the spirit of global contestation, the sense of their mission was to carry out provocative, demining activities. The main subject of their criticism was the ideology of the State and statehood, because the State was considered to be the institute of spiritual suppression and coercion, the institute of power which by means of its apparatus influences individuals and forces to abase themselves to it.

The development of the notion of nomadology is connected with the idea of the state authority as a mystical power that surrounds a person all over and is focused on him as the centre which the power is directed on. Nomadology is seen as the force able to resist to the influence of the

powerful institutes that are embodied in the State and that are opposed to the individual freedoms. In the «The Treatise of Nomadology» Deleuze and Guattari made attempts to give the theoretic explanation of the idea of a community that is in opposition to the State power and found such a community in wandering tribes or nomads who were able to create the War Machine powerful enough to destroy particular states and even strong empires.

However, the most essential goal for Deleuze and Guattari was to verify the ability of the nomadic people, who seemed to be much less cultured than the settled nations, to ruin powerful global civilizations. So, the French thinkers tried to form the hypothesis of a special feature of the nomadic culture: they stated that the nomads possessed «the war machine» which enabled them to always defeat their rival – the state apparatus. As they said the nomads invented the machine to fight the State in the war; history could never understand the nomadic, like a book could never understand the essence of everything outer to it. In the course of the world history the State was the model and the idea, the thought. It was the logos, the king was the philosopher, the idea was transcendent, there was the republic of the sages and the judgment of the mind, and a person was the law creator and the State's subject. The State claims its right to be the inner model for the universal order, and, based on this, its right to constantly instill a person within the borders of the state. The war machine has an absolutely different attitude to the outer, the external this is not simply a different model, it is a special way of action which makes the thought to become a nomad and the book to be the tool for the moving machines, the offshoot of the rhizome [3, p. 35-36].

It is natural that all the concepts in these French philosophers' work have non-literal, idiomatic meaning. The state is always written with the capital letter as it is the symbol of the hated power, the nomads, the tribe symbolize the driving force that fights against the State. To draw the analogy, Deleuze and Guattari started their explanations with the reference to the actual nomadic peoples, and as usual came to the abstract idea of the inevitably free nomadic tribe that was as much mystified as the concept of the vicious State. Thus, any free idea that is an external idea, as it is linked with the outer, external (with regards to the State) world, becomes the tribe, the war machine. They said that to establish the direct connection between the idea and the external, out-of-the-state world, in other words to turn our mind/thoughts into the war machine is an insane venture which can be learnt only from Nietzsche.

In conclusion we should say that nomadology presented by Deleuze and Guattari in 1970-s is the conception of the new vision of the world. Their

project was characterized with the rejection of the idea of the firm structure that is based on the binary oppositions and the idea of the strict determinism. In the works they call not to be in love with the state power and to de-individualize; they also suggested the idea of inclusion, t.e. the increase of the extent of citizens' involvement in the life of society.

Bibliography:

1. Пригожин И., Стенгерс И. Порядок из хаоса: Новый диалог человека с природой: Перс англ.– М.Прогресс, 1986. С. 275–386
2. Ж. Делез, ф. Гваттари Анти-Эдип: Капитализм и шизофрения / Пер. с фр. и послесл. Д. Кралечкина, науч. ред. В. Кузнецов. – Екатеринбург.: У-Фактория, 2007. – 672 с.
3. Ж. Делез, Ф. Гваттари Тысяча плато: Капитализм и шизофрения / Пер. с фр. и послесл. Я. И. Свирского, науч. ред. В. Ю. Кузнецов. – Екатеринбург, М.: У-Фактория, Астрель, 2010. – 895 с.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-117-6-5>

ТВОРЧИСТЬ ЯК ВИЯВ СВОБОДИ ЛЮДИНИ

Марасва У. М.

кандидат філософських наук,

доцент кафедри філософії

Державний вищий навчальний заклад

«Ужгородський національний університет»

м. Ужгород, Україна

Духовно-практичний досвід є невід'ємною складовою розвитку будь-якого суспільства. Основною його ознакою є ідеальна фіксація у формах свідомості різних компонентів зв'язку людини і світу. В ідеальній формі він відображений у філософії та мистецтві як результат прояву духовної культури і втілений у продуктах діяльності та творчості. Тому через творчу діяльність цей зв'язок відображає потреби у самоздійсненні людини, забезпечуючи при цьому духовний зв'язок і спадковість суспільства.

Творчість як фундаментальна властивість людини є проявом людської суб'єктивності. Тому вона завжди пов'язана із свободою людини, вираженням внутрішньої усвідомленості своєї свободи як індивідуального рівня самореалізації. Оскільки свобода є головною