NOMADISM – THE RIGHT TO NON-IDENTITY

Doris Pandžić
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract: **The text presents theories of nomadism by Felix Guattari, Gilles Deleuze and Vilém Flusser, explains the terminology used in these theories and applies it in the characters analysis of literary works of post-Yugoslav writers. Nomadism as a philosophy advocates non-defining – by place, time and identity. Literary works were analyzed and compared: Скриена камера by Lidija Dimkovska, Čefurji raus! by Goran Vojnović, Snežni čovek by David Albahari and Muzej bezuvjetne predaje by Dubravka Ugrešić. Character analysis based on the theory of nomadism shows non-rootedness and non-determination of the subject, but also his striving for non-dedication. The subject does not feel devotion to a nation, language or culture. Considering the fact that he does not feel determination in any situation, he is not a cosmopolite. Nomadic subject want to keep his right to non-identity and criticizes default, collective identities. Nomadism is a theory that advocates the destruction of tradition, distinctly territorially bounded and national culture and language, and the establishment of a distinctly defined identity. Nomadic subjects use computing techniques, construction of reality from parts of different cultures and languages (nomadic collage), which destroys their previous, distinctly defined identity and creates a fluid, ambiguous identity – non-identity.**

Keywords: **nomadism, non-defining, nomadic subject, computing-technique, non-identity**

For the emergence of the theory of nomadism the credited authors are Gilles Deleuze, the French philosopher and Felix Guattari, a French psychoanalyst. In 1972 they have published a work of Anti-Oedipus, which was the first part of their theoretical work Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Eight years later, in 1980 it is published the second part of Capitalism and Schizophrenia: A Thousand Plateaus. Their theoretical work could be described as an analysis and critique of the postmodern capitalist society.

In Capitalism and Schizophrenia the State is a term that is written with a capital letter: State is based on the system. The system has a hierarchical, branching structure. State is „no longer determineted a social system; it is itself determined by the social system into which it is incorporated in the exercise of its functions. In brief, it does not cease being artificial, but it becomes concrete, it "tends to concretization" while subordinating itself to the dominant forces." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 247) The system itself has the function of systematization - of defining the identity and position within the hierarchy. It requires a single and unchangeable identities so that the system and its hierarchy could function. Without a system there

would not exist the State. That which the State seeks, is to create the center:

„But on the other hand there has never been but one State, the Urstaat, the Asiatic despotic formation, which constitutes in its shadow existence history's only break, since even the modern social axiomatic can function only by resuscitating it as one of the poles between which it produces its own break. Democracy, fascism, or socialism, which of these is not haunted by the Urstaat as a model without equal?" (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 287)

By the term of Urstaat authors think about the first city in human history - Ed. Urstaat could identify with the polis - the city-state. Urstaat as great-town/great-state is synonymous with state-center, the country with a clear territory, a territory whose borders marks the wall. So clearly limited territory allows State control:

„It is a vital concern of every State not only to vanquish nomadism but to control migrations and, more generaly, to establish a zone of rights over an entire 'exterior', over all of the flows traversing the ecumenon. If it can help it the State does not dissociate itself from a process of capture of flows of all kinds, populations, commodities or commerce, money or capital, etc. There is still a need for fixed paths in well-defined directions, which restrict speed, regulate circulation, relativize movement and measure in detail the relative movements of subjects and objects." (Deleuze; Gauttari 2005: 385-386)

The problem of the present State is its inability to realize Urstaat. Large state vague and overly broad center, artificial barriers can not fully control its territory. They are decentered and deterritorialized, and its cities have become non-places:

„We live today in the age of partial objects, bricks that have been shattered to bits, and leftovers. We no longer believe in the myth of the existence of fragments that, like pieces of an antique statue, are merely waiting for the last one to be turned up, so that they may all be glued back together to create a unity that is precisely the same as the original unity. We no longer believe in a primordial totality that once existed, or in a final totality that awaits us at some future date." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 70)

The state tends to territorialization, but deterritorialised. On its territory, the event is permanent deterritorialization, which, in the pursuit of stability of the system, results with reterritorialisation:

„In short, there is no de territorialization of the flows of schizophrenic desire that is not accompanied by global or local reterritorializations, reterritorializations that always reconstitute shores of representation. What is more, the force and the obstinacy of a deterritorialization can only be evaluated through the types of reterritorialization that represent it; the one is the reverse side of the other." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 342)

Territorialization, deterritorialization and reteritorijalizaciju can not be understood solely in the discourse of the territory. They apply to the entire discourse States. In order to maintain its state sovereignty, it creates a certain team that implements the culture. These teams are usually called tradition. Eric Hobsbawm in the introduction to the book The

Invention of Tradition fictional tradition describes as a "set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. "(Hobsbawm 2004: 1) The tradition serves for creation of identity for the State, and time for the creation of these traditions can usually be dated.

According to Deleuze and Guattari, the nomadic subject is a schizophrenic. It is necessary to clarify what Deleuze and Guattari mean by schizophrenia. The authors make opposition paranoid - schizophrenic. The paranoic is identified with the State, it is part of the State system. His discourse authors indicate as a molar, as well as macro-phisical:

„The paranoiac engineers masses, he is the artist of the large molar aggregates, the statistical formations or gregariousnesses, the phenomena of organized crowds." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 305)

The paranoiac supports the State, he is the part of the masses, part of the machine –of the system. It organizes in the hierarchy. Now we can establish a triangle: paranoid - Country - reterritorialisation. Within this triangle there is interdependence. The paranoiac is a part of the State and does not want to/does not know its work outside the system. If the State would remained centered, it creates reterritorialisation. The paranoiac believes in the correctness of this reterritorialization because they are part of the State within whose system it is. The reterritorialisation strengthens the State and thus paranoiac safety in the immutability of State and the inapplicability of their own. Deleuze and Guattari think that psychoanalysis supports paranoid discourse

and on that basis, they offer shizoanalysis as the opposition:

„But psychoanalysis did find the following means, and fills the following function: causing beliefs to survive even after repudiation; causing those who no longer believe in anything to continue believing; reconstituting a private territory for them, a private Urstaat, a private capital (dreams as capital, said Freud). That is why, inversely, schizoanalysis mLlst devote itself with all its strength to the necessary destructions. Destroying beliefs and representations, theatrical scenes." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 340)

The paranoiac must take its role within the system, he chooses one-sided identity with which it will be identified, „penetrates into singularities" (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 306). Unlike the paranoid, schizophrenic is aware of the mechanisms for the States. He does not believe in the sense of reterritorialisation, center, or even the identity. Such a discourse of Deleuze and Guattari is called molecular, microphysical:

„And it could be said that by contrast the schizo goes in the other direction, that of microphysics, of molecules insofar as they no longer obey the statistical laws: waves and corpuscles, flows and partial objects that are no longer dependent upon the large numbers; infinitesimal lines of escape, instead of the perspectives of the large aggregates. Doubtless it would be a mistake to contrast these two dimensions in terms of the collective and the individual. On the one hand, the microunconscious

presents no fewer arrangements, connections. And interactions, although these arrangements are of an original type; on the other hand, the form of individualized persons does not belong to it, since it knows only partial objects and flows,…" (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 306)

Why the authors claim that paranoid discourse can not be regarded as colective, and schizophrenic individual? We have already mentioned that the system States has branched structure - a hierarchy. In order to achieve "collective", it requires equality, and the hierarchical structure abolishes the equality of individuals in a group. Therefore, the paranoid discourse can not be equated with "collective". Also, even schizoid discourse can not be equated with "individual" because "individual" in this sense implies identity. The nomadic schizophrenic entity rejects the existence of the center, "he expands on the periphery of the circle whose center is the self left." (Deleuze, Guattari 1990: 19) Nomadic subject is decentered. The question is: does the nomadic subject has its own identity? The authors explain the nomadic identity as follows:

„There is no ego at the center, any more than there are persons distributed on the periphery. Nothing but a series of singularities in the disjunctive network, or intensive states in the conjunctive tissue, and a transpositional subject moving full circle, passing through all the states, triumphing over some as over his enemies, relishing others as his allies, collecting everywhere the fraudulent premium of his avatars. Partial object: a well situated scar-ambiguous besides-is

better proof than all the memories of childhood that the pretender lacks.(…) But this *me* is merely the residual subject that sweeps the circle and concludes a self from its oscillations on the circle." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 116)

Although this identity is in most theories of nomadism, and in Deleuze and Guattari is called fluctuating identity, according to this quote, no one can agree with that. Shizoanalises implies a sort of destruction. This destruction does not happen suddenly. It is a process. The subject refuses to identify with the center, or because of external factors, the center disappears and appears in the second place. In both cases, the subject moves away from the center and it is located on the outskirts. What is happening on the periphery is the undertaking of his new identity. This is the moment of fluctuation. At this point, the subject can find a new one, take up a new identity, reterritorialize itself, and can continue the process of deterritorialisation and refuse to reterritorialize. Whether it is the subject being reterritorialized or the subject being refused reterritorialized, the outcome is not fluctuating identity. In the first case, the subject has taken immutable, reterritorialized identity. In the second case, the subject has left the principle of identity. He can, if necessary, ostensibly take a certain identity, or, as the Deleuze and Guattari put it, "avatar", but it is by no means identity - this is the role. In the process of the fluctuations, the subject is occupied and abandoned by various identities, which led him to the conclusion that identity has any meaning, because it is changeable, it is not universal, but that change of identity has trained him for the recapture of a particular identity if necessary. For nomadic entities exempt from the identity of the "I", the authors say:

„They must reinvent each gesture. But such a man produces himself as a free man, irresponsible, solitary, and joyous, finally able to say and do something simple in his own name, without asking permission; a desire lacking nothing, a flux that overcomes barriers and codes, a name that no longer designates any ego whatever." (Deleuze; Guattari 2000: 157)

Certainly we could say that the subject in the process of identity fluctuation is a nomadic subject, but not that every entity has a floating nomadic identity. When nomadic subject completely free of identity takes its avatars, it should not be seen as taking identity, just as taking the role that the subject consciously takes a role, and know that they will abandon him when the need for an avatar disappears. Nomadic subject in this way can work within the system States (when it wants to, or when there is a need), but the main difference between it and the resident paranoid subject is that paranoid entity believes in the State and its system, a nomadic subject is not trusted. When we talk about the State and its system, we are not talking only about the identity, but also the center. As mentioned, today's large states are themselves decentered, and reterritorialisation are constant attempts to create the center. The state is a decentered nomadic phenomenon with constant fluctuating identity, aimed at creating the illusion of the opposite situation. It follows the fact that the entire Western society nomadic, but paranoid-sedentary subjects artificially maintain their belief reterritorialisation States and its systems. In contrast to the paranoid-sedentary subject, the subject-nomad is aware of that fact.

The third important theorist of nomadism is Vilém Flusser. Although his theory of nomadism does not refer directly to the work of Deleuze and Guattari, the correspondences are significant, with the Flusser Theory of nomadism is fleshed out in the direction of globalization and digital culture. While the theory of nomadism Deleuze and Guattari is overloaded with revolution ideology, Flusser theory is exempt from any ideology belief. Speaking of a sedentary lifestyle as a closure in architecture, closed within the walls of what Deleuze and Guattari call Urstaat, Flusser begins debate on the state of exile outside the wall. The expulsion, the exile, is considered a punishment from the perspective of those who are inside the wall. The author finds that the state of exile is considered a non-sedentary, according to the three phases of exile and describes them:

„All three phases of the process are unsettling: being expelled, wandering in the void, and finally, being beached somewhere. The first phase unsettles us out of the ground that supports our reality; the second exposes us to unreality; the third transports us into an unacceptable second-degree reality." (Flusser 2003: 25)

Only when the exiled is found himself outside the wall, he can see the situation on the inside the wall as confinement, and his condition as a condition of freedom. In his theory, Flusser talks about the third season of the immediate future, an age which will again be nomadic, in which the wall and architecture disappears, and the beginning of that era is placed in the nineties of the twentieth century. In an era when Flusser wrote their essays, it has already been

activated, but has not yet been used commercially nor globally. He has predicted the commercialization of the Internet in the twentieth century and its significance for human society:

„Since the Information Revolution we have become indefinable. We can no longer be localized spatially or temporally." (Flusser 2003: 48)

Speaking of a cable as an information carrier, the cable which perforates the wall, Flusser describes it in the same way as Deleuze and Guattari rhizome. The Cable, just like rhizome, creates a network, in this case, network of informations, and at each end of the cable, there is a man. This network connectivity disintegrate sedentary world we know:

"The objective, physical world is disintegrating into dust, into particles. Life within it is also disintegrating into dust, into genes. Our thinking is disintegrating into dust, into bits of information. "(Flusser 2003: 50)

If we turn back to the theory of Deleuze and Guattari, this process is called deterritorialization. The world is becoming fragmented and we are forced again "*to collage*" picture of the world from these fragments. Flusser marks the process of establishing the new image of the fragments obtained by the disintegration of the term computing, which would mean calculations. This process, "computing" he describes the definition of "Computing is the concentration of abstract, potential particles out of a networked dispersion." (Flusser 2003: 51) This kind of human society, conditioned by digital technologies

Flusser callstelematics company. It is deterritorialised society, not only geographically, but also in temporal terms.

The literary works of the post-Yugoslav authors can be analyzed from the perspective of administrative theories of nomadism. By "post-Yugoslav authors," we imply authors who have written works after the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, and whose works are very similar to the discourse, and can not be strictly classified as works of one of the national literatures of former Yugoslavia. The coincidence in these works is exactly the nomadic discourse. Literary works will be analyzed and compared: *Скриена камера* by Lidija Dimkovska, *Čefurji raus!* by Goran Vojnović, *Snežni čovek* by David Albahari and *Muzej bezuvjetne predaje* by Dubravka Ugrešić.

The main subjects of these literary works are decentered, nomadic subjects. Losing center, operators can refuse reterritolizade or are unable reterritorilazed and define their identity.

The subject of the novel "Snežni čovek" by David Albahari is an exiled, who with the loss of the city-state, takes a fluctuating identity and nomadic discourse, is expressing through analysis of the vicissitudes of national borders and history:

„Sve je bilo tako naglo, pomislio sam, i odlazak i dolazak, pogotovo dolazak, nisam još imao vremena da se saberem, i dalje sam postojao kao niz scena, nevešto povezanih rukom neiskusnog montažera, kao da se moj život raspadao zajedno sa istorijom moje zemlje, moje *bivše* zemlje, morao sam da dodam, i kao da nisam više bio samo jedan čovek, jedno biće, već više ljudi i više bića, tako da sam svaku stvar istovremeno video iz više uglova, u

beskraju umnoženih trenutaka, kao što je svaka misao odmah postajala mnogo misli, istih a različitih, dovoljno različitih da me spreče da prihvatim bilo koju od njih, što me je, na kraju, ostavljalo praznog, izmučenog, poput ljušture, poput olupine,…" (Albahari 2009: 34)

With the disintegration of the State, its system, border and history, a chain occurs and the disintegration of the subject; the subject may decide to accept the new center-state and its reterritorialization but it can also reject the integration of the new state, which leaves him with no clear center and causes fluctuation of identity. Such centering consequently causes review of all components of the state system, including the sense of institutionalized education:

„…i da mu kažem koliko doista mrzim univerzitet. Bilo bi mi lakše *sada*, kada nisam imao kome to da kažem, osim sebi. i ne toliko univerzitet, pomislio sam, koliko veru u obrazovanje, u sistem učenja koji, navodno, omogućuje da se vidi bolje od svakoga ko se nalazi izvan tog sistema, drugim rečima: svaki sistem, pogotovo onaj koji propoveda da se sve može naučiti, pa i pisanje, pa i svaka umetnost, doista nauka, zbir definicija, jednačina i negacija." (Albahari 2009: 29-30)

With abandonment of faith in the system, the subject becomes a nomad and his only identification may be described as a negation: non-identification. The subject is no longer identified with the territory, the system, ideology or with any predetermined identity. He, with refusing of the identification, demands the right of non-identity and concieves the world as a collection of fragments to "calculate" in order to obtain a complete picture of reality:

„Sudeći po profesoru političkih nauka, možda nisam postojao. Sudeći po istoriji, sigurno nisam postojao. Sudeći po meni, nisam znao. Sve ono što sam donedavno poznavao kao celinu, sada je predstavljalo tek zbir fragmenata, i ako se sve raspalo, onda sam sa dosta pouzdanosti mogao da zaključim da sam se i sam raspao, da sam zbir pojedinosti koje još samo sumnja ili neodlučnost drže na okupu." (Albahari 2009: 39-40)

The technique of computing, Dubravka Ugrešić, in the novel "Muzej bezuvjetne predaje" shows through the metaphor of photography - clips that make someone's reality:

„Fotografija je svođenje beskrajnog i nesavladivog svijeta na kvadratić. Fotografija je naša mjera svijeta. Fotografija je naša uspomena. Pamćenje je svođenje svijeta na kvadratiće. Uvrštavanje kvadratića u album je autobiografija." (Ugrešić 2002: 45)

Combining the fragments, the subject tries to get his picture of the world, which, paradoxically, always changes, due to the viewing angle, which is always located outside the city, outside of the Wall, beyond the possibility of a clear definition. After such a process shizoanalises, the subject leaves the definition of discourse and accept fragmentation as a real state, which also refuses to define its own.

One of the important elements of the center and identity is certainly the language. In the Yugoslav case, hapened the disintegration of language, whose consequence Ugrešić considers and the disintegration of identity:

„Došavši na svijet u trenutku kada su njegov materinji jezik, taj koji je tek trebao savladati, nasilno podijelili na tri, dječak je s ravnodušnom brzinom savladao sve tri varijante, iako na svoj način. Najčešće je izgovarao riječi na jeziku koji nije bio njegov, ako je ijedan bio njegov, na engleskom, na jeziku kojem ga je Ivana učila u igri. U vremenu u kojem je riječ *identitet* odzvanjala posvuda kao božje slovo, i u čije su ime ljudi s božanskom lakoćom ubijali jedni druge, dječak je uporno odbijao da nauči zamjenicu *ja.*" (Ugrešić 2002: 274)

Language is a very important element of the novel "Čefurji raus!" of Goran Vojnovic. It is written in so-called "Fužinščina" combination of Ljubljana urban speech and language variants of the former Yugoslavia, the novel shows the life of the inhabitants of Ljubljana suburbs, where live members of the former Yugoslav republics, who are not Slovenes. Since they no longer have a national identity (because their identity was Yugoslav), they accept for themselves derogatory term for new arrivals from the southern states of the former Yugoslavia - Čefuri. Their Otherness becomes imposed, "labeled" identity within which they create their own variants of the language. Thus, in addition to the mixing of language standards and jargon in the speech of the characters, present poor implementation Slovenian dual, but also examples of hybrid words like "slovenština" (Vojnovic 2008: 151) - instead of regular forms of standard languages of the former Yugoslavia, "slovenščina", "slovenački "or" slovenski ". "Labelling identity", ie the identity that gives to one, how it could be viewed unilaterally, Vojnovic shows in a humorous way. Čefuri in Fužine play the game and even each other's national "label"; so the postman Matthew, the only one who is not a stranger, is named Slovenac,

Vlado from Slavonski Brod becomes Tuđman. In the same way, and linguistically distinct from Čefuri indigenous Slovenian population - Slovenians are "those on č" ie. "Sosedi" (Vojnovic 2008: 68), and Čefuri "they on ć" ie. "komšije" (Vojnovic 2008: 68).

Vojnovic using the language parodies with element of history: "Ajde, ko da se zgodovina mijenja." (Vojnovic 2008: 60). The latter example Vojnovic probably did not choose accidentally; Radovan, the father, talks about how history does not change, and it is precisely the word "zgodovina" is the only Slovenian word as that used in a sentence, instead of the Croatian-Serbian version of "istorija" or "povijest", which was probably used before.

Lidija Dimkovska writes about similar acceptance of Otherness and in her novel " *Скриена камера* ". She claims that otherness stops to exist at the time that it is accepted:

> *„Со сè човек треба да стапи во контакт, сè треба да прифати, да признае, па дури потоа Другото ќе попушти во својата моќ и ќе стане посвоено друго, или само посвоено*.‴ (Димковска 2004: 22)

Dimkovska criticizes the discourse of identity as discourse characteristic of the State. The state requires a clearly defined identity, the identity in which thw individual must forcefully and without deviation fit:

> „Протоколот ти е страшна работа и наметну- ва отуѓување од себе и влегување со строго од- реден идентитет, кон што се стремат и земји- те…" (Димковска 2004: 77)

The identity of the main subject of the novel "*Скриена камера*" is no longer a fluctuating identity, but the identity of the subject that is rejected as a concept. Subject disintegrate his identity in order to reintegrate in the form of non-identity:

Str. 223

„Дома бев само кога не си го поставував прашањето дали или каде сум дома. Имав идентитет само кога не знаев за друга алтернатива. Од идентитетот кон двојниот идентитет патот поминува низ себегубењето, па од *дома* стигнуваш *таму*, а постојано низ редици *овде*, и самите крстопати.“ (Димковска 2004: 196)

REFERENCES:

[1] Albahari, David, *Snežni čovek*, EPH Liber, Zagreb, 2009.
[2] Augé, Marc, *Non-Places, Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, Verso, London, New York, 1995.
[3] Bhabha, Homi, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, London and New York, 1994.
[4] Biti, Vladimir, *Doba svjedočenja: tvorba identiteta u suvremenoj hrvatskoj prozi*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2005.
[5] Benhabib, Seyla, *Pravice drugih : tujci, rezidenti in državljani,* Ulčakar & JK, Ljubljana: Krtina, 2010.
[6] *Čovjek/prostor/vrijeme, književnoantropološke studije iz hrvatske književnosti*, Disput, Zagreb, 2006.
[7] Deleuze, Gilles – Guattari, Félix, *Anti-Oedipus*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2000.
[8] Deleuze, Gilles – Guattari, Félix, *A Thousand Plateaus,* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, London, 2005.
[9] Deleuze, Gilles – Guattari, Félix, *Nomadology: The War Machine*, Wormwood Distribution, Seattle, WA, 2010.
[10] Димковска, Лидија, *Скриена камера*, Магор, Скопје, 2004.
[11] Flusser, Vilém, *The Freedom of the Migrant (Objections to Nationalism)*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 2003.
[12] Genette, Gérard, *Narrative Discourse, an essay in method*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1980.
[13] Kristeva, Julija, *Nations Without Nationalism*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1993.
[14] Kristeva, Julija, *Strangers to Ourselves*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1991.
[15] Шелева, Елисабета, *Дом/Идентитет*, Магор, Скопје, 2005.
[16] *The invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
[17] Vidmar Horvat, Ksenija, *Globalna kultura*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana, 2006.
[18] Ugrešić, Dubravka, *Muzej bezuvjetne predaje*, Konzor & Samizdat B92, Beograd, 2002.
[19] Vojnović, Goran, *Čefurji raus!*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana, 2008.