The Smith of the Gods

38 - « The Nomad War Machine »

380-Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend, notably in « Farewell to Reason », have brought us to the notion of imperial science. Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault and Michel de Certeau have brought us to nomad science. For Jacques Derrida, consciousness is language; for Gilles Deleuze, consciousness is above all the organic, the genealogical and the emergent, movement, the molecular and the molar, the multiple, cosmic escape and wild spirit. Philological studies are full of figures of flight, of multiple unnamables, of anarchic relations strong with their capacities, insinuating new dynamics, calling into question in the Western mind the beautiful genealogical and root organization of society. A place apart should be made for America. Of course, it is not exempt from the practice of domination by genealogical trees and from a search for roots. One sees it even in literature, in the quest for a national identity, and even for a European ancestry or genealogy (Kerouac sets off again in search of his ancestors). Yet everything important that has happened, everything important that happens, proceeds by rhizome of linguistic links: beatnik, underground, subterranean movements, bands and gangs, successive lateral pushes in immediate connection with an outside. Never has history understood nomadism, never has the book understood the outside. At the heart of a long history, the State has been the model of the book and of thought: the logos, the philosopher-king, the transcendence of the Idea, the interiority of the concept, the republic of minds, the tribunal of reason, the functionaries of thought, man as legislator and subject. The pretension of the State to be the interiorized image of a world order, in order to take root in man. But the relation of a war machine with the outside is not another model, it is an assemblage which makes thought itself become nomad, the book is a part for all mobile machines, a branch for a rhizome. One must write at n or n-1, write by slogans. Make a rhizome and not a root, never plant! Do not sow, prick! Do not be where one expects you! Do not be one nor multiple, be multiplicities! Make the line and never the point! Speed transforms the point into a line! Be fast, even standing still! Line of chance, line of hip, line of flight. Do not awaken in yourself the general idea! Not just ideas, just an idea (Godard). Have short ideas. Make maps, and not photographs or drawings. Be the Pink Panther, and may your loves still be like the wasp and the orchid, the cat and the baboon. A rhizome does not begin and does not culminate, it is always in the middle, between things, inter-being, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, only alliance. The tree imposes the verb « to be », but the rhizome is alliance and the tissue of the rhizome is the conjunction « and... and... and... ». There is in this conjunction enough force to shake and uproot the verb to be. Where are you going? Where do you start from? Where do you want to get to? are quite useless questions in the rhizome or the network. To wipe the slate clean, to leave or to start again from zero, to seek a beginning or a foundation, implies a false conception of voyage and of movement (methodical, pedagogical, initiatory, symbolic...). But Kleist, Lenz or Büchner have another way of traveling and of moving: to leave in the middle, by the middle, to enter and to exit, not to begin nor to finish. Still more, it is American literature, and already English literature, which has manifested this rhizomatic sense, has known how to move between things, to establish a logic of the « and », to overturn ontology, to depose the foundation, to annul end and beginning. They have known how to make a pragmatics. For the

middle is not at all an average, it is on the contrary the place where things pick up speed. « Between things » does not designate a localizable relation which goes from one to the other and reciprocally, but a perpendicular direction, a transversal movement which carries them away, the one and the other, a stream without beginning or end, which gnaws its two banks and picks up speed in the middle, a Heraclitean flux. The Dogons thus posed the problem: an organism happened to the body of the smith, under the effect of a machine or a machinic assemblage which operated its stratification. « In the shock, the mass and the anvil had broken his arms and legs, at the level of the elbows and knees which he did not have until then. He thus received the articulations proper to the new human form which was going to spread over the earth and which was destined for labor. In view of labor, his arm had folded. But, of course, to reduce the articular relation to the bones was only a manner of speaking. It was the whole organism which had to be considered under the species of a double articulation, and at very different levels.

First at the level of the morphogenesis of life: on the one hand, realities of the molecular type with random relations are taken in crowd phenomena or statistical ensembles which determine an order (the protein fiber, and its sequence or segmentarity).

On the other hand, these ensembles are themselves taken in stable structures which « elect » the stereoscopic compounds, which form organs, functions and regulations, organize molar mechanisms, and even distribute centers capable of flying over the crowds, of watching over the mechanisms, of using and repairing the tools, of « overcoding » the whole (the folding of the fiber into a more compact structure plus the second segmentarity): Capacity of sedimentation and folding, mechanics of the fiber and folding, accomplishment of forms in « splay », in « twist », and of the « bend ». But at another level, the cellular chemistry which presides over the constitution of proteins also proceeds by double articulation. This one passes inside the molecular, between small and large molecules, process of segmentarity by successive rearrangements plus segmentarity by polymerization. « In a first stage, the elements taken from the milieu are combined through a series of transformations. All this activity brings into play several hundred reactions. But in the end, it leads to the production of a limited number of small compounds, a few dozen at most. In the second stage of cellular chemistry, the small molecules are assembled for the production of the large ones. It is by the polymerization of units linked end to end that the chains characterizing macromolecules are formed. The two stages of cellular chemistry thus differ at once in their function, their products and their nature.

381-The first form of the compounds which have only a temporary existence. For they constitute intermediaries on paths of biosynthesis; the second erecting stable products. The first operates by a series of distinct reactions; the second by the repetition of the same. » And again, at a third level upon which cellular chemistry itself depends, the genetic code is in its turn not separable from a double segmentarity or a double articulation which now passes between two types of independent molecules, on the one hand the sequence of protein units, on the other that of nucleic units, the units of the same type having binary relations, and the units of different type, one-to-one relations. There are therefore always two articulations, two segmentarities, two kinds of multiplicity, each of which brings into play forms and substances; but these two articulations are not distributed in a constant manner, even within a given stratum of concentrate. We have not even taken account yet of Darwin, of evolutionism

and neo-evolutionism. Yet it is there that a decisive phenomenon is produced: our puppet theater becomes more and more nebulous, that is to say collective and differential. The two factors invoked with their uncertain relations, to explain the diversity upon a stratum – the degrees of development or of perfection, and the types of form – undergo a profound transformation. Following a double tendency, the types of form must be understood more and more on the basis of populations, packs and colonies, collectivity or multiplicities; and the degrees of development must be understood in terms of speeds, rates, coefficients and differential relations. Double deepening. It is the fundamental acquisition of Darwinism, implying a new coupling of individuals-milieux upon the stratum. On the other hand, at the same time and under the same conditions, the degrees are not preexisting degrees of development or of perfection, they are rather relative and global equilibria: they are worth as a function of the advantages they give to such elements, then to such multiplicity in the milieu, and as a function of such variation in the milieu. In this sense, degrees are no longer measured by an increasing perfection, by a differentiation and complication of the parts, but by these differential relations and coefficients such as pressure of selection, action of catalyst, speed of propagation, rate of growth, of evolution, of mutation, etc.; relative progress can therefore be made by quantitative and formal simplification rather than by acquisition (it is a question of speed, and speed is a differential). It is by population that one is formed, that one takes forms; it is by loss that one progresses and picks up speed. The two fundamental acquisitions of Darwinism go in the direction of a science of multiplicities: the substitution of populations for types, and that of rates or differential relations for degrees. They are nomadic acquisitions, with shifting boundaries of populations or variations of multiplicities, with differential coefficients or variations of relations. It was a question of drawing several conclusions concerning this unity and this diversity of the same stratum, namely the organic stratum. In the first place, a stratum indeed had a unity of composition, by which it could be called a stratum: molecular materials, substantial elements, relations or formal traits. In the Azoic era, the materials were not the unformed matter of the plane of consistency (the primary broth), they were already stratified and became « substrates » (teeming elements made up of coagulants and innumerable eobionts). But the substrates should certainly not be considered as simple substrata: in particular, they did not have a less complex or inferior organization, and one had to beware of any ridiculous cosmic evolutionism. The materials furnished by a substrate were no doubt simpler than the compounds of the stratum itself. Between the materials and the substantial elements, there was another organization, a change of organization, not an increase. The materials furnished constituted an exterior milieu for the elements and the compounds of the stratum considered; but they were not exterior to the stratum. The elements and compounds constituted an interior of the stratum, just as the materials an exterior of the stratum, but both belonged to the stratum, the latter as materials furnished and taken, the former as formed with the materials. And again this exterior and this interior were relative, existing only by their exchanges, therefore by the stratum which put them in relation. Upon a crystalline stratum, the amorphous milieu is exterior to the germ at the moment when the crystal is not yet constituted; but the crystal is not constituted without interiorizing and incorporating masses of the amorphous material. Conversely, the interiority of the crystalline germ must pass into the exteriority of the system in which the amorphous milieu can crystallize (aptitude to take the other organization, process of emergence). To the point that it is the germ which comes from outside. In short, the exterior and the interior are both of them interior to the stratum.

The same for the organic: the materials furnished by the substrates are indeed an exterior milieu constituting the famous prebiotic soup, while catalysts play the role of germ to form interior substantial elements and even compounds. But these elements and compounds appropriate the materials, no less than they exteriorize themselves by replication under the very conditions of the primitive soup. Here again, the interior and the exterior exchange themselves, both of them being interior to the organic stratum.

Between the two, it is the limit, it is the membrane which regulates the exchanges and the transformation of organization, the distributions interior to the stratum, and which define upon it the totality of the relations or formal traits, even if this limit has a very variable situation and role according to each stratum: for example, the limit of the crystal or of the liquid crystal and the membrane of the cell. One can therefore call the central layer, the central ring of a stratum, the whole forming a unity of composition: the exterior molecular materials, the interior substantial elements, the limit or membrane bearer of formal relations. There is like a single and same abstract machine enveloped in the stratum, and constituting its unity. It is the Ecumene, as opposed to the Planomene of the plane of consistency.

382-Now that we have spoken of what remained constant and of what varied upon a stratum, from the point of view of substances and forms, it remained to ask what varied from one stratum to another, by taking the point of view of content and expression. For, if it is true that there is always a real distinction constitutive of double articulation, a reciprocal presupposition between content and expression, what varies from one stratum to the other is the nature of this real distinction, and the nature and respective position of the terms distinguished.

Consider already a first great group of strata: they can be characterized by saying summarily that « the content (form and substance) is molecular, the expression (form and substance) is molar; between the two, the difference is first of all one of order of magnitude or of scale ».

It is the resonance, the communication occurring between the two independent orders, which establishes the stratified system, whose molecular content has itself a form corresponding to the distribution of elementary masses and to the action of molecule upon molecule.

No less than the expression has a form which manifests for its part the statistical ensemble and the state of equilibrium at the macroscopic level. The expression is like an « operation of amplifying structuration which makes the active properties of the originally microphysical discontinuity pass to the macrophysical level ». We had started from such a case for the physicochemical strata, everywhere one can say that the molar expresses the microscopic molecular interactions (« the crystal is the macroscopic expression of a microscopic structure », « the form of the crystals expresses certain molecular or atomic characters of the constituent chemical species »).

383-Admittedly, the possibilities were themselves very varied in this respect, according to the number and the nature of intermediate states, and also according to the intervention of exterior forces for the formation of the expression. There could be more or fewer intermediate states between the molecular and the molar; there could be more or fewer exterior forces or organizing centers intervening in the molar form. And no doubt these two factors were in inverse ratio, indicating two limit-cases. – For example, the form of molar expression could be of the « mold » type, mobilizing a maximum of exterior forces; or on the

contrary of the « modulation » type, involving only a minimum of them.

In the case of the mold, there were interior, almost instantaneous, intermediate states, between the molecular content which took its specific forms, and the molar expression determined from outside by the form of the mold.

Conversely, when the multiplication and the temporalization of the intermediate states attested to the endogenous character of the molar form, as for crystals, there was no less a minimum of exterior forces intervening at each of these stages.

One had therefore to admit that the relative independence of content and expression, the real distinction between the molecular content with its forms and the molar expression with its own, had a special status endowed with a certain latitude between the limit-cases.

By this fact one misconstrues both the nature of language, which exists only in heterogeneous regimes of signs, distributing contradictory orders rather than making information circulate, and the nature of the regimes of signs, which express precisely the organizations of power or the assemblages. They have nothing to do with ideology as supposed expression of a content, and the nature of the organizations of power, which are not at all localized in an apparatus of State, but operate everywhere the formalizations of content and expression whose segments they crisscross, and the nature of content, which is by no means economic. In reference to the LTI, in the last instance, for there are as many directly economic signs or expressions as non-economic contents. It is not either by putting some signifier into the infrastructure, or conversely, a little phallus or castration into political economy, a little economy or politics into psychoanalysis, that one elaborates a status of social formations. There is finally a third problem. For it is difficult to expound the system of strata without appearing to introduce between them a kind of cosmic or even spiritual evolution toward an Omega point, as if they ordered themselves in stages and passed through phase transitions and degrees of perfection. Yet it is not so. The different figures of content and expression are not strata. There is no lithosphere, no biosphere, no noosphere, there is everywhere one and the same mechanosphere in the planomene.

The question of structural invariants, and the very idea of structure, is inseparable from such invariants, atomic or relational, and is essential for linguistics. It is the condition under which linguistics can claim a pure scientificity, nothing but science, sheltered from any supposedly exterior or pragmatic factor.

This question of invariants takes several closely linked forms: the constants of a language (phonological by commutativity, syntactic by transformativity, semantic by generativity); the universals of language (by decomposition of the phoneme into distinctive traits, of syntax into basic constituents, of signification into minimal semantic elements); the logical trees, which link the constants to one another, with binary relations upon the whole of the trees (Chomsky's arborescent linear method); competence, coextensive in right with the language and defined by judgments of grammaticality; homogeneity, which bears upon the elements and the relations no less than upon the intuitive judgments; synchrony, which erects an « in-itself » and a « for-itself » of the language, passing perpetually from the objective system to the subjective consciousness which apprehends it in right (that of the linguist himself).

384-Gilles Deleuze tells us: « There is a universal figure of minoritarian consciousness, as the becoming of everybody, and it is this becoming which is creation. » It is not by acquiring

the majority that one attains it. This figure is precisely continuous variation, like an amplitude which does not cease to overflow, by excess and by default, the representative threshold of the majoritarian standard. In sketching the figure of a universal minoritarian consciousness, one addresses powers of becoming which are of another domain than that of Power and Domination. It is continuous variation which constitutes the minoritarian becoming of everybody, as opposed to the majoritarian fact of Nobody. The minoritarian becoming as universal figure of consciousness is called autonomy. It is certainly not by using a minor language as a dialect, by making regionalism or a ghetto, that one becomes revolutionary; it is by using many elements of minority, by connecting them, by conjugating them, that one invents a specific autonomous, unforeseen becoming. In a becoming-animal, one always has to do with a pack, a band, a population, a peopling, in short a multiplicity. « Shamans and sorcerers have known it at all times. » It may be that other instances, moreover very different from one another, have another consideration of the animal: in the spirit of Epimetheus, one can retain or extract from the animal certain characters, species and genera, forms and functions, etc. Society and the State need animal characters in order to classify men; natural history and science need characters in order to classify the animals themselves. Serialism and structure sometimes graduate characters according to their resemblances, sometimes order them according to their differences. Animal characters can be mythical or scientific. But the nomads take no interest in characters, they take interest in the modes of expansion, of propagation, of occupation, of contagion, of peopling of the packs. The territorial motifs form rhythmic faces or characters, and the territorial counterpoints, melodic landscapes. There is a rhythmic character when we are no longer in the simple situation of a rhythm which would itself be associated with a character, a subject or an impulse. It is the rhythm itself which is the whole character, the music of the place which, as such, can remain constant, but can also increase or diminish, by addition or withdrawal of sound, of always increasing and decreasing durations, by amplification or elimination which make one die and be resurrected, appear and disappear. Likewise, the melodic landscape is no longer a melody associated with a landscape, it is the melody which itself makes a sonorous landscape, and which takes in counterpoint all the relations with a virtual landscape.

385-The consistency of the matters of expression therefore refers on the one hand to their aptitude to form rhythmic and melodic themes, on the other hand to the power of the natal.

And there is finally another aspect, which is their very special relation with the molecular (the machine puts us precisely on this path). The very words « matters of expression » imply that expression has an original relation with matter.

As they take on consistency, the matters of expression constitute semiotics; but the semiotic components are not separable from material components, and are singularly in gear with molecular levels. The whole question is therefore to know whether the molar-molecular relation does not take on here a new figure. Indeed, one has been able to distinguish in general « molar-molecular » combinations which vary greatly according to the direction followed. In the first place: the individual phenomena of the atom can enter into statistical or probabilistic accumulations which tend to efface their individuality, in the molecule, then in the molar ensemble. But they can also become complicated by interaction, and keep their individuality within the molecule (the action of a too much of self-determination intricate with its a-local/non-linear variable), then of the macro-molecule, etc., composing direct

communications of individuals of different orders. In the second place: one sees well that the difference is not between the individual and the statistical;

In fact, it is always a question of populations, statistics bears upon individual phenomena, just as anti-statistical individuality operates only by molecular populations.

The difference is between two movements of group, as in d'Alembert's equation, where one group tends toward more and more probable states (divergent wave and retarded potential), but the other group toward less probable states of concentration (convergent wave and anticipated potential). In the third place: the intra-molecular internal forces, which confer upon an ensemble its molar form, can be of two types, or of localizable, linear, mechanical/arborescent, covalent relations, submitted to the chemical conditions of action and reaction, of chained reactions, or else non-localizable, superlinear, machinic and non-mechanical, non-covalent, indirect bonds, operating by discernment or stereospecific discrimination rather than by chaining. A fuzzy ensemble, a synthesis of disparates is defined only by a degree of consistency making precisely possible the distinction of the disparate elements which constitute it (discernibility). The material must be sufficiently deterritorialized (leaving a trace in a different topos or at a molar or superior scale) in order to be molecularized, and to open itself to the cosmic, instead of falling back into a statistical mass. Now one fulfills this condition only by a certain simplicity in the non-uniform material: a maximum of sobriety calculated in relation to the disparates or to the parameters. It is the sobriety of the assemblages which makes possible the richness of the effects of the Machine.

386-One has often too great a tendency to reterritorialize oneself (by sublimation) upon the child, the madman or noise. At that moment, one becomes fuzzy, instead of making the fuzzy ensemble consistent, or of capturing cosmic forces in the deterritorialized material. This is why Paul Klee becomes very angry when one speaks of the « infantilism » of his drawing. According to Klee, one needs a pure and simple line, joined to an idea of object, and nothing more, in order to « make visible », or to capture the Cosmos: one obtains nothing, except a blurring, a visual sound effect, if one multiplies the lines and if one takes the whole object. According to Varese, one needs a simple figure in movement, and a plane itself mobile, in order for the projection to give a highly complex form, that is to say a cosmic distribution; otherwise, it is sound effect. Definition of sobriety: it is the common condition for the deterritorialization of matters, the molecularization of the material, the cosmicization of forces. Perhaps the child attains it. But this sobriety is that of a becoming-child, which is not necessarily, and above all is not, the becoming of the child, just like that of a becoming-madman, which is not necessarily the becoming of the madman, on the contrary. It is evident that one needs a very pure and simple sound, an emission or a wave without harmonics, in order for the sound to travel, and for one to travel around the sound. You will find all the more disparates as you are in a rarefied atmosphere. Your synthesis of disparates will be all the stronger as you operate with a sober gesture, an act of consistency, of capture or of extraction which will work upon a material not summary, but prodigiously simplified, creatively limited, selected. For there is imagination only in technique. The modern figure is not that of the child nor of the madman, still less that of the artist, it is that of the cosmic artisan. An artisanal atomic bomb is very simple in truth, it has been proven, it has been done and Ted Kaczynski would not disown us. To be an artisan, not an artist, a creator or a founder, is the only way of becoming cosmic, of leaving the milieux, of leaving the earth.

The invocation of the cosmos does not at all operate like a metaphor; on the contrary, the operation is effective as soon as the artist puts a material in relation with forces of consistency or of consolidation. As Virilio says, in his very rigorous analysis of the depopulation of the people and of the deterritorialization of the earth, the question is: « To inhabit as a poet or as an assassin? »

387-The assassin is the one who bombs the existing people, with molecular populations which do not cease to close up again all the assemblages, to precipitate them into a black hole ever vaster and deeper. The poet, on the contrary, is the one who releases molecular populations in the hope that they sow or even engender the people to come, that they pass into a people to come, that they open a cosmos. And here again one must not treat the poet as if he gorged himself with metaphors: it is not certain that the sonorous molecules of pop music do not swarm, here or there, currently, a people of a new type, singularly indifferent to the orders of the radio, to the controls of the computers, to the threats of the atomic bomb. It is in this sense that the relation of the artists to the people has much changed: the artist has ceased to be the One-Alone withdrawn into himself, but he has also ceased to address the people, to invoke the people as a constituted force. Never has he had so much need of a people, but he notes to the highest degree that the people are lacking, the people are what is most lacking, we have neglected the people. They are not popular or populist artists; it is Mallarme who can say that the Book needs the people, and Kafka, that literature is the affair of the people, and Klee, that the people are the essential, and yet it is lacking. The problem of the artist is therefore that the modern depopulation of the people leads onto an open earth, and this with the means of art, or with the means to which art contributes. Instead of the people and the earth being bombed from all sides in a cosmos which bounds them, the people and the earth must be like the vectors of a cosmos which carries them away; then the cosmos will itself be art. To make of depopulation a cosmic people, and of deterritorialization a cosmic earth, such is the wish of the artist-artisan. If our governments have dealings with the molecular and the cosmic, our arts also find their affair there, with the same stake, the people and the earth, with means alas incomparable, and yet competitive, the sickle and the hammer, the sword and the mace. Is it not the property of creations to operate in silence, locally, to seek everywhere a consolidation, to go from the molecular to an uncertain cosmos, while the processes of destruction and conservation work in bulk, hold the front of the stage, occupy the whole cosmos in order to enslave the molecular, to put the power of the Smith in a conservatory or into a bomb? One reduces too easily the « itineration » (a space where everything proceeds by becoming, whose model is no longer iteration or representation) to a condition of technique, or of the application and the verification of science. But it is not so: to follow is not at all the same thing as to reproduce, and one never follows in order to reproduce. The ideal of reproduction, deduction or induction, is part of royal science, at all times, in all places, and treats the differences of time and of place as so many variables whose law precisely disengages the constant form. A gravitational and striated space is enough for the same phenomena to be produced, if the same conditions are given, or if the same constant relation is established between the various conditions and the variable phenomena. To reproduce implies the permanence of a fixed point of view, exterior to the reproduced; it is to watch the water flow while being on the bank. But to follow is something other than the ideal of reproduction. Not better, but something else. One is quite forced to follow when one is in search of the « singularities » of a matter or rather of a material, and not in the discovery of a

form.

When one ceases to contemplate the flow of a laminar flux with determined direction, and one is carried away by a vortex flux.

When one escapes the gravitational force in order to enter into a field of celerity.

When one engages in the continuous variation of the variables, instead of extracting constants from them, etc. And it is not at all the same sense of the Earth: according to the model, one does not cease to reterritorialize oneself upon a point of view, in a domain, according to a set of constant relations, but following the itinerant model. It is in fact the process of deterritorialization which constitutes and extends the very territory.

388-Remember Charles Fourier and his Gastrosophy:

– « Go to your first plant, and there observe attentively how the runoff water flows from this point. The rain must have transported the seeds far away. Follow the furrows which the water has dug, thus you will know the direction of the flow. Then look for the plant which, in this direction, is the most distant from yours. All those which grow between these two are yours; later, you will be able to increase your territory. »

– There are ambulant, itinerant sciences, which consist in following a flux in a field of vectors where singularities distribute themselves like so many accidents.

– For example: why is primitive metallurgy necessarily an ambulant science, which communicates to the smiths a quasi-nomad status?

– One can object that, in these examples, it is still a question of going from one point to another (even if they are singular points), by way of channels, and that the flux remains sliceable into sections.

But this is true only to the extent that the ambulant approaches and processes are necessarily related to a striated space, always formalized by royal science which deposes them of their model, submits them to its own model, and lets them subsist only by way of « technique » or « applied science ». As a general rule, a smooth space, a field of vectors, a non-metric multiplicity will always be translatable, and necessarily translated, into a « compass »: fundamental operation by which one poses and reposes at every point of the smooth space a tangent Euclidean space, endowed with a sufficient number of dimensions, and by which one reintroduces the parallelism of two vectors, in considering the multiplicity as plunged into this homogeneous and striated space of reproduction, instead of continuing to follow in an « exploration by itineration ». It is the triumph of the logos over the nomos which represents the essence of the people. Not everything is metal, but there is metal everywhere. Metal is the conductor of all matter. The machinic phylum is metallurgical or at least has a metallic head, its seeker head, itinerant. And thought is born less with the stone than with metal: metallurgy is the minor science in person, the « vague » science or the phenomenology of matter. The prodigious idea of a non-organic Life is the invention, the intuition of metallurgy. Metal is neither a thing nor an organism, but a body without organs, the very Archaic stratum. The septentrional line, or gothic line. It is first of all the mining and metallic line which encircles this body. The relation of metallurgy with alchemy rests not, as Jung believed, upon the symbolic value of the metal and its correspondence with an organic soul, but upon the immanent power of corporeality in all matter, the mineralized crystals as well as the liquid

crystals of the living reign, and upon the spirit of the body which accompanies it. The smith of all times and in all places furnished sickles and hammers to the nomads and the sedentary, but also swords and maces. He traced the space of the territory with his metallic furrow, traveling along a cosmic and machinic trajectory. It is peace which technically liberates the unlimited material process of total war.

389-If it is a question of itineration, the Beatniks owe much to Henry Miller; with him, they will again change the orientation initiated by Kerouac, they will make a new use of the space outside the cities. Long ago Fitzgerald said: it is not a question of leaving for the South Seas, that is not what determines the voyage. There are not only strange voyages in the city, but voyages on the spot: we are not thinking of drug addicts, whose experience is too ambiguous, but rather of the true nomads. It is about these nomads that one can say, as Toynbee suggests: they do not move. They are nomads by dint of not moving, of not migrating, of holding onto a smooth space which they refuse to leave, and which they leave only in order to conquer and to die like the Hero. Voyage on the spot is the name of all the intensities, even if they develop also in extension. To think is to travel, and this work has previously tried to draw up a theo-noological model of smooth and striated spaces. In short, what distinguishes the voyages is neither the objective quality of the places, nor the measurable quantity of the movement, nor something which would be only in the mind, but the mode of spatialization, the manner of being in space, of being to space. To travel in smooth or in striated, to think likewise. But always the passages from one to the other, the transformations of the one into the other, the reversals. In the film « Alice in the Cities », Wenders makes the paths of two characters crisscross and superpose, one of whom leads a still Goethean, cultural, memorial, « educational » voyage, striated on all sides, while the other has already conquered a smooth space, made only of experimentation and amnesia, in the German desert. But bizarrely, it is the first who opens up the space and operates a sort of retroactive smoothing, while striations come to reform upon the second, closing up his space. To travel in smooth space is a whole becoming, and again a difficult, uncertain becoming. It is not a question of returning to pre-astronomical navigation, nor to the ancient nomads. It is today, and in the most diverse senses, that the confrontation of the smooth and the striated continues, the passages, alternations and superpositions. Bergson brought out « two very different kinds of multiplicity », the one qualitative and of fusion, continuous; the other numerical and homogeneous, discrete. One will note that matter operates a sort of round trip between the two, sometimes still enveloped in the qualitative multiplicity, sometimes already developed in a metric schema which pushes it out of itself. Bergson's confrontation with Einstein, from the point of view of Relativity, remains incomprehensible if one does not relate it to the basic theory of Riemannian multiplicities, such as Bergson transforms it. The strata are phenomena of thickening upon the Body of the earth, at once molecular and molar: accumulations, coagulations, sedimentations, foldings. They are Belts, Pincers or Articulations; thus one distinguishes summarily and traditionally three great strata:

physicochemical, organic, anthropomorphic or alloplastic (designates a type of reaction or adaptation of the organism in the face of the interaction with the surroundings which consists in a modification only of the surrounding milieu). Each stratum or articulation consists of coded milieux, formed substances. Forms and substances, codes and milieux are not really distinct. They are the abstract components of every articulation. A stratum obviously presents very diverse forms and substances, varied codes and milieux. It has therefore at once types of

formal organization and modes of substantial development, which divide it into parastrata and epistrata: for example the divisions of the organic stratum. The epistrata and parastrata which subdivide a stratum can themselves be considered as strata (so that the list is never exhaustive). Any stratum has nonetheless a unity of composition, despite its diversities of organization and development. The unity of composition concerns formal traits common to all the forms or codes of a stratum, and substantial elements, materials common to all its substances or its milieux. There is a great mobility of the strata. A stratum is always capable of serving as substratum for another, or of bumping into another, independently of an evolutionary order. And above all, between two strata or between two divisions of strata, there are interstrata phenomena: transcodings and passages of milieux, blendings. The rhythms refer to these interstratic movements, which are as many acts of stratification. Stratification is like the creation of the world from chaos, a continued, renewed creation. And the validation of the strata constitutes the judgment of God. The classical artist is like God; he makes the world by organizing forms and substances, codes, milieux, and rhythms, by constructing his aesthetic sense through Rhythmotopic capacities. The articulation, constitutive of a stratum, is always a double articulation (double-pincer). It articulates in effect a content and an expression. And, whereas form and substance are not really distinct, content and expression are really distinct. So that the strata answer to Hjelmslev's grid:

– articulation of content and articulation of expression, the content and the expression having each for its part form and substance. Between content and expression, there is neither correspondence, nor cause-effect relation, nor signified-signifier relation: there is real distinction, reciprocal presupposition, and only isomorphism. But it is not in the same way that content and expression are distinguished upon each stratum:

– the three great traditional strata do not have the same distribution of content and expression (there is for example a « linearization » of expression upon the anthropomorphic strata).

– This is why the molar and the molecular enter, according to the stratum considered, into very different combinations through the systemic movements of History.