

## The new aesthetic paradigm

It was only quite late in Western history that art detached itself as a specific activity concerned with a particularised axiological reference. Dance, music, the elaboration of plastic forms and signs on the body, on objects and on the ground were, in archaic societies, intimately connected with ritual activities and religious representations. Equally, social relations, economic and matrimonial exchanges, were, in the group life, hardly discernible from what I proposed calling territorialised Assemblages of enunciation. Through diverse modes of semiotisation, systems of representation and multireferenced practices, these assemblages managed to crystallise complementary segments of subjectivity. They released social alterity through the union of filiation and alliance; they induced personal ontogenesis through the operation of peer groups and initiations, such that individuals found themselves enveloped by a number of transversal collective identities or, if one prefers, found themselves situated at the intersection of numerous vectors of partial subjectivation. In these conditions, an individual's psychism wasn't organised into interiorised faculties but was connected to a range of expressive and practical registers in direct contact

with social life and the outside world. Such an interpenetration of the socius with material activities and modes of semiotisation leaves little place for a division and specialisation of work — the notion of work itself remaining blurred — and, even less the disengagement of an aesthetic sphere distinct from other spheres (economic, social, religious or political).

It is not my intention to retrace, even summarily, the diverse paths of deterritorialisation of these territorialised Assemblages of enunciation. Let us just note that their general evolution will move towards an accentuation of the individuation of subjectivity, towards a loss of its polyvocality — simply consider the multiplication of names attributed to an individual in many archaic societies — and towards an autonomisation of Universes of value of the order of the divine, the good, the true, the beautiful, of power.... This sectorisation of modes of valorisation is now so deeply rooted in the cognitive apprehension of our era that it is difficult for us to trace its economy when we try to decode past societies. How can we imagine, for example, that a Renaissance prince did not buy works of art but attached to himself masters whose fame reflected on his prestige. Corporatist subjectivity with its pious implications for master artisans of the Middle Ages who built the cathedrals remains obscure to us. We cannot restrain ourselves from aesthetising a rupestral art which, to all appearances, had an essentially technological and cultural significance. Thus any reading of the past is inevitably overcoded by our references to the present. Coming to terms with this does not mean that we should unify fundamentally heterogeneous points of view. A few years ago an exhibition in New York presented cubist works and productions of what is generally called primitive art side by side. Formal, formalist and ultimately quite superficial correlations were made, the two series of creations being detached from

their respective contexts — on the one side, tribal, ethnic, mythical; on the other, cultural, historical, economic. We shouldn't forget that the fascination that African, Oceanic and Indian art exercised on the cubists was not only of a plastic order but was associated with an exoticism of the period, informed by exploration, colonial expeditions, travel journals, adventure novels, whose aura of mystery was intensified by photography, cinema, sound recordings and by the development of field ethnology. If it is not illegitimate, and doubtless inevitable, to project onto the past the aesthetic paradigms of modernity, it can only be on the condition we recognise the relative and virtual character of the constellations of Universes of value brought about by this kind of recomposition.

Science, technology, philosophy, art and human affairs confront respectively the constraints and resistances of specific materials which they loosen and articulate within given limits. They do this with the help of codes, know-how and historical teachings which lead them to close certain doors and open other ones. The relations between the finite modes of these materials and the infinite attributes of the Universes of the possible they imply are different within each of these activities. Philosophy, for example, generates its own register of creative constraints, secretes its material of textual reference; it projects their finitude onto an infinite power corresponding to the auto-positioning and auto-consistency of its key concepts, at least at each mutant phase of its development. For their part, the paradigms of techno-science place the emphasis on an objectal world of relations and functions, systematically bracketing out subjective affects, such that the finite, the delimited and coordinatable, always takes precedence over the infinite and its virtual references. With art, on the contrary, the finitude of the sensible material becomes a support for the production of affects

and percepts which tend to become more and more eccentred with respect to preformed structures and coordinates. Marcel Duchamp declared: "art is a road which leads towards regions which are not governed by time and space." The different domains of thought, action and sensibility position, in dissimilar ways, their movement from infinity into the passage of time, or rather into epochs capable of returning to or intersecting each other. For example, theology, philosophy and music today no longer compose a constellation as strong as during the Middle Ages. The metabolism of the infinite, proper to each assemblage, is not fixed once and for all. And when an important mutation appears within a domain, it can have "fallout," it can transversally contaminate many other domains (for example, the effect on the arts and literature of the potentially unlimited reproducibility of text and image by the printing press, or the power of cognitive transference acquired by mathematical algorithms in the sciences).

The aesthetic power of feeling, although equal in principle with the other powers of thinking philosophically, knowing scientifically, acting politically, seems on the verge of occupying a privileged position within the collective Assemblages of enunciation of our era. But before approaching this issue, it is necessary to further clarify its position within the anterior assemblages.

Let us return to the territorialised Assemblages of enunciation. Strictly speaking, they don't constitute a particular historical stage. Though they may characterise societies without writing or State, we can find relics or even active renaissances of them in developed capitalist societies — and without doubt they can be thought to hold a significant place in post-capitalist societies. Aspects of this kind of polysemic, animistic, transindividual subjectivity can equally be found in the worlds of infancy, madness, amorous passion and artistic creation. It might also be better here to speak of a proto-aesthetic paradigm, to

emphasise that we are not referring to institutionalised art, to its works manifested in the social field, but to a dimension of creation in a nascent state, perpetually in advance of itself, its power of emergence subsuming the contingency and hazards of activities that bring immaterial Universes into being. A residual horizon of discursive time (time marked by social clocks), a perpetual duration, escapes the alternative of remembering-forgetting and lives with a stupefying intensity, the affect of territorialised subjectivity. Here the existential Territory becomes, at the same time, homeland, self-belonging, attachment to clan and cosmic effusion.

In this first illustration of an Assemblage, the category of space is in a position that can be described as globally aesthetised. Polyphonic spatial strata, often concentric, appear to attract and colonise all the levels of alterity that in other respects they engender. In relation to them, objects constitute themselves in a transversal, vibratory position, conferring on them a soul, a becoming ancestral, animal, vegetal, cosmic. These objectities-subjectities are led to work for themselves, to incarnate themselves as an animist nucleus; they overlap each other, and invade each other to become collective entities half-thing half-soul, half-man half-beast, machine and flux, matter and sign.... The stranger, the strange, evil alterity are dispelled into a menacing exterior. But the spheres of exteriority are not radically separated from the interior. Bad internal objects have to respond to everything governing the exterior worlds. In fact, there isn't really any exteriority: collective territorialised subjectivity is hegemonic; it folds one Universe of value into another in a general movement of folding over on itself. It gives rhythm to times and spaces at the pleasure of its interior tempo, its ritual refrains. The events of the macro-cosm are assimilated to those of the micro-cosm — to which they are also accountable. Space and time are thus never neutral receptacles; they

must be accomplished, engendered by productions of subjectivity involving chants, dances, stories about ancestors and gods.... Here there is no effort bearing on material forms that does not bring forth immaterial entities. Inversely, every drive towards a deterritorialised infinity is accompanied by a movement of folding onto territorialised limits, correlative to a jouissance in the passage to the collective for-itself and its fusional and initiatory mysteries.

With deterritorialised assemblages, each sphere of valorisation erects a transcendent autonomised pole of reference: the Truth of logical idealities, the Good of moral will, the Law of public space, the Capital of economic exchange, the Beautiful of the aesthetic domain.... This carving up of transcendence is consecutive to an individuation of subjectivity, which itself is divided up into modular faculties such as Reason, Understanding, Will, Affectivity.... The segmentation of the infinite movement of deterritorialisation is accompanied by a reterritorialisation, this time incorporeal: an immaterial reification. The valorisation which, in the preceding illustration, was polyphonic and rhizomatic, becomes bipolarised, Manicheanised, hierarchised and, in particularising its components, tends, in a certain way, to become sterilised. Dualisms in an impasse, like the oppositions between the sensible and the intelligible, thought and extensity, the real and the imaginary, involve a recourse to transcendent, omnipotent and homogenetic instances: God, Being, Absolute Spirit, Energy, The Signifier.... The old interdependence of territorialised values is thus lost, as are the experimentation, rituals and bricolages which led to their invocation and provocation — with the risk that they would reveal themselves as evanescent, dumb, without “surety” and even dangerous. Transcendent value presents itself as immovable, always already there and thus always going to stay there. From its perspective, subjectivity remains in perpetual lack, guilty a priori,

or at the very least in a state of “unlimited procrastination” (following Kafka’s expression in *The Trial*). The “lie of the ideal” as Nietzsche wrote, becomes “the curse on reality.”<sup>1</sup> Thus modular subjectivity has no connection with the old dimension of the emergence of values which are neutralised under the weight of codes, rules and laws decreed by the transcendent enunciator. It is no longer the result of the changing contours of an intrication of spheres of valorisation secured to matters of expression — it is recomposed, as reified individuation, from Universals laid out according to an arborescent hierarchy. Imprescriptible laws, duties and norms take the place of the old prohibitions which always arranged a place for conjuration and transgression.

This sectorisation and bipolarisation of values can be defined as capitalistic due to the neutralisation, the systematic dequalification, of the materials of expression from which they proceed — which puts them into the orbit of the economic valorisation of Capital, treating as formally equal the values of desire, use values, exchange values, and which puts differential qualities and non-discursive intensities under the exclusive control of binary and linear relations. Subjectivity is standardised through a communication which evacuates as much as possible trans-semiotic and amodal enunciative compositions. Thus it slips towards the progressive effacement of polysemy, prosody, gesture, mimicry and posture, to the profit of a language rigorously subjected to scriptural machines and their mass media avatars. In its extreme contemporary forms it amounts to an exchange of information tokens calculable as bits and reproducible on computers. Modular individuation thus breaks up the complex overdeterminations between the old existential Territories in order to remodel the mental Faculties, a self, organs, personological, sexual and familial modalities of alterity, as so many pieces compatible with the

mechanics of social domination. In this type of deterritorialised assemblage, the capitalist Signifier, as simulacrum of the imaginary of power, has the job of overcoding all the other Universes of value. Thus it extends to those who inhabit the domain of percept and aesthetic affect, who nevertheless remain — faced with the invasion of canonical redundancies and thanks to the precarious reopening of lines of flight from finite strata to incorporeal infinity — nuclei of resistance of resingularisation and heterogenesis.

Capitalistic deterritorialised Assemblages do not constitute well defined historical periods — any more than do emergent territorialised Assemblages. (Capitalistic drives are found at the heart of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Chinese empires, then throughout the whole of classical Antiquity.) The third type of processual Assemblage will be even more difficult to delimit, since it is only presented here prospectively, from traces and symptoms it appears to manifest today. Rather than marginalising the aesthetic paradigm, it confers on it a key position of transversality with respect to other Universes of value, from which it intensifies, each in its own way, creationist nuclei of autopoietic consistency. However, the end of the autarky and desertification of the Universes of value in the previous illustration is not synonymous with a return to the territorialised aggregation of emergent Assemblages. One does not fall back from the regime of reductionist transcendence onto the reterritorialisation of the movement of infinity in finite modes. The general (and relative) aesthetisation of the diverse Universes of value leads to a different type of re-enchantment of the expressive modalities of subjectivation. Magic, mystery and the demonic will no longer emanate, as before, from the same totemic aura. Existential Territories become diversified, heterogenised. The event is no longer enclosed in myth; it becomes a



nucleus of processual relay. The incessant clash of the movement of art against established boundaries (already there in the Renaissance, but above all in the modern era), its propensity to renew its materials of expression and the ontological texture of the percepts and affects it promotes brings about if not a direct contamination of other domains then at the least a highlighting and a re-evaluation of the creative dimensions that traverse all of them. Patently, art does not have a monopoly on creation, but it takes its capacity to invent mutant coordinates to extremes: it engenders unprecedented, unforeseen and unthinkable qualities of being. The decisive threshold constituting this new aesthetic paradigm lies in the aptitude of these processes of creation to auto-affirm themselves as existential nuclei, autopoietic machines. We can already sense the lifting of shackles from the sciences constituted by the reference to a transcendent Truth as the guarantee of its principle of consistency, which increasingly appears to relate to operational modelisations that stick as close as possible to immanent empiricism. But in any event, whatever the detours of History, social creativity seems called upon to expropriate its old rigid ideological structures, in particular those which served as a guarantee of the eminence of State power and those which still make a veritable religion out of the capitalist market. If we turn for a moment to a discipline like psychoanalysis, which claimed to affirm itself as scientific, it is increasingly clear that it has everything to gain from putting itself under the aegis of this new type of aesthetic processual paradigm. Only in this way can it reacquire the creativity of its wild years at the turn of the century. Its vocation (depending on apparatuses, renewed procedures and references open to change) is to engender a subjectivity free from adaptive modelisations and capable of connecting with the singularities and mutations of our era. We can multiply the examples. In every domain we could find the same

interlacing of three tendencies: an ontological heterogenification of Universes of reference deployed across what I have called the movement of infinity; an abstract, machinic transversality articulating the multitudes of finite interfaces which manifest these Universes in the same hypertext<sup>2</sup> or plane of consistency; a multiplication and particularisation of nuclei of autopoietic consistency (existential Territories). This processual aesthetic paradigm works with (and is worked by) scientific and ethical paradigms. It is installed transversally to technoscience because technoscience's machinic Phylums are in essence creative, and because this creativity tends to connect with the creativity of the artistic process. But to establish such a bridge, we have to shed our mechanist visions of the machine and promote a conception which encompasses all of its aspects: technological, biological, informatic, social, theoretical and aesthetic. Once again, it is the aesthetic machine which seems to be in the best position to disclose some of its often unrecognised but essential dimensions: the finitude relative to its life and death, the production of proto-alterity in the register of its environment and of its multiple implications, its incorporeal genetic filiations.

The new aesthetic paradigm has ethico-political implications because to speak of creation is to speak of the responsibility of the creative instance with regard to the thing created, inflection of the state of things, bifurcation beyond pre-established schemas, once again taking into account the fate of alterity in its extreme modalities. But this ethical choice no longer emanates from a transcendent enunciation, a code of law or a unique and all-powerful god. The genesis of enunciation is itself caught up in the movement of processual creation. We see this clearly, with scientific enunciation, but always with multiple heads: an individual head, of course, but also a collective head, an institutional head, a machinic head with

experimental apparatuses, informatics, data banks, artificial intelligence.... The process of differentiating these machinic interfaces fragments the autopoietic enunciative nuclei and renders them partial to the extent that it itself deploys itself everywhere across the fields of virtuality of Universes of reference. But how, with this explosion of the individuation of the subject and this fragmentation of interfaces, can we still speak of Universes of value? No longer aggregated and territorialised (as in the first illustration of *Assemblage*) or autonomised and transcendentalised (as in the second), they are now crystallised in singular and dynamic constellations which envelop and make constant use of these two modes of subjective and machinic production. One must never confuse here machinism and mechanism. Machinism, in the way that I understand it, implies a double process — autopoietic-creative and ethical-ontological (the existence of a “material of choice”) — which is utterly foreign to mechanism. This is why the immense machinic interconnectedness, the way the world consists today, finds itself in an autofoundational position of its own bringing into being. Being does not precede machinic essence; the process precedes the heterogenesis of being.

Emergence tied to collective Territories, transcendent Universals, processual Immanence: three modalities of praxis and subjectivation specifying three types of enunciative *Assemblage* involving equally the psyche, human societies, the living world, machinic species and, in the last analysis, the Cosmos itself. Such a “transversalist” enlargement of enunciation should lead to the fall of the “ontological Iron Curtain” (following Pierre Lévy’s expression) that the philosophical tradition erected between mind and matter. The establishment of such a transversalist bridge leads us to postulate the existence of a certain type of entity inhabiting both domains, such that

the incorporeals of value and virtuality become endowed with an ontological depth equal to that of objects set in energetico-spatio-temporal coordinates. It is less a question of an identity of being which would traverse regions, retaining its heterogeneous texture, than of an identical processual persistence. Neither a Platonic Whole, nor an Aristotelian Prime Mover, these transversal entities appear like a machinic hyper-text — establishing themselves far beyond a simple, neutral support for forms and structures at the absolute horizon of all processes of creation. Thus one does not situate qualities or attributes as secondary in relation to being or substance; nor does one commence with being as a pure empty container (and a priori) of all the possible modalities of existing. Being is first auto-consistency, auto-affirmation, existence for-itself deploying particular relations of alterity. The for-itself and the for-others stop being the privilege of humanity; they crystallise everywhere that machinic interfaces engender disparity and, in return, are founded by it. The emphasis is no longer placed on Being — as general ontological equivalent, which, in the same way as other equivalents (Capital, Energy, Information, the Signifier) envelops, encloses and desingularises the process — it is placed on the manner of being, the machination producing the existent, the generative praxes of heterogeneity and complexity. The phenomenological apprehension of being existing as inert facticity only occurs in the case of limit experiences such as existential nausea or melancholic depression. Awareness of machinic being, on the other hand, will instead be deployed across multiple and polyphonic spatial and temporal envelopments and across potential, rational and sufficient developments in terms of algorithms, regularities and laws whose texture is just as real as its actual manifestations. And here once again emerges the thematic of virtual ecology and ecosophy.

The machinic entities which traverse these different registers of the actualised world and incorporeal Universes are two-faced like Janus. They exist concurrently in a discursive state within molar Fluxes, in a presuppositional relationship with a corpus of possible semiotic propositions, and in a non-discursive state within enunciative nuclei embodied in singular existential Territories, and in Universes of ontological reference which are non-dimensioned and non-coordinated in any extrinsic way.

How can we associate the non-discursive, infinite character of the texture of these incorporeals with the discursive finitude of energetico-spatio-temporal Fluxes and their propositional correlates? Pascal shows us a way in his response to the question: Do you think it is impossible that God is infinite and indivisible? "...I would like to show you something infinite and indivisible. It is a point which moves everywhere at infinite speed; because it is in all places and whole in each place."<sup>3</sup> In fact only an entity animated by an infinite speed (that is to say no longer respecting Einstein's cosmological limit of the speed of light) can hope to include both a limited referent and incorporeal fields of possibles and thereby give credibility and consistency to the contradictory terms of a proposition. But with this Pascalian speed deploying an "infinite and indivisible thing" we are still only left with an ontologically homogeneous infinity, passive and undifferentiated. The creativity intrinsic to the new aesthetic paradigm demands more active and activating folds of this infinity, in two modalities, which we will now examine, whose double articulation is characteristic of the machine in the wider sense envisaged here.

An initial chaomic folding consists in making the powers of chaos co-exist with those of the highest complexity. It is by a continuous coming-and-going at an infinite speed that the multiplicities of entities differentiate into ontologically hetero-

geneous complexions and become chaotised in abolishing their figural diversity and by homogenising themselves within the same being-non-being. In a way, they never stop diving into an umbilical chaotic zone where they lose their extrinsic references and coordinates, but from where they can re-emerge invested with new charges of complexity. It is during this chaosmic folding that an interface is installed —an interface between the sensible finitude of existential Territories and the trans-sensible infinitude of the Universes of reference bound to them. Thus one oscillates, on one hand, between a finite world of reduced speed, where limits always loom up behind limits, constraints behind constraints, systems of coordinates behind other systems of coordinates, without ever arriving at the ultimate tangent of a being-matter which recedes everywhere and, on the other hand, Universes of infinite speed where being can't be denied anymore, where it gives itself in its intrinsic differences, in its heterogenetic qualities. The machine, every species of machine, is always at the junction of the finite and infinite, at this point of negotiation between complexity and chaos.

These two types of ontological consistency — heterogenetic being-quality and homogenetic being-matter-nothingness — do not involve any Manichean dualism, since they constitute themselves from the same plane of entitative immanence and envelop each other. But the price to pay for this initial level of immanence and complexity is that it does not deliver the key to the stabilisation, localisation and rhythmisation of decelerating chaosmic stases and strata, of "freeze framings" of complexity, of what prevents the latter from turning back and from once again being swallowed up by chaos and of what leads them, on the contrary, to engender limits, regularities, constraints, laws, and everything that the second autopoietic folding must assume.

In fact, it is not legitimate to try to intercept finite contingency on such a direct route between chaos and complexity. There are two reasons for this. On one hand, the fleeting complexion which emerges from chaos to return there at infinite speed is itself the virtual bearer of reduced speeds. On the other, the chaosmic umbilicus, insofar as it develops consistency, also has a role to play in the birth of finitude with its two functions of existential grasping and transmonadism. Thus, we will be led to superpose the immanence of infinity and finitude onto the immanence of complexity and chaos; we will have to assume that the primordial slowing down manifested in finite speeds, proper to limits and extrinsic coordinates and to the promotion of particularised points of view, inhabits chaos just as much as the infinite entitative speeds which attempt to domesticate philosophy with their conceptual creations. The movement of infinite virtuality of incorporeal complexions carries in itself the possible manifestation of all the components and all the enunciative assemblages actualisable in finitude. So chaosmosis does not oscillate mechanically between zero and infinity, being and nothingness, order and disorder: it rebounds and irrupts on states of things, bodies and the autopoietic nuclei it uses as a support for deterritorialisation; it is relative chaotisation in the confrontation with heterogeneous states of complexity. Here we are dealing with an infinity of virtual entities infinitely rich in possibles, infinitely enrichable through creative processes. It is a force for seizing the creative potentiality at the root of sensible finitude — “before” it is applied to works, philosophical concepts, scientific functions and mental and social objects — which founds the new aesthetic paradigm. The potentiality of the event-advent of limited speeds at the heart of infinite speeds constitutes the latter as creative intensities. Infinite speeds are loaded with finite speeds, with a conversion of the virtual into the possible, of the reversible into irreversible, of the deferred

into difference. The same entitative multiplicities constitute virtual Universes and possible worlds; this potentiality of finite, sensible bifurcation inscribed in an irreversible temporality remains in an absolute, reciprocal presupposition with a-temporal reversibility, the incorporeal eternal return of infinitude.

A throw of dice

Never

Even ~~indeed~~ when thrown in eternal circumstances

From the depths of a shipwreck...

This irruption of the irreversible, these choices of finitude can only be framed — so as to acquire a relative consistency — on condition that they are inscribed on a memory of being and positioned in relation to axes of ordination and reference. The autopoietic fold responds to these two demands by putting into action its two inextricably associated facets of appropriation (or existential grasping) and trans-monadic inscription. But the grasping only confers auto-consistency on the monad to the extent that it deploys a transmonadic exteriority and alterity such that neither the first nor second benefit from a relation of precedence, and that one cannot approach either of them without referring to the other.

Let us nevertheless start with the grasping side: it establishes a “holding together” between:

— the respective autonomy of the complexions and its chaotomic umbilicus, their distinction, their absolute separation;

— and their equally absolute concatenation, within the same plane of double immanence.

Our experience of such ambivalent positioning and fusional abolition is given through the apprehension of Kleinian partial



objects — the breast, faeces, the penis...which crystallise the self even as they dissolve it in projective-introjective relations with the other and with the Cosmos. An incorporeal complex-ion, snatched up by grasping, will only receive its character of finitude if the advent-event of its encounter with a transmonadic line occurs, which will trigger the exit, the expulsion of its infinite speed, its primordial deceleration. Before this crossing of the threshold, the existence of the incorporeal complex-ion, just as much as that of the composition and of the assemblage — candidates for actualisation — remains aleatory and evanescent. The complex entitative multiplicity is only indexed by an autopoietic nucleus. Here, we evoke the experience of earliest dream recollection with the wild flight of its traits of complexity. Everything really begins when transmonadism enters the scene to inscribe and transform this first autopoietic coupling. We too must start again from its side.

The permanent metabolism of nihilation, the depolarisation and dissipation of the diverse that shapes the monad, prevents it from delimiting a distinctive identity. The fusional nothing of a "given" monad inhabits the nothing of another monad and so on to infinity, in a course of multidirectional relays with stroboscopic resonances. How does such a trail of nihilation, at once omnipotent and impotent, come to be the means of inscription for a reappearance of finitude, how does it become deterritorialisation? It is because where there was only infinite disappearance, absolute dispersion, the transmonadic slide introduces an ordered linearity — one moves from one point of consistency to another — thereby allowing the ordination of incorporeal complexions to crystallise. Chaosmosis functions here like the pickup head of a Turing machine. The chaotic nothing spins and unwinds complexity, puts it in relation with itself and with what is other to it, with what alters it. This actu-

alisation of difference carries out an aggregative selection onto which limits, constants and states of things can graft themselves. Already we are no longer at the speeds of infinite dissolution. There is something left over, a remainder, the selective erection of semblances and dissemblances. In symbiosis with infinite complexions, finite compositions insert themselves within extrinsic coordinates, enunciative assemblages fit together in relations of alterity. Linearity, the matrix of all ordination, is already a slowing down, an existential stickiness. It might seem paradoxical that it is the persistence of a nihilation — or rather of an intensive deterritorialisation — which gives its corporeal consistency to autopoietic states of things and points of view. But only this type of linear and rhizomatic distancing can select, arrange and proportion a complexity which will now live under the double regime of a discursive slowing down and of an absolute speed of non-separability. The virtual complexion which has been selected is then stamped with an irreversible facticity enveloped by a proto-temporality that can be described as instantaneous and eternal and easily recognised in the phenomenological apprehension of Universes of value. Transmonadism through the effect of retro-activity crystallises within the primitive chaotic soup spatial coordinates, temporal causalities, energy levels, possibilities for the meeting of complexions, a whole ontological “sexuality” composed by axiological bifurcations and mutations. In this way, the second fold of autopoietic ordination — intensely active and creationist — separates from the inherent passivity of the first chaomic fold. The passivity will transform itself into a limit, a framing, a sensitive refrain out of which an enrichment of finite and “controlled” complexity can emerge — while ontological heterogeneity will transform itself into alterity. Nothing will work until such an event-advent of primordial slowing-down and selection has happened — from the moment it is inscribed on

the transmonadic, autopoietic network. Such an aleatory limit of a virtual point of view becomes a necessary and sufficient accident in the extraction of a fold of contingency, or a “choice” of finitude. From now on we have to make do with it, start from there, return to it and circle around.

Through this precipitation of crystals of finitude and this declination of attractors of the possible, the limits of territorialisation will be irremediably promoted — limits such as those of relativity and of photon exchange, of regularities and constraints; limits like that of a quantum of action, limits that scientific assemblages will semiotise into functions, constants and laws. But the decisive point remains that the transmonadic breakout, far from resolving itself on the fixed horizon of nihilation, curls up along an infinite twisting line of flight whose circumvolutions, like those of strange attractors, give chaos a consistency at the intersection of the actualisation of finite configurations and an always possible processual recharge — the medium for ordinal and novel bifurcations, for energetic conversions escaping the entropy of territorialised stratifications — and open to the creation of mutant assemblages of enunciation.

It is a striving towards this ontological root of creativity that is characteristic of the new processual paradigm. It engages the composition of enunciative assemblages actualising the compossibility of two infinities, the active and the passive. A striving that is in no way constrained, catatonic or abstract like those of capitalistic monotheisms, but animated by a mutant creationism, always to be re-invented, always about to be lost. The irreversibility belonging to the events-advents of autopoietic grasping and transmonadism is consubstantial with a permanent resistance to circular, reterritorialising repetitions and with a constant renewal of aesthetic boundaries, scientific apparatuses of partial observation, philosophical conceptual

montages and the establishment of “habitats” (*oikos*) that are political or psychoanalytical (ecosophy). To produce new infinities from a submersion in sensible finitude, infinities not only charged with virtuality but with potentialities actualisable in given situations, circumventing or dissociating oneself from the Universals itemised by traditional arts, philosophy, and psychoanalysis: all things that imply the permanent promotion of different enunciative assemblages, different semiotic recourses, an alterity grasped at the point of its emergence — non- xenophobic, non-racist, non-phallocratic — intensive and processual becomings, a new love of the unknown.... In the end, a politics and ethics of singularity, breaking with consensus, the infantile “reassurance” distilled by dominant subjectivity. Dogmatisms of every kind investing and obscuring these points of creationism, points which necessitate a permanent confrontation (in the analysis of the unconscious as in all the other disciplines) with the collapsus of non-sense, with insoluble contradictions — the manifestations of short-circuits between complexity and chaos. For example, the democratic chaos which conceals a multitude of vectors of resingularisation, attractors of social creativity in search of actualisation. No question here of aleatory neo-liberalism with its fanaticism for the market economy, for a univocal market, for a market of redundancies of capitalist power, but of a heterogenesis of systems of valorisation and the spawning of new social, artistic and analytical practices.

So the question of inter-monadic transversality is not simply of a speculative nature. It involves calling into question disciplinary boundaries, the solipsistic closure of Universes of value, prevalent today in a number of domains. Let us take as a final example an open redefinition of the body, so necessary for the promotion of therapeutic assemblages of psychosis: the body

conceived as intersection of partial autopoietic components, with multiple and changing configurations, working collectively as well as individually; all “the bodies” — the specular body, the fantasmatic body, the neurological corporeal schema, the biological and organic soma, the immune self,<sup>4</sup> the personological identity within familial and environmental eco-systems, collective faciality, refrains (mythical, religious, ideological...) So many existential territorialities linked by the same transversal chaosmosis, so many monadic “points of view” terraced or structured across fractal ascents and descents, authorising a combined strategy of analytical approaches (institutional psychotherapeutic, psychopharmalogical) and personal recomposition that is either delirious or of an aesthetic character.... It is one and the same thing to declare these territories partial and yet open to the most diverse fields of alterity: this clarifies how the most autistic enclosure can be in direct contact with ambient social constellations and the machinic Unconscious, historical complexes and cosmic aporias.

- 1 Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, trans. W. Kaufmann, Vintage, New York, 1989, p. 218.
- 2 Cf. Pierre Lévy, op. cit.
- 3 Pascal, *Pensées*, trans. A.J. Krailsheimer, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1968, p.153.
- 4 Anne-Marie Moulin, *Le dernier langage de la médecine. Histoire de l'immunologie de Pasteur au sida*, PUF, Paris, 1991.