

## ***Making cosmos: the tangle of the universe***

by ENRICO MONACELLI AND SILVIA ZANELLI

Right now, I'm dealing, like everybody else, with the big bang, the creation of the universe, the infinite curvature, things like that. How did the big bang happen? I believe that at the origin of things there is no big bang, there is the Z [...] Yes, the big bang should be replaced with the Z, which in fact is Zen, which is the path of the fly. What does that mean? For me to invoke the zig-zag, it is what we were saying before, no universals, but sets of singularities. The problem is how to relate disparate singularities or potentials [...] there was the obscure precursor, and then the flash. That is how the world is born. There is always an obscure precursor, which nobody sees. And then the lightning that lights up. And the world, and thinking should be like that. Philosophy should be like that, that is the big Z.

G. Deleuze, *Alphabet Book*

Cosmology represents *the margin* of contemporary thought, the unthought of all ontological and metaphysical reflection: in the shadow of metaphysics and on the edges of ontology, cosmology subverts the foundations of the former and expands the boundaries of the latter. In this sense the power of cosmology is an adventure of ideas still partly philosophically unexplored, but also a theoretical and poetic gamble on which contemporaneity seems to ask us to bet upon.

Cosmology is therefore *a minor line of thought* whose practical effects and theoretical depth are to be probed. Cosmology is nourished by the inextinguishable task of articulating a thought on globality, and wholeness, while considering its radical and contradictory openness. Cosmology is structurally ambivalent: on the one hand, a genuine cosmological reflection implies a theory of everything, but, on the other hand, it does not cease to figure it in its infinite and constantly postponed evenementiality. That of cosmology is thus a vocation for the *paradoxical*, and the *chimerical*. Cosmology is basically a lost bet, a fallibilistic attempt to determine the perimeter «of a world of universal variation,

of universal undulation, of universal lapping» (Deleuze 2001: 140). In this sense the power of cosmos is in principle incircumscribable, without thereby being in any way transcendent. The Deleuzian thought can act as a forerunner in this sense as Deleuze draws the margins of a new geography of the cosmos: his *absolute* and *absolutely immanent* vision of the real conveys within philosophical reflection the two-faced and paradoxical need to hold together a global conception of the whole and its dimension of ever open and evenemential articulation. The pulsating question at the center of this issue of La Deleuziana is therefore what the usefulness is (for life and for thought) of a theory of everything, as well as what might be the status of the concept of totality in the Deleuzian thought and, more generally, in contemporary thought. Nowadays, exhuming the corpse of a theory of everything, whose face we perhaps no longer even recognize, can only be a way of resemantizing its terms and to erode its presuppositions from within, i.e. *intensively*: this is the theoretical space that Deleuze's thought seems to glimpse and whose heuristic nature we would like to probe.

Problematizing the relation between ontology, cosmology and metaphysics, thinking about their possible junctions and disjunctions, is the form that the question around the possibility of thinking the Deleuzian philosophy as a genuine cosmology takes in this issue. The outline of a transversal, transindividual and transpecific cosmology seems to peep through the Deleuzian reflections, but there is an additional need of an "*hermeneutic machination*" (Vignola 2018) on the subject, in order to grasp the "implicatures" that the Deleuzian work never ceases to produce. In other words, Deleuze's thought seems to *make sign* for a cosmology, but the power of the cosmological is in part still an unexplored ground.

One of the problematic points that this issue proposes to analyze is certainly that between reason and cosmology. After all, cosmology, at least in the eyes of moderns, has always carried with it a taste of unreasonableness, or even primitivism, to use an outdated and stale term. Cosmology has always seemed the reverse of the map of the rational world, a theoretical and practical *milieu* where powers and forces that escape modern constraints are constantly at work. How, then, can a new cosmological thought and reason, understood in the broadest possible sense of the term, be related? Deleuze's entire thought, moreover, bears the marks of this clash with reason, reasonableness, and common sense. His use of the tools produced by sciences has always been a subtle but constant conflict with the constraint uses that capitalist society attributes to those same conceptual weapons. How can this conflict, an affirmation of new uses for ancient tools, nurture a new Deleuzian cosmology?

Another path to pursue is the relation between virtuality and cosmos, exploring in what sense a transcendental that is not broader than all its explications can be configured as a mobile pre-condition of each of its expressions and in what terms the virtual represents *the beginningless (cosmo)genesis* of all things, nothing but *a cosmic zigzag*. Deleuze's thought seems to virulently push to interrogate the philosophemes of the be-

ginning and the end (of all things) and to do so under a cosmic key, engaging in a hand-to-hand combat with absolutizing reifications of the concepts of the beginning and the end, which tend to be assimilated to “wellspring points” or hermetic and definitive closures. On the contrary, Deleuze detects their continuous openness and limitlessness. In this perspective, the beginning of the world, of philosophy and of thought are nothing more than the illusory optical effects of the paradigm of representation, to which the paradigm of differentiation and genesis must be substituted. Under this light there is no “alpha point” of beginning but only a pure past that hems *virtualiter* every actualization, like a contrast agent. The virtual is the shadow of the cosmos, the past that topologically chases every line and occasion of the actual without ever transcending it; that is to say, the pure past for Deleuze is an indelible trace that marks every determination and connects it to an informal field without origin from which each of them emerges. The cruelty of the beginning is its structural absence and its state of continuous *disparity*. For Deleuze: «every philosophical beginning, that is, Difference, is already in itself Repetition» (1994a: 129). The “cosmic fabric” of immanence is thus a reticular tangle where the origin sinks into the infinite tunnel of event, «an invisible, incessant labyrinth of a single straight line» (Deleuze 1998: 28), which has neither beginning nor end. The cosmos in its virtuality is a *dark precursor* that precedes like thunder every flash and burst (of the actual), never ceasing to guide its *intensive evolution*. The dark precursor is a topological and timeless past, whose rhythm is ascribed to a non-pulsed and cosmic temporality: the past (virtuality) is simultaneous with every now (actuality). This is exactly the power of the cosmos: breaking all diachrony, towards an *out-of-joint* temporality, perfect synchrony of the eternal.

Moreover, the evolution of the cosmos is configured as the continuous establishment of a *metastable equilibrium* between *chaos* and *kosmos*. The trajectory that unites order and chaos is that of a *disjunctive synthesis* collected in the Guattarian term *chaosmos* (Guattari 1995), a still little-studied word that this issue of La Deleuziana proposes to explore in depth. The aim is to highlight the ineliminable mutuality between the line of flight, that is the virtuality of the cosmos, the plane of immanence, an informal multiplicity that sifts chaos and gives consistency to its infinite velocities (Deleuze & Guattari 1994b: 36), and the molar lines that preside over the formation of all hierarchizing structuration. Ultimately, it is a question of problematizing the relation between the virtual and the actual, grasping the power of this nexus in its cosmic breath.

Another node of interest in this issue is the elaboration of what we might call a cosmology of *unreason*, a specification of that troubled relation between rational thought and cosmology. After all, Deleuze made no secret that he imagined his philosophy as an operation of theoretical *aberration*. It has become almost a cliché to associate Deleuze’s thought, with or without Guattari, with madness, understood both in a liberating and explosive sense and in a paranoid and dystopian one. From the Artaudian nomadic signs to the topic of molecular control, the Deleuzian reflection is traversed from top to bottom

by a complex, non-medicalized conceptualization of unreason. And Deleuze himself, after all, has defined his thought nothing less than an *apocalyptic science-fiction*. How, then, do apocalypse and madness come into play in cosmological thought? Can there be a Deleuzism of “*the last things*”? An aberrant cosmos?

A further itinerary of interest that seems to emerge spontaneously within contemporary thought is a possible *alliance* between the questions that the Deleuzian philosophy leaves open and anthropology. Of particular relevance in this regard is the topic of non-Western cosmologies (Viveiros de Castro 2012, 2017; Viveiros de Castro & Danowski 2016) that are capable of reconfiguring the cosmological and *cosmomorphic* force (Montebello 2016) of philosophy. Under this light the notion of *becoming-other* decomposes the classical binarism of modern thought (nature/culture, male/female, soul/body, subject/object...), proposing a surprising return to things, to the entities of the world and to the dynamics of becoming that they are capable of mobilizing.

The issue opens *in the midst of things*, with a *sui generis* exergue by Salvatore Iaconesi and Oriana Persico, a performative gesture that stages the problem of cosmology in its vivid contemporaneity. It is a dialogue, in the form of a poem, that tells of a com-possible love story between an artificial intelligence and a plant. Such affective alliance, conceived as a cosmic vector, gives body to Wisteria Furibonda, a cosmological figuration that makes sign towards new ways of inhabiting the Earth, in a non-anthropocentric perspective.

Moving on to “*Necessities/Concepts*” section, the translation of the dialogue between Yuk Hui and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro offers a survival kit of conceptual tools that enable us to navigate the sea of the “end of time”, between automation, ecological crisis and Anthropocene. The two philosophers reflect on the question of Amerindian perspectivism, multinaturalism, on the relationship between nature and culture as well as on the relation between cosmotechnics, cosmopraxis and ecopolitics.

With the articles of David Antonio Bastidas Bolaños and Yannis Chatzantonis, we enter the beating heart of Deleuzian cosmology. The attempt is to map the process of cosmogenesis, following on the one hand the theme of intensity and spatio-temporal dynamisms – with reference to the question of experimentation –, and on the other hand the complex relationship between Deleuze and the notion of structure. For Chatzantonis the French thinker, fold after fold, is able to deform and re-semantize the concepts of mereology, overcoming the dichotomy between divisibility and indivisibility. The attempt, on the part of both authors, is to reason about the process of differential and genetic structuring, according to which the Deleuzian cosmos continues to evolve intensively. Thus, the topic elicits a neuralgic point for the issue: the *need* to think about totality in a renewed way, intensively eroding the perimeter of metaphysics, in order to bend it homeomorphically, towards new adventurous uses. In other words, the whole must be continually invented and fabricated. It is necessary to chase the openness of totality in the

evenemential processuality of its cosmogenesis: making-cosmos is in this perspective a poietic necessity, even before being a theoretical problem.

Silvia Zanelli's article speaks to us of another necessity, namely that of *keeping together* (Marra: 2023) the dimension of chaos and order, which flow at the contrary and at the same time in the chaosmotic function of cosmogenesis. The question of the relationship between heterogenesis and homogenesis adds a piece to the problematic of cosmology and represents another necessary stage to stay at in order to think in its radicality about a new cosmo(logic) of things.

The first two texts of the second section "*Symptomatologies*" shift the center of gravity of the reflection to the eminently political aspect that a renewed cosmology must assume. Following this conceptual and practical guideline, Angelika Seppi's article questions the possibility of rearticulating the theme of cosmology in the times of Anthropocene and Capitalocene, identifying the conditions within which such a rethinking can take place. For Seppi, the techno-economic globalization of the Western way of life and the annihilating powers that point towards a generalized ecocide that threatens to put an end to every way of life and every form of worldliness constitute the constraints of possibility that cosmopolitics will have to pass through in order to filter a new way of inhabiting the Earth. The need for a new cosmopolitics resurfaces, like a refrain, also in the work of Camilla Zani, who shows how it is necessary to think of a humble cosmology, which has no claim to circumscribe the absolute definitively. The gesture to be made to hold cosmos together is, for Zani too, a cosmopolitic gesture.

Gustavo Martín Arévalo explores the intersubjective relations of otherness between the indigenous Andean and Amazonian communities, offering a "multi-species cosmological pedagogy", as a form of resistance. Through the analysis of some performative activities that mobilize sounds, languages and forms of corporeity, the author, thanks to a conceptual and practical ethnographic journey, transports us throughout the compositional flux of affects, perceptions and concepts, which are ways of co-constituting the world and should be thought of as real political powers against environmental extractivism and against the colonisation of thought.

Still in the wake of an alliance between anthropology and philosophy, Leif Grünwald highlights that we can think of cosmology only if we figure it as a composition of forces, affective and energetic. For the author, mutinaturalism should be welded to a certain practice of unreason, as a heuristic way to fully experience the cosmic connections in which we float, becoming-other.

In "*Red Eyes*" section, the experimental (in the full Deleuzian sense of the term) and collective work of Jon McKenzie, Bryan Reynolds, Leeny Sack and Saviana Stanescu detonate the dynamitard power of cosmology. The article unhinges and spins the concept of text *out of joint*, performatively probing the creative effects of a cosmographic practice. By delaying the question of what cosmography is, the paper enacts the power of world-writing as a global and extended desiring machine.

Antoine Renzo's article, which is also written in a peculiar style that "dramatizes" the movement, provides us with a possible line of flight for cosmology, through the notion of interstitiality.

The "Anomaly" of Fabián Darío Mosquera's paper represents a threshold of disparity for the issue on cosmology, a *delirium*, that is, literally, an exit from the groove: the article offers an original perspective on the theme of materialism and community in Pasolini, linking it to the interstitial and heterotopic figuration of the firefly, thought of as an image of resistance, vital and affective, beyond any possible moral reification. Interference is, after all, an eminently cosmological figure, that guides us once again, albeit indirectly, to the question of chaosmosis.

Sara Baranzoni's concluding text, rather than closing the issue, leaves it open and imagines new scenarios for cosmology. Starting from Maglioni and Thomson's translation into Italian of Guattari's UIQ script (2022), Baranzoni's article is a creative machination of Guattari's work on cosmic interferences.

## REFERENCES

- Deleuze, G. (2001). *Cinema 1. The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1998) *Essay Critical and Clinical*. London/New York: Verso.
- Deleuze, G. (1994a). *Difference and Repetition*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994b) *What is Philosophy?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Guattari, F. (2022). *UIQ*. (Tr. it. Maglioni, S., Thomson, G.). Roma: Luiss University Press.
- Marra, E. (2023). *Mantenere insieme. Strategie del sistema nella Francia post-strutturalista*. Milano: Meltemi.
- Montebello, P. (2016). *Métaphysiques cosmomorphes: La fin du monde humain*. Paris: Les presses du réel.
- Vignola, P. (2018) *La funzione N. Sulla macchinazione filosofica in Gilles Deleuze*. Napoli-Salerno: Orhotes.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2012). *Cosmological Perspectivism in Amazonia and Elsewhere*. London/Manchester: Hau.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2017). *Cannibal Metaphysics: for a post-structural anthropology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Viveiros de Castro, E., & Danowski, D. (2016). *The Ends of the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.