SPASMAL NORMATIVITY: REASSEMBLING NATIONALITY

Ruhtan YALÇINER[*]

ABSTRACT

Today, it might be possible to argue that the hyper-technological transformation, with its spatiotemporal consequences, has provided an ontological and epistemological crisis weakening various delineations of identity. Rather than reflecting an absolute paralysis of meaning and interpretation, this crisis has been experienced as a disseminated and everlasting state of spasm. Throughout the study, first, 'spasmal normativity' is introduced as an umbrella concept enclosing normative interpretations posited to avoid this crisis. Second, this study interprets the normative orientation on questions of identity and recognition in contemporary political theory within the framework of 'affirmative universalism'. By disengaging with the identity-oriented reading of affirmative universalism; third, the study introduces 'chiasmic nationality' as a concept enabling to discuss recognition vis-à-vis the interpretation of difference drawn upon plasticity, allagmatics and rhizomatics.

Keywords: *Spasmal Normativity, Chiasmic Nationality, Affirmative Universalism, Molar Paradox, Plasticity, Identity, Recognition.*

ÖZET
SPAZMAL NORMATİVİTE: MİLLİYETİ YENİDEN KURMAK

Günümüzde; yaşanılan hiper-teknolojik dönüşümün, mekân zamansal sonuçları itibariyle, türlü kimlik tariflerini kifayetsizleştiren ontolojik ve epistemolojik bir krize yol açtığı söylenebilir. Bu kriz, anlama ve muhakemeye ilişkin mutlak bir felci yansıtmasa da, yaygın ve sürekli bir spazm hali olarak tecrübe edilir. İlk olarak, çalışma boyunca 'spazmal normativite', bu krizin etkilerinden sakınmak üzere ortaya konulan normatif tarifleri içine alan şemsiye bir kavram olarak önerilmektedir. İkinci olarak, çalışma; çağdaş politika teorisinde görülen, kimlik ve tanınma meselelerine normatif yönelimi 'olumlayıcı evrenselcilik' çerçevesinde yorumlamaktadır. Üçüncü olarak çalışma, olumlayıcı evrenselciliğin kimlik merkezli okumasından ayrılarak, tanınmayı; plastisite, alagmatik ve rizomatiğe dayanan bir farklılık yorumu üzerinden ele almayı mümkün kılan 'kiyazmik milliyet' kavramını tanıtmaktadır.

[*] Yrd. Doç.. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü (ruhtan@hacettepe.edu.tr)

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Spazmal Normativite, Kiyasmik Milliyet, Olumlayıcı Evrenselcilik, Molar Paradoks, Plastisite, Kimlik, Tanınma.*

_____

Introduction

Nationality has generally been regarded as a central marker of belonging-together. However, it has mostly been studied through the nexus of nations and nationalism. Within this framework, nationality has been related with questions considering the modernity of nations, or discussed by reference to civic or ethnic characteristics of nationalism. However, regardless of the classical continuum of nations or nationalism studies, nationality has recently become to be regarded as an ontological and normative question. As a normative and ontological *problematic*, nationality now indicates a central marker of defining the political.

The question of nationality today denotes the double bind of political belonging. Through the corpus of this double bind, nationality plastically reassembles central questions of identity and difference. Accordingly, nationality has most recently become to be related with the ontological and normative context of the debates on diversity and recognition. At this point, however, it might be worth mentioning an epistemological flux of assessing ontological markers of being and becoming.

Hyper technological and hyper industrial conditions of late/postmodern epoch have inaugurated new mode and modalities of spatiotemporality (Harvey, 2000; Sloterdijk, 2013; Stiegler, 2014).Together with the acceleration of the *life experience* through this hyperepokhality, a major deconstructive element has become to be affiliated with the transformation of the classical context of political belonging. Drawing upon Pyrrhonian and Stoic etymological roots of the concept epokhē; hyperepokhality has become to mount as an ontological marker of the hyper-*krisis* of decision. According to Jacques Derrida, "what the accelerated development of teletechnologies, of cyberspace, of the new topology of 'the virtual' is producing is a practical deconstruction of the traditional and dominant concepts of the state and citizen (and thus of 'the political') as they are linked to the actuality of a territory" (Derrida & Stiegler, 2002, 36).

Hyperepokhal *krisis* of decision might be regarded as the central *problematic* of the political today. The central code of this *krisis*, on the other hand, is not merely spatial, but also temporal. In other words, it is ontological and spatiotemporal. Therefore; the spasm, as the pivotal condition of contemporary normative theory,

indicates a covert relation with the politics of the metaphysics of presence. It detaches and reunites the reduction of being to a purified single subsistence either through immanence or qua transcendence. The evocative formula of this design has been posited on foundation and essence. From this vortex of political metaphysics and transcendental reduction, a critical connection with questions of particularity and universality transpires. Spasmal reading of belonging might thus be outlined as an epistemic appeal to *Verwindung* and an attempt of overcoming metaphysical violence of Cartesian dualisms.

Spasmal normativity, on the other hand, signifies the fall of politics of potentiality. Although it expounds *ought to situations* to be universally applied on the effects of experiencing an epochal spasm, spasmal normativity unveils a condition of undecidability. It, mainly, reflects a pause in time regarding the void of decision. The longitude of this mode of normativity, on the other hand, is subject to the duration of the spasms of the human condition. Hyperepokhal spasms are ephemeral, transductive and recurrent. Unlike a general paralysis, this spasmal condition appeals to underwrite the already lost foundational promise. Spasmal normativity, hence, does not merely reflect a hyperepokhal appeal to belonging qua being and becoming. At the same time, it signifies a foundationalist melancholia. It unveils a *dramatization* of identification with linear reference to a generic sense of dialectics by evoking Hegelian *Anerkennung* either in terms of implying the necessity of identity and reciprocity or as regard to generating alternative ways of interpreting the form and the trace via plasticity.

Spasmal normativity might be read as hyper-caesural condition of transductive plasticity and assemblage of interpretations. However, spasmal normativity also entails a generic necessity of reciprocity. Spasmal normativity, in this sense, emanates the centrality of not only *identity* but also *difference*. First, spasmal normativity refers potentiality of interpreting identity as *idem*, as sameness. This point might be read, i.e. through the reciprocal markers of multiculturalism assigning a renewed ontology of recognition to the debates on nationality. Second, spasmal normativity also reflects an epistemic condition of hyper-epokhality through which a *politics of khōra*, in Jacques Derrida's sense, may flourish.

Spasmal normativity reflects a paracaesural condition of spatiotemporal *krisis*. The shift from modernity to post modernity primarily denotes ontological, socio-economic or ethico-political crisis of spatiotemporality (Jameson, 1991; Wood, 2007; Hetherington, 1997). *Normativization* of nationality, accordingly, might be seen as a response to this hyperepokhal transition of spatiotemporality. The

kernel of such modification might be defined as "time-space compression" which "has had a disorienting and disruptive impact upon political-economic practices" (Harvey, 1992, 284). According to David Harvey (1992), "the intensity of time-space compression in Western capitalism since the 1960s, with all of its congruent features of excessive ephemerality and fragmentation in the political and private as well as in the social realm, does seem to indicate an experiential context that makes the condition of post modernity somewhat special" (306).

Through the hyperepokhal experience of the world, normative and ontological context of belonging have become to be based on a new conditional character. This paper interprets such hyperepokhal and hyper-caesural condition of belonging through the concept of spasmal normativity. Spasmal normativity throughout this study is introduced as an epistemological orientation and as a methodological caesura reflecting today's ontological *krisis* of disindividuation.

Following Gilbert Simondon's (1995) transductive allagmatic of individuation, this paper enhances nationality as an epochal *problematic* and assemblage of mode and modalities of belonging-together. On the other hand, the major aim of the study is to discuss some of the key elements of the *krisis* of the normative theories of nationality. After focusing on three onto-spasms of normativity regarding the question of nationality–affirmative universalism, molar solipsism of the core nation and the question of de/territorialization–the paper introduces the concept of chiasmic nationality as a plastic mode of belonging– together reassembling particular and universal organs of nationality within the rhizomatic and allagmatic context of irreducibility and undecidability. Spasmal normativity also implies an organology of nationality.

Spasmal normativity might be read as an epistemic response to the hyperepokhal transposition of being and becoming through which Cartesian logic of dualisms has become dysfunctional. According to R. B. J. Walker (1995), "epistemologies that simply affirm these dichotomies are not obviously the most appropriate place from which to investigate a world in which boundaries are so evidently shifting and uncertain" (8). Spasmal normativity might, therefore, be read as an epistemic condition of a new *enframing*. Spasmal normativity, as a matter of *hyperepokhal enframing*, however could not be easily grasped. For, dioramic illusion of *identity* and ontological remains of metaphysics of presence together effectuate a camouflage of universalism.

Affirmative Universalism: A Spasmal Camouflage

The augmentation of the normative theoretical spectrum on the question of nationality recapitulates rising interdisciplinary emphasis posited on difference, identity and recognition. Debates on equal respect politics, justice and fairness, multiculturalism, secession or immigration might be mentioned as some of the key discussions of this spectrum. Recent normative studies, therefore, do not follow classical lines of questions on nations and nationalism while assessing nationality. Rather, they stipulate a more comprehensive corpus of normative problems.

Most readings of nationality in contemporary normative theory, therefore, have vastly been focusing on the debates on justice, fairness, recognition, equality or democracy (May, Modood & Squires, 2004, 2; Moore, 2001a, 100-101). These approaches also posit a normative emphasis on the possibilities of resolving tensions of ethnic or cultural diversity (Kymlicka, 2000, 184). In line with a normative primacy posited on diversity, normative theories of nationality also share a general tendency to universalizability of ethico-political questions. They mostly draw upon a politics of potentiality based on both the construction of foundational norms or procedures and the application of this universalizable content to particular circumstances. A key symptom of such perspectives, therefore, might be summarized within the context of affirmative universalism.

Affirmative universalism might be defined as a spasmal camouflage encompassing a corpus of universality vis-à-vis identity (*idem*). Affirmative universalism discloses a foundational principle of identity and identification by effectuating a *fore-condition* of particularity. By inaugurating the spasmal camouflage of the object of its own critique, this reading aims at reframing the very idea of the political in agonistic terms. Affirmative universalism, therefore, denotes a critique of modern universalism–as moral monism–by reference to its unitary and homogenizing logic of identity. Yet, affirmative universalism is spirally bound by its own critique as soon as designating the political by going through diverse accounts of particularity varying from *molecular essentialisms* to *molar foundationalism*.

Affirmative universalism might be defined as an umbrella category for defining the *politics of potentiality*. This perspective does not merely insist on maintaining universality as key marker of rehearsal unveiling a new potentiality of politics as truth. At the same time, it also claims the reciprocal bound of identity and recognition as an affirmative democratic resolution. Accordingly, these perspectives

normatively employ Hegelian dialectic of recognition as a modality of ceasing contested issues of nationality. Affirmative universality is a spasmal module of normativity effectuating a remedial ontology of belonging-together.

Remedial ontology of belonging-together in affirmative universalism unveils a spasmal condition of solipsism. The most obvious disclosure of this spasmal inauguration might be read as the *foundationalizing* emphasis posited on ethno-cultural universality of national identification. This spasmal condition reveals ethnicity and culture as universal and foundational premises.

Among foundationalizing elements of affirmative universalism, the role of cultural affiliation has been of critical importance (Tamir, 1993; Kymlicka, 1991, 1997). Within this affirmative spectrum of universalism, nominalism has reflected the key marker of identification. A synthetic void of universalism and particularism, in this regard, is revealed as an immanent corpus of relationality, which is to be reciprocally recognized as a necessity of the *self-fulfillment* of the *subject*. This locus of self-fulfillment frames the national idiom as universal potentia of social meaning.

Particularity as affirmative function of subject's fulfillment unveils the on tic structure of reciprocal recognition. The Hegelian necessity of reciprocity, herein, underpins a normative imperative of onto-solipsism. It displays the *other* merely as a constructive function of inter subjectivity. Alterity, in this dialectic tandem, hence, underpins solipsistic component of identification. Normative imperative of defining nationality through this perspective primarily conceals a foundational assumption, which is posited on the designation of identity as *idem*. This assumption marks a substitute of *ipseity* by the hypothetically continuous efficacy of belonging via transcendental dispositif of identification.

Onto-spasmal solipsism denotes a critical basis of cohesion regenerated by affirmative universalism. For, nationality has generally been defined as a "vital" function of consensualism (Calhoun, 2006, 17). This vital function, however, is not limited with the normative framework of consensualism. It may also refer to "incommensurable experiences of struggle and survival" (Bhabha, 2007, 218). Nationality, thus, also insinuates a central dispositif of interpreting immanent layers of national delirium.

Solipsistic element of nationality enables political stabilization of the ontogenesis of individuation. It ontologically binds the contextual nexus of ethno-cultural belonging with a universal sort of transcendental reduction. This double bind is clearly spatiotemporal. The solipsistic element of nationality, hence,

regenerates a form of *dwelling*, which enables the enunciation of the national *good* to flourish at a "sufficiently familiar moral space" (Ripstein, 1997, 210).

Nationality also connotes structural moments and modalities of rhetoric and identity (Calhoun, 2005, 260). Nationality, in this regard, underpins a key political framework of belonging together. It reflects a syntactic mode/modality of belonging, which is "inherently political *and* inherently cultural" (Nielsen, 1998, 105). Nationality postulates eclectic elements of affirmative universalism. Through the course of affirmative universalism, nationality underpins a bucket of normative and ontological questions varying from "personal identity" and "ethical community" to "particular territory" or "political self-determination" (Miller, 1993, 5).

Beside centrality of markers of individuation, the contested meaning of *the political* also refers an all-encompassing element of spasmal camouflage. Nationality, hence, could not merely be regarded as a "normative argument". It rather denotes a central symbol of a "normative theory" (Moore, 2001a, 5). The ethico-political corpus of the political, hence, might be seen as a critical marker of defining nationality.

Designating the relation between nationality and the political by reference to the interplay between mimic particularity and universality is a key leitmotif of normative theory. This metonymical solipsism denotes a practical task (Moore, 2001b; Norman, 1999; Miller, 2000; Canovan, 1998). Affirmative universalism, therefore, firstly draws upon the pragmatic vein of normative questions regarding matters of nations and nationality.

Affirmative universalism unveils a framework of normative corrections. Regarding affirmative universalism, the fundamental locus is the practicability of generating and applying a universal principle. This practicability is posited on the foundational corpus of a *politics of truth*. Spasmal normativity of this disposition, on the other hand, might be interpreted as a revised version of the classical content of politics of rights or equal respect politics. This disposition noticeably stipulates the camouflage of universalism.

Spasmal camouflage of affirmative universalism underpins a critical element of designating the centrality of *content* and *composition*. The content and composition of the nationality do not merely embrace particular contexts of immanence through which markers of ethno-culturalism are being effectuated. They are also thoroughly associated with the daily disposition of a nominal principle. For

Wayne Norman (2005), i.e. "the clearest way to understand the idea of an *ethnic* national identity is in terms of content" (86). Composition, on the other hand, denotes the milieu of actuality, which differentiates the content. The content of nationality, therefore, does not merely reflect a contextual potentiality of identity and identification. At the same time, the content is also bound by composition not only disposing events of inclusion/exclusion but also determining canons of participation to the routines of national enunciation.

Affirmative universalism is based on the normative axiom of subjective participation to "nation-building–or at least nation-shaping–politics" (Norman, 2005, 93). Nationality, hence, denotes a cohesive dispositif of participation to transductive effectuation of the political. Affirmative universalism effectuates nationality as a "daily plebiscite, just as an individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life" (Renan, 1996, 53). Having been effectuated as foundational principle, affirmative universalism denotes not merely the civic cohesion as the *demos*. Affirmative universalism of a particular *idem*, also embraces a quasi-essentialist quest for the spatiotemporal legitimacy of national affiliation in terms of the immanence of the *ethnos*.

Affirmative universality discloses the urgent necessity of correlating questions concerning fairness and identity with nationality (Norman, 2006; Moore, 1999). Spasmal normativity, herein, functions as an assemblage of particularity and universality. Drawing upon a particular occasion of justice and fairness, affirmative universalism underpins procedural and instrumental augmentation of the foundational principle of identity. This posterior vein of normative orientation implies a categorical locus of universality. Having been related with *normativization* of authenticity, therefore, affirmative universalism effectuates reciprocal tandem of recognition as consensual dispositif of spasmal normativity.

Recognition endorses foundational assertion of universalism. However, normative mandate of this affirmative action camouflages the ruling efficacy of authenticity and particularity. Affirmative universalism might then be regarded as a spasmal camouflage of immanence by transcendental reduction. The major political corpus of this reduction is established on the principle of identity and as *politics of potentiality*. Spasmal character of the appeal to affirmative universalism unveils the modernist locus of *politics of truth*, which brings forth the implicit efficacy of a molar solipsism.

A Molar Paradox: Solipsism(s) of Identity

Contemporary debates on the possibility of generating a universal meaning of nationality replicate one of the most central issues of classical nationalism studies: the *molarsolipsism* of nationhood. In its solipsistic contexture, "the nation, each nation, is its own *raison d'être*" (Smith, 1990, 1). Solipsism of nationality also denotes molar and molecular correspondences of cultural and political *raison d'etre* (Gellner; 1964, 1983).

Nationality is mostly interpreted through molar dispositions of cohesion. Accordingly, as regard to spasmal normativity, i.e. the question of fairness does not merely imply a critical continuum of national singularity. At the same time, it has also been related with the effectuation of amajoritarian dispositif. Ontological spasms of normativity, here, could be read through the question of *the core nation*, which implies the solipsistic resonance of the majority rule.

National enunciation of the core nation designates a central solipsistic corpus of nationality. For Rogers Brubaker, "the core nation is understood as the legitimate 'owner' of the state, which is conceived as the state *of* and *for* the core nation" (Brubaker, 1998, 237). This molar disposition unveils the question of power, which is legitimized through the universal nexus of an ethico-political principle exposed via the modern tandem of reciprocal recognition.

Solipsism of identity connotes the political vein of the metaphysics of presence. Identity, as a principle of thought, reflects corpus of stability, which inaugurates the ontological hegemony of *idem*. Politics of identity effectuates a double bind of the political. Moreover, the solipsism of identity denotes the normative affirmation of sameness. Spasmal normativity of nationality, at this point, intermingles two notions of the political: the content of truth and the composition of power. The principle of identity, by consolidating the solipsistic syntax of the problem of the core nation, has become to refer a central marker of this double bind.

The reciprocal tandem of the self and the other unveils the ontological milieu of the solipsistic design of nationality. Drawing upon molar voids of collective identity, state or citizenship, solipsism allagmatically operates an interpenetrative function of reciprocity and recognition, which cannot be absolutely departed from individuation, difference and alterity. Molar solipsism of nationality, in this regard, is not totally indifferent to molecular conditions of immanence and particularity.

Normativity oriented emphasis on the solipsistic nature of nationality reflects a universal perspectivism on the relation between identity and cohesion. Normative theories of nationality combine two questions on this solipsistic orientation. First, they reveal the ethico-political question of the core nation. Second, they propose an alternative molar counter-proposition as a remedy overcoming molar indifference to diversity. In this second aspect, normative perspectives stipulate the *problematic* of power without providing an alternative to either metaphysics of presence or its metaphysical violence. The principle of identity is substituted with a counter dispositif of identification.

While designating the *nomos* as the leitmotif of maintaining diversity, affirmative universalism disregards irreducible undecidability of individuation. Following Simondon; however, we can argue that "individuation is never concluded, that the pre-individual is never fully translated into singularity…the subject consists of the permanent interweaving of pre-individual elements and individuated characteristics: moreover, the subject is this interweaving" (Virno, 2007, 78). By omitting irreducible allagma of difference and individuation, most normative perspectives fail to criticize molar markers of singularity which have reflected metaphysical dispositions of maintaining singularity.

Affirmative universalist accounts of the spasmal condition are not able to escape from the very idea of their own criticism directed against universalist perspectivism of moral monism. Hence, these propositions merely provide a counter-molar substitute. Respectively, solipsism of identity reveals the metaphysical paradox of advocating a principle of identification as a molar potentiality of generating diversity from recognition. Hence, through the corpus of the molar paradox of solipsism(s) of identity; i.e., a normative defense of the idea of impartiality coincides with its multicultural critique at the same line of sameness when they both draw upon identity as a hylomorphic component of subjective *self-fulfillment*.

The molar paradox of affirmative universalism is a consequence of the substantial tendency they posit on identity. Affirmative universalist accounts of nationality, in this regard, provide *figurative* responses to the majority rule. The *figure* of this response, however, is ontologically conjectured by an equivalent *molar sublime*: hylomorphism of *idem*as molar dispositif of *self-fulfillment*. Affirmative universalist models of nationality, hence, generally aim at revoking hyperepokhal conditions of spasmal normativity by proposing an alternative nexus of politics of potentiality. The core principle of this political potentiality, on the other hand, is

based on recognition.

Within the reciprocal tandem of recognition, the question of fairness has generally been reduced to the question of how the state should respond to the demands of diverse entities. One of the most striking questions of affirmative perspectives has been formulated around the question of impartiality (Nagel, 1991; McMahan, 1997; Weinstock, 1999). State neutrality denotes a central marker of classical liberalism. However, its normative context is also associated with a more comprehensive framework embracing the *republican idea of the civic public*. The idea of impartiality might, accordingly, be seen as an ethico-political *point de caption*. Along with national sovereignty and legitimacy, the idea of impartiality reflects a functional dispositif of veiling particular signs of the majority rule.

The idea of impartiality is a figurative molar modality of metaphysics of presence. In its ethico-political transcendentalism and hypothetical universality it denotes "cultural artifacts of a particular kind" (Anderson, 1991, 4). Idea of impartiality thus implies a "universal identity that appears as discriminatory, a form of particularism disguising itself as a universal principle" (Ricoeur, 2005, 215). Even in its hypothetical syntax, impartiality reflects molar dispositions of moral monism within the *nous* of belonging together (Miscevic, 1999, 116). So, the idea of impartiality was rightly criticized as having been served to a general indifference and blindness to the problems of diversity (Kymlicka, 2000, 186).Diverse normative readings of nationality in contemporary political theory have criticized this molar machine of immanent abstraction and transcendental reduction, which has politically been functioning through the effectuation of the ontological principle of recognition qua the ideal of impartiality.

Hegelian vein of *Anerkennung* is now augmented as a substitute of the ideal of impartiality. Recognition, at this point, primarily indicates a form of abstraction. Affirmative universalist critique of impartiality, cannot refrain from the ethico-political efficacy of the principle of thought. This detention denotes the implicit role of consensualism and conformism derived from the normative predisposition of a molar truth as the hylomorphic telos of a comprehensive politics of potentiality. Affirmative accounts thus provide only the *substitute* of cohesion. They basically offer an alternative modality of the *idem*, which might essentially be read through the nexus of counter metaphysics of presence. Unlike the universal perspectivism posited on the application of impartiality via civic transcendence, epitome of this *affirmative substitute* normatively draws upon the hypothetical assumption on the immanent stabilization, transcendental exactitude and hylomorphic fullness of

identity.

The solipsistic paradox of identity denotes a twofold structure. It first denotes foundational principle of cohesion. Herein, the political is designated through the vein of an agonistic principle of identity. It thus hypothetically imposes transcending all sorts of particularisms. This implies the molar potentiality of hylomorphic exactitude through which the subject is going to actualize her own telos. Second, subjective corpus of belonging-together is normatively ascribed by an affirmative appeal for categorical identification.

Regarding modern democracy, this double bind of the solipsistic paradox of belonging-together might be read through the vital question of whether it is possible to augment a new context of the political combining the necessity of weakening markers of certainty with the irreducible allagmatics of difference. This point entails metastatic efficacy of an "empty space" (Lefort, 1986, 303).However, solipsistic paradox of identity keeps implying not only the procedural consequentialism of inter subjectivity (Arneson, 2003, 382), but also the civic milieu of "inherited particularism" (Hastings, 2006, 32).

De/Territoriality: Ontopology of Nationality

De/territoriality unveils a condition of normativity flux at the center of which "the domestic analogy is fixed within precise ontological coordinates" (Walker, 1995, 133). The spatiotemporal ontology of nationality, in its modern epochality, might essentially be read as a reflection of a dialectic double bind upon which an order of cohesion was stabilized. The corpus of such stability might be read as the political perspectivism of "an absolute homogeneous space" (Walker, 1995, 133) and "national temporality of the 'meanwhile', a form of homogenous empty time" (Bhabha, 2007, 226). This double bind mounts spiral interconnectedness of molecular and molar dispositions of nationality.

The spiral bound of molar and molecular dispositions of nationality is effectuated by an allagmatic system of axiomatic operations. The allagma of nationality, in this regard, might be defined through the helix bound of *ontology* and *topoi*. The spiral prerequisite of nationality initiates an *ontopology*. Jacques Derrida (1994) defines ontopology as "an axiomatics linking indissociably the ontological value of present-being [*on*] to its situation, to the stable and presentable determination of a locality, the topos of territory, native soil, city, body in general" (103).

Ontopology of nationality indicates a significant question of spasmal normativity. On the one hand, it denotes an affirmative context of universality through which fairness has become an ethicopolitical problematic. Nevertheless, this ontopology also connotes the camouflage of a particular essence. In its both universal and particular orientations, as an ontopological question, nationality could not be separated from the *problematic* of the political *technē*.

According to Stuart Elden (2013), "territory should be understood as a political technology, or perhaps better as a bundle of political technologies" (322). In other words, "territory comprises techniques for measuring land and controlling terrain" (Elden, 2013, 323). Instead of taking space and temporality as separate notions of reality, an ontological assemblage of spatiotemporality might also be discussed. At this point, according to Levi Bryant (2014), "there is no space that does not have its temporal dimension and implications, nor is there any time that does not have its spatial dimension and implications. Space and time are necessarily and *ontologically* bound up with one another like two sides of a coin or, better yet, a Möbius strip" (141). This allagmatic inter-relationality of *ontochronism* and *ontopology* might be read through the allagmatic impasse of the *in*-between implying de/territoriality and becoming.

De/territoriality, drawing upon Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (2005), might be defined as a spatiotemporal corpus of becoming. The central tenant of de/territoriality is the impossibility of not only exactitude but also reciprocity. De/territoriality of nationality might hence be regarded as a critical corpus of reading individuation and belonging-together through the irreducible context of their becoming.

On the other hand, while drawing upon the normative grounds of the ontology of being, rather than becoming, the solipsistic link between self-determination and onto-territoriality plays a crucial role. Spatiotemporality, in this regard, unveils a normative logic of exactitude and fulfillment regarding the hylomorphic completion of a potentiality. In this sense, i.e. "when political and cultural boundaries do not coincide, there can be conflicts about partiality" (Hurka, 1997, 154). This normative framework binds territorialization of space with hylomorphic potentiality of the national entity. The normative dispositif of executing this ontopological and hylomorphic potentiality is self-determination.

Immanent signification of de/territoriality implies normative potentiality of self-determination (Moore, 1998, 150; Tamir, 1993, 121). Self-determination, here,

is adopted as norm and as normality. It provides not only the ontological adjustment of milieus of "noninterference", but also denotes a central element of universal perspectivism implying the continuum of equal rights and equal respect (Young, 2004, 187-188).

On the other hand, once nationality is considered as an allagmatic *problematic* of difference and individuation, then, de-re/territorialization might be considered as nomadological aspects of becoming. As for hyperepokhal conditions of spasmal normativity, on the other hand, the question of becoming has not yet referring to an eliminated representational system, nor underpinning a central marker of a post-metaphysical epoch. But, de/territorialization as a matter of becoming and dis/individuation might still be considered as an emerging assemblage of heterogeneous affiliations. Although an early marker of this hyperepokhal setting might be discussed as post-representational politics, the epochal orientation on the determination of *the people* and *the territory* has remained to function as a key dispositif of nationality.

Self-determination as classical representational setting connotes a critical dispositif of counter-national movements concerned with the struggle against an existing state (Keating, 1996). It does, hence, provide a normative nexus for onto-territoriality among "stateless nations" (Keating, 1997), or in other words, among "nations without states" (Guibernau, 1999a), or among "national minorities" (Bauböck, 2006; Kymlicka, 2005a, 2005b; Musgrave, 1997). Normative grounds of defining territorial modalities of national self-determination have reflected not only the particularity of a national homeland, but also the universality of its territorial autonomy (Moore, 2001a, 191).

The most critical question of national spatiotemporality today might be read through the debates on secession, which has long been related with the normative context of legal and ethico-political questions on self-determination, and self-rule (Buchanan; 1991, 1997). Secession refers to a specific form of "boundary-alteration" (Moore, 2001a, 139). The normativity basis of secession might be oriented on nominal claims of "cultural distinctiveness" or, the existence of alternate "cultural markers of subjective meaning" (Lecours, 2000, 164).

Secession denotes an ontological marker of normative de/territorialization and binds two sources of the political together: particularity and universality. Secession also reassembles politics of truth and politics of power around the problematic of collective de/territorialization.The demands for secession have

become a world-phenomenon regardless of the state-systems or the extent of democratic institutional arrangements (Kymlicka, 2001, 91-92).Principled partition and secession have become to refer major normative and representational resolutions for ethnic or national conflicts in diverse territories and societies (Buchanan, 2004; McGarry & O'Leary, 1996; Bauböck, 2000).

Regarding the contested meaning of the nation and its ontopology, nature of authenticity still denotes a critical marker (Tamir, 1993, 51). Nominalism of the particular is closely related with the universalization of the consent of the national entity. Ontopology of nationality, at this point, entails a composite amalgamation of normative questions for both majority and immigrant groups, and national minorities (Miller, 1998, 65-66). Representational nexus of de/territoriality still imposes the double task of designating truth and power.

Regarding the contested structure of the nation-space, de/territorialization has still been considered as a key asset of providing normative answers to the power/truth based questions of representation. While pursuing normative answers in representational grounds, affirmative universalism oriented readings aim at overcoming the repressive and unitary contexts of diversity-blind moral monism. They avoid criticizing consensual and reciprocal vortex of identity and recognition. These perspectives, thus, share the same consequentialist position with politics of universalism. Normative perspectives drawing upon affirmative universalism, accordingly, lack in proposing a critique or alternative to politics of truth and to its long-lasting remains of metaphysical violence.

Chiasmic Nationality: A Mode of Plasticity

Spasmal normativity might be defined as a corpus of epistemic responses to the par caesural conditions of hyperepokhal transformations. As regard to the question of nationality, spasmal normativity reflects a double bind. On the one side of the *pharmakon*, an interpenetrative possibility of generating a universal principle of belonging is being discussed. This framework implies affirmative universalism. The very idea of affirmative universalism regarding the question of nationality, accordingly, has been related with the normative context revising dysfunctional wheels of the *truth machine*. Rehabilitation of the regime of recognition by considering the questions of diversity and fairness has been of critical importance for affirmative universalism.

The spasmal condition, herein, is sketched along with the hyperbolic

preoccupation of nationality. It hence denotes the locus of recognition. For, nationhood is oriented on the corpus of reciprocal recognition, the task of nationality has always argued as a necessity of reciprocity between immanence and transcendence. Normative attempts of correlating the immanent and transcendent themes of nationality are derived from a spasmal reading of Hegelian dialectics. Nationality, herein, is possessed by interpenetrative void of particularity and universality qua civic cohesion. It is defined through the corpus of recognition that denotes both a desirable act, and a spasmal activity.

The corpus of normativity, on the other hand, has been transposing into a new continuum of irreducible critique. Onto-spasms generated by the *in*-between conditions of hyperepokhality have stimulated this transposition. Spasmal normativity, therefore, also reveals a conditional discrepancy of both modernity and post modernity, and denotes a khōra of interpretation. On the one hand, this spasmal condition provides the potentiality of understanding. On the other hand, it underpins the ephemeral condition of *in*-betweenness as actuality.

The other part of the spasmal *pharmakon*, on the other hand, implies the impossibility of generating regimes of ontological truths, not only as regard to the hypertechnological and hyperindustrial transformation of spatiotemporality, but also in terms of the decadence of an existential system of *care*. This second aspect of the *pharmakon* posits the centrality of becoming in place of being, and implies allagmatic flux of individuation and difference, instead of the metaphysical violence of both universal truths and reciprocal consensualism of the molar regimes of identity and recognition. This second reading of spasmal normativity focuses on alternative programmatologies as a proposition for a *hyperepokhal critique*, which cannot be reduced to any of the *figurative* voids of belonging-*together* signified by particularity and universality, or immanence and transcendence. In its normative political theory corpus this spasmal reading reflects an attempt for *Verwindung*, which denotes a nucleus of overcoming metaphysics of presence.

Spasmal normativity does not only reveal rhizomatic possibilities of becoming as in Deleuze and Guattari (2005) or as a hermeneutic critique as *Verwindung* in Martin Heidegger (2003) and Gianni Vattimo (1987, 2012). Spasmal normativity also signifies the deconstructive "crisis of versus" through which "marks can no longer be summed up or 'decided' according to the two of binary oppositions nor sublated into the three of speculative dialectics" (Derrida, 1981, 25). In effect, spasmal normativity as a plastic component of chiasmic nationality denotes neither a total *crisis* nor an absolute recurrence. Rather, it reveals rhizomatic

de-re/territorialization of becoming, and unveils the *in*-between condition of aporetic undecidability.

Rather than referring to a paralysis, hyperepokhal condition of spasmal normativity implies toxic spasms caused by the realization of the impossibility of affirming any original position or metaphysical sublime anymore. This impossibility, however, provides a new alternative regarding the relation between trace, change and form. Chiasmic plasticity of nationality, accordingly, first refers to the lack of any original position. Plasticity, herein, underpins a critical element of deconstruction.

On the other hand, plasticity denotes an *in*-between condition of trace and form. Catherine Malabou (2010), i.e. locates plasticity between "excess of reification" and "excess of fluidification" (81).Malabou (2009) defines plasticity as "being at once capable of receiving and of giving form" (8). Chiasmic nationality, as an allagmatic form and trace of the *in*-between, might be read as a plastic mode of belonging. Chiasmic nationality hence implies an irreducible notion of individuation.

Chiasmic nationality provides a rhizomatic potentiality regarding the question of the *form*, which cannot be stabilized or hylomorphically fulfilled. Rather than referring to molar stabilization of a foundational principle of thought, as we have seen in principle of identity, chiasmic nationality unveils a potentiality of irreducibility. As regard to the *problematic* of *trace*, chiasmic nationality might thus be regarded as a mode of "weakening" (Vattimo, 2012).Chiasmic nationality as a mode of weakening might also be read in line with the "general plasticity of Assemblages" (Guattari, 2013, 20).

Chiasmic nationality might be read through the vein of the plasticity of belonging-together; or as a critical and hermeneutic continuum unconcealing ontology of actuality, which cannot be reduced to any teleological premise. The critical continuum of reading nationality as a chiasmic mode of irreducibility imposes necessary distancing from affirmative universalism, unambiguously as regard to the *problematic* of recognition.

Hegelian *Anerkennung* refers the central tenant of politics of recognition, which has been influential on the epochal connection between modernity and nationality (Taylor; 1994, 1997). Affirmative universalism keeps following this connection as a cure for the hyperepokhal conditions of spasmal normativity.

Through the glances of affirmative universalism, generating a revised notion of *principle of identity* or *diversity friendly politics of thought* might be developed through the context of recognition. Affirmative universalism in normative political theory thus embraces perspectives that have been critical against principles, ideals or procedures of monistic universalisms, as in the example of the critique of impartiality. However, while insisting on the centrality of diversity, affirmative universalism paradoxically proposes counter-molar argumentations limited to identity. The pretended forms of alternative politics on diversity qua reciprocity of recognition, which have been proposed by affirmative universalism, therefore, primarily reflect a molar orientation on identity vis-à-vis sameness (*idem*).

Affirmative universalism denotes a limited and identity oriented reading of Hegelian recognition. As regard to the question of nationality, by neglecting the critical *problematic* of *ontological difference*, affirmative universalism lacks in connecting individuation with plastic and allagmatic resonances of *difference* and *becoming*. This point also defines affirmative universalism's indifference to the critique of metaphysics of presence.

The key *problematic* of Hegelian philosophy of recognition, on the other hand, might be defined through its dialectic plasticity (Malabou, 2010). Hegel's (1977) plasticity, herein, denotes the dialectic "act of becoming". In Hegel's (1983) words, "Being-recognized (*Anerkanntseyn*) is immediate actuality" (120).

Plasticity of Hegelian dialectic might be read as an assemblage of experiences through which an irreducible and undecidable *difference* prospers. This point might also be read as a matter of enunciation. In Hegel's words, "a plastic discourse requires a plasticity of sense also in hearing and understanding" (Hegel, 2010, 30).*Chiasmic nationality*, by following this line of plastic enunciation; therefore, might be read as an irreducible mode of belonging, which is unconcealed via allagmatic and rhizomatic dispositions of difference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Arneson, R. J. (2003). "Consequentialism vs. Special-ties Partiality". *The Monist*, 86 (3), 382-401.

Bauböck, R. (2000). "Why Stay Together? A Pluralist Approach to Secession and Federation". In W. Kymlicka & W. Norman (Eds.), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies* (pp. 366-94). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bauböck, R. (2006). "Autonomy, Power-sharing and Common Citizenship: Principles for Accommodating National Minorities in Europe". In J. McGarry & M. Keating (Eds.), *European Integration and the Nationalities Question* (pp. 85-102). London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (2007). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brubaker, R. (1998). "Myths and Misconceptions in the Study of Nationalism". In M. Moore (Ed.), *National Self-determination and Secession* (pp. 233-265). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryant, L. R. (2014). *Onto-Cartography: An ontology of Machines and Media*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Buchanan, A. (1991). *Secession: The Morality of Political Divorce from Fort Sumter to Lithuania and Quebec*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Buchanan, A. (1997). "Self-determination, Secession and the Rule of Law". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 301-323). New York: Oxford University Press.

Buchanan, A. (2004). *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-determination: Moral Foundations for International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calhoun, C. (2005). "Constitutional Patriotism and the Public Sphere: Interests, Identity, and Solidarity in the Integration of Europe". *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 18 (3/4), 257-280.

Calhoun, C. (2006). "Nationalism Matters". In D. H. Doyle & M. A. Pamplona (Eds.), *Nationalism in the New World* (pp. 16-40). Georgia: The University of Georgia Press.

Canovan, M. (1998). *Nationhood and Political Theory*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2005). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Derrida, J. (1981).*Dissemination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. & Stiegler, B. (2002). *Echographies of Television: Filmed Interviews*. Cambridge: Polity.

Elden, S. (2013). *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gellner, E. (1964). *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Guattari, F. (2013). *Schizoanalytic Cartographies*. London: Bloomsbury.

Guibernau, M. (1999a). *Nations without States: Political Communities in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harvey, D. (1992). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hastings, A. (2006). *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1983). *Hegel and the Human Spirit: A Translation of the Jena Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit (1805-1806) with Commentar*y. Leo Rauch (Ed.). Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (2010).*The Science of Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heidegger, M. (2003). "Overcoming Metaphysics". In *The End of Philosophy*, (pp. 84-110). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hetherington, K. (1997). *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. London: Routledge.

Hurka, T. (1997). "The Justification of National Partiality". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 139-157). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Keating, M. (1996). *Nations against the State: The New Politics of Nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland*. London: Macmillan.

Keating, M. (1997). "Stateless Nation-building: Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland in the Changing State System". *Nations and Nationalism*, 3 (4), 689–717.

Kymlicka, W. (1991). *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1997) "The Sources of Nationalism: Commentary on Taylor". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 56-65). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2000). "Nation-building and Minority Rights: Comparing West and East". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 26 (2), 183-212.

Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2005a). "Federalism and Secession". In R. Máiz & F. Requejo (Eds.), *Democracy, Nationalism and Multiculturalism* (pp. 108-126). London: Frank Cass.

Kymlicka, W. (2005b). "Renner and the Accommodation of Sub-state Nationalisms". In E. Nimni (Ed.), *National Cultural Autonomy and Its Contemporary Critics* (pp. 137-149). London: Routledge.

Lecours, A. (2000). "Ethnic and Civic Nationalism: Towards a New Dimension". *Space and Polity*, 4 (2), 153-165.

Lefort, C. (1986). *The Political Forms of Modern Society: Bureaucracy, Democracy, Totalitarianism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Malabou, C. (2009). *The Future of Hegel: Plasticity, Temporality and Dialectic*. London: Routledge.

Malabou, C. (2010). *Plasticity at the Dusk of Writing: Dialectic, Destruction, Deconstruction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

May, S., Modood, T. & Squires, J. (2004). "Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Minority Rights: Charting the Disciplinary Debates". In S. May, T. Modood & J. Squires (Eds.), *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Minority Rights* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGarry, J. & O'Leary, B. (1996). "Eliminating and Managing Ethnic Differences". In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 333-341). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McMahan, J. (1997). "The Limits of National Partiality". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 107-138). New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. (1993). "In Defence of Nationality". *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 10 (1), 3-16.

Miller, D. (1998). "Secession and the Principle of Nationality". In M. Moore (Ed.), *National Self-determination and Secession* (pp. 62-78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. (2000). *Citizenship and National Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Miscevic, N. (1999). "Close Strangers: Nationalism, Proximity and Cosmopolitanism". *Studies in East European Thought*, 51, 109–125.

Moore, M. (1998). "The Territorial Dimension of Self-determination". In M. Moore (Ed.), *National Self-determination and Secession* (pp. 134-157). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moore, M. (1999). "Nationalist Arguments, Ambivalent Conclusions". *The Monist*, 82 (3), 469-490.

Moore, M. (2001a). *The Ethics of Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, M. (2001b). "Normative Justifications for Liberal Nationalism: Justice, Democracy and National Identity". *Nations and Nationalism*, 7 (1), 1-20.

Musgrave, T. D. (1997). *Self-determination and National Minorities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nagel, T. (1991). *Equality and Partiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nielsen, K. (1998). "Liberal Nationalism and Secession". In M. Moore (Ed.), *National Self-determination and Secession* (pp. 103-133). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norman, W. (1999). "Theorizing Nationalism (normatively): The First Steps". In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing Nationalism* (pp. 51-65). New York: State University of New York Press.

Norman, W. (2005). "From Nation-building to National Engineering: The Ethics of Shaping Identities". In R. Máiz & F. Requejo (Eds.), *Democracy, Nationalism and Multiculturalism* (pp. 79-95). London: Frank Cass.

Norman, W. (2006). *Negotiating Nationalism: Nation-building, Federalism, and Secession in the Multinational State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Renan, E. (1996). "What is a Nation?". In G. Elley & R. G. Suny (Eds.), *Becoming National: A Reader* (pp. 42-55). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2005). *The Course of Recognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ripstein, A. (1997). "Context, Continuity, and Fairness". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 209-226). New York: Oxford University Press.

Simondon, G. (1995). "The Genesis of the Individual". In J. Crary and S. Kwinter (Eds.), *Incorporations* (pp. 297-319). New York: Zone.

Sloterdijk, P. (2013). "In the Auto-operatively Curved Space: New Human Beings between Anesthesia and Biopolitics". In *You Must Change Your Life* (pp. 369-403). Cambridge: Polity.

Smith, A. D. (1990). "The Supersession of Nationalism?". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 31 (1-2), 1-31.

Stiegler, B. (2014). *Symbolic Misery–Vol. 1: The Hyperindustrial Epoch*. Cambridge: Polity.

Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, C. (1994). "The Politics of Recognition". In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition/Charles Taylor...(et al.)* (pp. 25-73). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, C. (1997). "Nationalism and Modernity". In R. McKim & J. McMahan (Eds.), *The Morality of Nationalism* (pp. 31-55). New York: Oxford University Press.

Vattimo G (1987). "*Verwindung*: Nihilism and the Postmodern in Philosophy". *SubStance*, 16 (2), 7-17.

Vattimo G. (2012). "Dialectics, Difference, Weak Thought". In G. Vattimo G. & A. Rovatti (Eds.). *Weak Thought* (pp. 39-52). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Virno, P. (2007). *A Grammer of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Walker, R. B. J. (1995). *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinstock, D. (1999). "National Partiality: Confronting the Intuitions". *The Monist*, 82 (3), 516- 541.

Wood, D. (2007). "Topologies of Transcendence". In J. D. Caputo and M. J. Scanlon (Eds.), *Transcendence and Beyond: A Postmodern Inquiry* (pp. 169-187). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Young, I. M. (2004). "Two Concepts of Self-determination". In S. May, T. Modood & J. Squires (Eds.), *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Minority Rights* (pp. 176-195). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.