RETURNING TO REVOLUTION: DELEUZE, GUATTARI, AND ZAPATISMO

by

THOMAS ANDREW NAIL

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Philosophy
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

March 2011

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Thomas Andrew Nail

Title: Returning to Revolution: Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Philosophy by:

John Lysaker	Co-Chairperson
Ted Toadvine	Co-Chairperson
Colin Koopman	Member
Forest Pyle	Outside Member

and

Richard Linton	Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded March 2011

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Thomas Andrew Nail

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Philosophy

March 2011

Title: Returning to Revolution: Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo

Approved: _____
Dr. Ted Toadvine, Co-Chair

Approved: _____
Dr. John Lysaker, Co-Chair

We are witnessing today the beginning of a return to and renewal of the theory and practice of political revolution. This return to revolution, however, takes none of the traditional forms: the capture of the state, the political representation of the party, the centrality of the proletariat, or the leadership of the vanguard. Rather, given the failure of such tactics over the last century, coupled with the socio-economic changes brought by neoliberalism in the 1980s, revolutionary strategy has developed in a more heterogenous and non-representational direction. The aim of this dissertation is to map an outline of this new direction by drawing on the theory and practice of two of its main inspirations: French political philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari and, what the New York Times has called "the first post-modern revolution," the 1994 Zapatista Uprising in Chiapas, Mexico. The aim of this dissertation is thus threefold. First, I provide a philosophical clarification and outline of a revolutionary strategy that both describes and advances the process of constructing real alternatives to state-capitalism. Second, I focus on three influential and emblematic figures of revolutionary history, mutually disclosive of one another, as well as this

larger revolutionary return: Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas. Third, and more specifically, I propose four novel theoretical practices that characterize this return to revolution: (1) a multi-centered diagnostic of political power; (2) a prefigurative theory of political transformation; (3) a participatory theory of the body politic; and (4) a theory of political belonging based on mutual global solidarity.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Thomas Andrew Nail

PLACE OF BIRTH: Portland, Oregon

DATE OF BIRTH: December 12, 1979

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
University of North Texas, Denton

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, 2011, University of Oregon
Master of Arts, Philosophy, 2007, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy, 2001, University of North Texas

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

European Philosophy
Political Philosophy
Environmental Philosophy

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Morse Center for Law and Politics Dissertation Fellow, University of Oregon, 2010–2011

Visiting Scholar, University of Toronto, 2009–2010

Assistant Editor of the Journal, *Environmental Philosophy*, University of Oregon, 2008–2009

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Composition, University of Oregon, 2007–2008

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Philosophy, University of Oregon, 2003–2007; 2009; 2010

Spanish Tutor, University of Oregon, 2002

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Fulbright Eco-Leadership Program Award, 2011

George Rebec Prize, University of Oregon, for "Political Affinity and the Singular-Universal: From Citizenship to the Solidarity City" (best essay written by a graduate student), 2010

Leon Culbertson Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2010-2011

Wayne Morse Center for Law and Politics Dissertation Fellowship, University of Oregon (university-wide competition for stipend and tuition waiver), 2010-2011

Fulbright Professional Development Program Award (for travel and presentation of research on the Solidarity City project), 2009

U.S. Fulbright Research Scholarship: "From Citizenship to the Solidarity City" (Invited by Université de Montréal, McMaster University, University of Guelph, and Concordia University), 2009-2010

Visiting Scholar invitation from the University of Toronto, CA, 2009-2010

Laurel Scholarship, University of Oregon (did not accept because of Fulbright), 2009-2010

North American Students of Cooperation Institute Scholarship Award, 2008

Clara Nasholm Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2008-2009

University of Oregon Graduate Teaching Fellowship, English, 2007-2008

Certificate of Completion Postgraduate course on Gilles Deleuze, University of Cardiff, Wales, 2007

University of Oregon Graduate Research Award for French Language and Philosophical Study in Paris, France, 2006

University of Oregon Philosophy Travel Grant, 2006

University of Oregon Philosophy Travel Grant, 2004

University of Oregon Graduate Teaching Fellowship, Philosophy, 2003-2006, 2008-2010

Study Abroad Scholarship for language study in Germany, University of North Texas, 2001

Student Ambassador of the Department of Philosophy, University of North Texas, 2001

Awarded the Oscar Aries Peace Scholarship by the Department of Political Science and Peace Studies, University of North Texas, 2001

Awarded the Fifth Annual John Creuzot Scholarship by the Department of Philosophy and Religion Studies, University of North Texas, 2001

Study Abroad Scholarship for language study in Mexico, University of North Texas, 2000

PUBLICATIONS:

Nail, Thomas, trans. 2011. Quentin Meillassoux, "Histoire et événement chez Alain Badiou" *Parrhesia* (11): 24–34.

Nail, Thomas. 2010. "Constructivism and the Future Anterior of Radical Politics," *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* (1): 73–94.

Nail, Thomas. 2010. "A Post-Neoliberal Ecopolitics?: Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo," *Philosophy Today* (54) 2: 179–90.

Nail, Thomas. 2010. "Building a Sanctuary City: No One is Illegal–Toronto on Non-Status Migrant Justice Organizing," *Upping the Anti: A Journal of Theory and Action no. 11*: 149–62.

Nail, Thomas. 2009. Review of *Real Utopia: Participatory Society for the 21st Century,* edited by Chris Spannos. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 20 (4): 112–114.

Nail, Thomas. 2008. "Expression, Immanence, and Constructivism: 'Spinozism' and Deleuze and Guattari," *Deleuze Studies* (2) 2: 201–19.

Nail, Thomas. 2006. Review of *Deleuze and Environmental Damage: Violence of the Text,* by Mark Halsey. *Environmental Philosophy* 3 (2): 64–66.

Nail, Thomas. 2003. "Regicide: Genealogy and Juridical Subjectivity," *Unterschrift* (2): 34–51.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Professors Toadvine, Lysaker, and Koopman for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. This work was supported in part by a U.S. Fulbright Scholarship, and a Wayne Morse Center for Law and Politics Dissertation Fellowship.

For all those who believe that another world is possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> We have to try and think a little about the meaning of revolution. This term is now so broken and worn out, and has been dragged through so many places, that its necessary to go back to a basic, albeit elementary, definition. A revolution is something of the nature of a process, a change that makes it impossible to go back to the same point. . . . a repetition that changes something, a repetition that brings about the irreversible. A process that produces history, taking us away from a repetition of the same attitudes and the same significances. Therefore, by definition, a revolution cannot be programmed, because what is programmed is always the *deja-la*. Revolutions, like history, always bring surprises. By nature they are always unpredictable. That doesn't prevent one from working for revolution, as long as one understands "working for revolution" as working for the unpredictable.
>
> Félix Guattari (2008, 258)

Introduction

We are witnessing today the beginning of a return and renewal of revolution. This return, however, takes none of the traditional forms: the capture of the state, the political representation of the party, the centrality of the proletariat, or the leadership of the vanguard. Rather, given the failure of such tactics over the last century, coupled with the socio-economic changes brought by neoliberalism in the 1980s, revolutionary strategy has developed in more heterogenous and non-representational directions. The aim of this dissertation is to map an outline of these new directions by drawing on the theory and practice of two of its main inspirations: French political philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari and what many have called "the first post-modern revolution," the 1994 Zapatista Uprising in Chiapas, Mexico (Burbach 1994; 1996; Carrigan 1995; Golden 1994; 2001).

There are two important reasons for undertaking a philosophical interrogation of this admittedly young revolutionary direction. First, political life does not have the leisure to wait until after the revolution for the hindsight of philosophical inquiry. If philosophy waited until a new political form of revolution had already come and gone, it would be useless in the formation of the revolutionary process itself. Thus, it is not in spite of, but

rather precisely because of the fact that we are in the middle of this return to revolution that a philosophical interrogation and clarification of its practical meaning is needed. Second, since the turn of the century we have heard consistently from the Left (the Anti-globalization movement and the World Social Forum in particular) that "another world is possible." But what we have not heard is, more positively, what this alternative world to neoliberal capitalism is. Beyond the political philosophy of possibility, what is needed is a more constructive theory and practice of this "other world." I believe we can locate the beginnings of this world in the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas.

The aim of this dissertation is thus threefold: First, to provide a philosophical clarification and outline of a revolutionary strategy that both describes and advances the process of constructing real alternatives to state-capitalism. Second, to do so by focusing on three influential and emblematic figures of its history, mutually disclosive of one another as well as this larger revolutionary return: Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas. Third, and more specifically, this dissertation proposes four novel theoretical practices that characterize this return to revolution: (1) a multi-centered diagnostic of political power; (2) a prefigurative theory of political transformation; (3) a participatory theory of the body politic; and (4) a political theory of belonging based on mutual global solidarity.

Methodology

Deleuze and Guattari

Thus, with the aim of developing these four theoretical practices, I draw from Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy by extracting from them the concepts that are most relevant and thematically productive to the problematic at hand. Rather than a linear exegesis or intellectual history of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution, I adopt instead a problem oriented approach that focuses on four central questions of revolutionary

praxis taken up in each chapter: What is the relationship between history and revolution? What is revolutionary transformation? How is it possible to sustain and carry out the consequences of a revolutionary transformation? And how do revolutions connect up each other to produce a new form of world-wide solidarity? Deleuze and Guattari never wrote a book, or more than a couple of focused pages at a time, on the concept of political revolution.[1] In fact, the present dissertation is the first and only full length work to centrally thematize this concept in their *oeuvre*. Because their usage of the concept of revolution was topical and problematic, created to be put to use, so my own methodology will follow suit. Additionally, this methodology allows for the most productive and focused use of their work, as it deals with one concept per chapter and aims to connect it directly to the political practices of the Zapatistas.

Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy is not only conceptually advantageous to this effort, it is historically relevant as well. Deleuze and Guattari, unlike most of their philosophical contemporaries after the revolutionary events of May 1968, remained openly faithful to the concept of revolution throughout their work. In fact, it is in the aftermath of the failure of many of the political experiments that happened in the 60s around the world that Deleuze and Guattari wrote their largest work of political philosophy, *Capitalisme et schizophrénie,* volumes one and two (1972, 1980). They were witnessing then the end of what Alain Badiou has called "the last great emancipatory narrative: the revolutionary Party-State." (Badiou 2010a, 101; 2010b, 67). Accordingly, in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, revolution is consistently valorized and juxtaposed against State-Capitalism as well as State-Socialism and the Party/Union Bureaucracy heavily criticized in France and around the world in the 60s and 70s. During the increasingly conservative and reactionary years of the 70s and 80s,

[1] Although one might argue that their political philosophy in general expresses a theory of revolution. For example, Guattari's book, *Molecular revolution: psychiatry and politics (1984)* may be understood to be just this.

Deleuze and Guattari worked tirelessly, in their single largest work, toward a political philosophy that would no longer be subordinated to State, Party, or Vanguardism. If we want to look for some of the earliest philosophical origins of the contemporary revolutionary sequence, it is in these dark but fecund years (70s and 80s) that Deleuze and Guattari, perhaps more prolifically, and perhaps more influentially than any other major philosophers at the time, created political concepts most consonant with the networked horizontalism that characterizes today's revolutionary return.[2] It was also during these same years that another influential revolution was being prepared, not in France, but in the mountains of the Mexican Southeast.

Yes, Deleuze and Guattari never wrote a book on political revolution, but this does not mean that they did not write about revolution extensively and consistently throughout their political philosophy. If this dissertation has adopted the method of creating concepts through the assembly of heterogenous fragments from Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of revolution, it is not only out of methodological affinity, but out of a practical necessity of doing so as well. And if this dissertation has chosen to extract these concepts from Deleuze and Guattari rather than other political philosophers in this time period, it is because Deleuze and Guattari never gave up on their belief that a world-wide revolution could emerge from the smallest of political experiments without the representation of the State, Party, Vanguard, or proper class consciousness, as indeed it did with the Zapatistas.

Zapatismo

But if Deleuze and Guattari theorized this nascent revolutionary sequence so well, why the need to extract anything from the Zapatistas to create these four theoretical practices? Although not exactly the same, what I am calling the recent return to revolution

[2] Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical and political influence on Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, in particular, is well known.

can be loosely associated with the popular emergence of what the media (and not the activists themselves) have named The Anti-Globalization Movement (AGM). While the AGM and groups like Peoples Global Action (PGA) and the World Social Forum are a significant part of the present revolutionary sequence, the sequence itself is not reducible to the features of these groups, in part because these meta-groups are composed of thousands of sub-groups from around the world. In any case, the AGM did not start in Seattle in 1999. Most of the historical scholarship on the AGM dates it from 1994, that is, from the beginning of the Zapatista uprising (Notes from Nowhere 2003; Khasnabish 2008; Curran 2006; Engler 2007). Zapatismo and the *Intercontinental Encuentros* were the first and largest global anti-neoliberal gatherings of their kind and gave birth to several important groups like the PGA (Khasnabish 2008, 238; Olesen 2005). And although they are obviously not the only source of inspiration, it is well documented that the Zapatistas' declarations against all forms of domination, their strategic refusal of capturing state or party power, their creation of directly democratic consensus-based communes, and their vision of a mutual global solidarity network were all highly visible and have had a lasting impact on revolutionary theory and practice today (Khasnabish 2008). Thus, understanding Zapatismo is quite important to understanding the larger movement currently underway.[3]

But my argument that we are witnessing a new revolutionary sequence is not merely an empirical one, although many strong empirical arguments for the emergence of a new revolutionary sequence have been made (and in far more complete ways than I am capable of here).[4] I am thus truly indebted to those works, which are like the empirical companion to

[3] There are, however, a lot more influences on todays radical left organizing than the Zapatistas.

[4] The World Social Forum's *Charter of Principles* also supports several of the theoretical practices I propose in this dissertation (World Social Forum 2001).

this philosophical dissertation.[5] What I am arguing instead is that, in addition to this descriptive history of the past fifteen years of struggle, we can also define the emergence of this new revolutionary sequence by its creation of a set of novel and coherent philosophical concepts. But since locating these concepts in even the most active organizations of the last fifteen years is well beyond the scope of the present work, I want to focus on a deeper analysis of two of the earliest, most influential, and most prolific sites of this often cited "return to revolution": Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo.

Accordingly, I try to give equal qualitative importance to extracting my theoretical practices from the political writings and actions of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas (although I admittedly spend more quantitative time with Deleuze and Guattari in this dissertation). Politics, I hope to demonstrate, has its own thinking and does not need philosophy to think for it or represent its thought back to it (Lazarus 1996; Badiou 2005a; Foucault 1977). Rather, what the Zapatistas offer that other activists and philosophers do not is a particularly prolific and conceptually creative site at the beginning of this new and still unclear revolutionary sequence. Many have gone as far as to call them the first "post-communist," "post-modern" (Golden 1994), and "post-representational" revolution (Tormey 2006; Proyect 2003). This dissertation thus aims to contribute some novel philosophical clarifications, not for the Zapatistas themselves, but for others who wish to understand and continue the Zapatista struggle elsewhere. But as these practices appear only here and there in various writings and political actions over a fifteen-year period and never in a coherently self-described manifesto, the method of extraction and creative reassembly is one of necessity with the Zapatistas as well.

[5] In addition to all of the literature on the Anti-Globalization Movement cited in my dissertation, I am indebted to the following articles (Harvey 2010; Graeber 2002; Grubacic and Graeber 2004).

Assembly, Relay, and Contribution

But if Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas share in common their being particularly early and influential sources of concepts for the philosophical development of what myself and others (Graeber 2002; Grubacic and Graeber 2004) are calling the present revolutionary sequence, what is their relationship to one another in a philosophy dissertation methodologically based on conceptual creation through extraction and reassembly? First, I certainly do not want to argue for a direct mutual influence between Deleuze and Guattari and the Zapatistas. Despite being more of a historical/empirical question than a philosophical one, it is also highly unlikely (and not worth trying to map their degrees of separation). Deleuze and Guattari, to my knowledge, were not aware of the early stages of the Zapatista uprising (before 1994), nor were the Zapatistas likely readers of Deleuze and Guattari's work leading up to 1994. Second, I do not want to argue that we should use Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy to interpret, explain, or understand the Zapatistas, any more than I want to argue that we should use the Zapatista uprising to legitimate, ground, or justify Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy. This approach not only presupposes a privileged foundationalism of theory over practice, or practice over theory, but it also risks perpetuating a long legacy of Eurocentrism and theoretical imperialism (Spivak 2010). Thirdly, the aim of this dissertation is not to discover in either Deleuze and Guattari, or the Zapatistas the philosophical foundations of all political life or "the political," in part because this task is conceptually totalitarian, but also in part because this task is impossible and only reveals to us the un-grounded and anti-foundational character of political being as such (Lacoue-Labarthe, Nancy, and Derrida 1997). So rather than argue the point of political anti-foundationalism that has been argued elsewhere and much better, this dissertation is proposing a different project.

This dissertation instead proposes to read Deleuze and Guattari and the Zapatistas side-by-side using the differences between theory and practice as a productive system of relays from which to create concepts for use elsewhere. Where a theoretical action is unclear, weak, or too general, a practical action will clarify, strengthen, or specify how to open up theory in a new direction, and *vice versa.* Where one hits a wall, the other might break through, not as a substitute for the other but as a relay or assemblage of two heterogenous actions: theory and practice (Foucault 1977, 207). This methodology of doing political philosophy by extracting and reassembling a system of useful practical-theoretical relays is one used by Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault, and one I follow in this dissertation. Accordingly, philosophy, for Deleuze and Guattari, is political in so far as it is directed toward creating concepts that are "adequate to what is happing around us. It must adopt as its own those revolutions going on elsewhere, in other domains, or those that are being prepared" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 100; Deleuze 2004, 138). This dissertation thus adopts as its own the current revolution in preparation.

But this adoption and adequation is not a matter of representation or resemblance. Intellectuals do not simply stand at the front and off to the side of revolutionary struggles as its representatives (Foucault 1977, 208). Whether theory is supposed to inform practice or practice is supposed to inform theory, in each case their relationship has typically been a totalization of one over the other (1977, 206). In contrast, the goal of developing a political philosophy of practical-theoretical relays is not to ground one in the other or to describe/interpret the world more accurately, but rather to *transform* the world itself through the creation of a new assemblage. Theory does not cause praxis, nor does praxis cause theory: both are heterogeneous components constitutive *of* the practical-theoretical arrangement itself. The political analysis of revolutionary movements is thus never a question of representation, interpretation, or of "speaking for others;" rather, as Guattari says, "[i]t is a

question of situating their trajectory to see whether they are in a position to serve as indicators of new universes of references that could acquire sufficient consistency to bring about a radical change in the situation" (2008, 328). But, as Guattari continues, because "there are no universal scientific models with which to try to understand a situation . . . known in advance of the situation," one must continually develop new concepts that *help articulate* the situation, *not* represent it (2008, 343, 397). This is what I have aimed to do with the four concepts I propose in this dissertation.

So, if there are no universal foundations or categories for all political life, as Guattari argues, then the goal of political philosophy changes significantly. If the role of leadership and critique are forever bound by the question of political foundations, then the alternative task of an engaged political philosopher is to intervene and contribute immanently to political struggles themselves just like anyone else. Or as Subcomandante Marcos says, "We had to be honest and tell people that we had not come to lead anything of what might emerge. We came to release a demand, that could unleash others" (Marcos 2001c). Or perhaps as Foucault says of his own philosophical interventions,

> So, since there has to be an imperative, I would like the one underpinning the theoretical analysis we are attempting to be quite simply a conditional imperative of the kind: If you want to struggle, here are some key points, here are some lines of force, here are some constrictions and blockages. In other words, I would like these imperatives to be no more than tactical pointers. Of course, it's up to me, and those who are working in the same direction, to know on what fields of real forces we need to get our bearings in order to make a tactically effective analysis. But this is, after all, the circle of struggle and truth, that is to say, precisely, of philosophical practice. (2007, 3)

In sum, the aim of the present dissertation, in addition to the aforementioned three aims is, following Marcos, Marx, and Foucault, not to interpret the world, but to transform it by releasing concepts that might unleash something else. Thus the ultimate criteria of success for the four concepts proposed in this dissertation is not whether they have accurately described the world, but whether they will have been useful to those engaged in the present

revolutionary task of changing it.

Interventions

The question of general methodology being resolved, what are the specific philosophical interventions being proposed in this dissertation as regards the work of Deleuze and Guattari, and the Zapatistas? That is, within what readings, contexts, and assumptions do I propose to draw on these political thinkers? In this next section I propose two interventions, one into the scholarly literature on Deleuze and Guattari and one into the political commentary written on the Zapatista uprising. In both cases my conclusion is similar: to reject reading them as either theories of political representation or as theories of political differentiation. I propose, rather, to read them as theories of political constructivism, that is, as contributions to the *creation* of a new collective political body. I deal firstly with Deleuze and Guattari.

Deleuze, Guattari, and Representation

Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy, due in part to the increasing amount of anti-capitalist activity in the last fifteen years, has recently come to significant scholarly attention, and with this attention the concept of revolution has emerged as a central point of interest. Paul Patton has gone as far as to say that revolutionary deterritorialization is the normative concept underlying their entire political philosophy (2000, 10).[6] And in his book, *Deleuze and Guattari: an introduction to the politics of desire,* Philip Goodchild locates their "concern for the immanent transformation of society [revolutionary desire] as the sole purpose of their political philosophy" (1996, 5). But within this common interest one can see the formulation of at least two well-argued readings of this concept.

---

[6] "In all cases, [Deleuze] presents a world understood as a complex of interconnected assemblages (earth, territory, forms of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation), where the overriding norm is that of deterritorialisation."

On the one side Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution is read as a process by which marginalized or minor peoples come to be increasingly included and represented by the Liberal Democratic State. We can see this type of reading in the work of Anglophone scholar Paul Patton (translator of *Différence and Répétition*, 1968, and author of *Deleuze and the Political,* 2000), as well as the Francophone scholar Philippe Mengue (author of *Deleuze et la question de la démocratie*, 2003). Revolution, as a real object of political aims, according to Mengue, should be considered as a process of becoming-mediated and represented under a democratic state. Non-mediated, non-representational politics, according to Mengue, are not only highly speculative, but practically impossible and undesirable.

> What is the big difficulty of micropolitics? It is that it refuses all mediation and representation. It pretends to be capable of doing it, but—letting aside, for a moment, the problem of the theoretical or speculative validity of such a thesis—experience has shown that this refusal is absolutely impossible and not even desirable. Indeed, politics is linked to the function of mediation and representation—the *doxic* plane of immanence guarantees it...opinion is at the heart of politics. (2009, 172)

Similarly, Paul Patton highlights the figure of "becoming-democratic" in Deleuze and Guattari's later work and argues that, despite their lack of a normative political position, there are certainly democratic principles implicit in their political philosophy. Despite Deleuze and Guattari's frequent criticisms against modern state democracies, Patton argues that "the appearance of 'becoming-democratic' in *What Is Philosophy?* represents a new turn in Deleuze and Guattari's political thought" (2008, 178). Specifically, it takes a normative turn in favor of the institutions, rights, and values of modern liberal democracy.

While this position may not be the dominant reading of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution, the authors of this position have certainly contributed to a healthy debate over the concept. Despite a host of agreements I have with these authors in other areas, I find a few problems with this position. Firstly, it seems a bit strange to say, as Mengue implies, that the historical practice of direct democracy (non-representational, non-

mediated democracy) would be simply speculative. Countless volumes on the history of the Paris Commune, the Spanish Civil War, the Landless Peasants Movement in Brazil, and others (not to mention those of many Indigenous peoples like the Zapatistas), attest to the the very non-speculative nature of direct versus representational democracy. There is a meaningful distinction between the two that remains unaddressed by both Patton and Mengue. Secondly, if these events have been experienced, as Mengue claims, they could not possibly be just speculative. The assertion that these experiments have been tried, and have failed, would seem already to indicate that some did find them desirable enough to start them and perhaps die for them. Thirdly, the determination of what is and is not possible and desirable is precisely what revolution aims to transform. I find the closure of this possibility politically suspicious. The brute fact that the Liberal State has won a certain historical battle and is the presupposition of many political philosophers has nothing to do with the possible emergence of another more inclusive and desirable form of political organization. In the end, given Deleuze and Guattari's clear and consistent critique of State representation and mediation, one has to disavow too much of their political work and explicit condemnations of state democracy in order to make them liberal democrats. Additionally, this move takes away one of Deleuze and Guattari's most original contributions to the history of political philosophy: a non-foundational theory of revolution (without State, Party, Vanguard, or representation).

Deleuze, Guattari, and Difference

On the other side, Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution is more often read as the pure process of political becoming, uncaptured by all forms of political representation and mediation (Territory, State, Capital). We can see this type of reading in the work of American and Italian philosophers Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (authors of *Empire*, 2000; *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, 2004; and *Commonwealth*, 2009) as well

as in the work of American scholar Eugene Holland (author of *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis,* 1999). Opposed to defining the aim of revolution by its inevitable incorporation into the Liberal State apparatus, as Mengue and Patton do, Hardt and Negri draw from Deleuze and Guattari a theory of revolutionary potentiality or *difference-in-itself* that they call the *Multitude*. Rather than basing revolutionary action on an analogy with, an opposition to, a resemblance with, or a representation of the originally presupposed political bodies of Territory, God, King, Statesman, or Capital, Hardt and Negri propose a Deleuzian inspired theory of political creativity located ontologically anterior to any constituted or mediating power, whether State, People, or Capital. Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution, according to Hardt and Negri, should not be read as a theory of possibility defined by what is dominantly understood to be "possible" or "feasible" (as Mengue argues), but rather as a pure potentiality "to become other than one is," as Foucault says.

In Hardt and Negri's version of Spinozist-Deleuzian political ontology the concept of the *Multitude* stands, not as a new form of representation for global minority movements (that would speak for them), or as a negative movement "against representation," but rather as an *expressive* potential that all such subjugated groups have "to revolt," "to create something new": a new "absolutely deterritorialized socius" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 39). But since this potential is not a political object nor even a specific political event, but rather a pure "becoming-revolutionary" that allows for the possibility of new conditions, elements, and agencies in the political field as such, Hardt and Negri are able to avoid the restrictions of only thinking Deleuze and Guattari's theory of revolution as taking place within a pre-given political domain. Thus, "the creative forces of the multitude that sustain Empire are also capable of autonomously constructing a counter-Empire, an alternative political organization of global flows and exchanges," as they claim in their book, *Empire* (11–23).

Examples of this potential for counter-empire, Hardt and Negri argue, are the alter-globalization movement (2009, 368), and the nomadisms of refugees and immigrants who remain unrepresented in politics today: their *transformation in-itself* being the real sphere of "the political," perpetually open to all those who potentially participate in its non-exclusive community.

Similarly, for Eugene Holland, "it is not the entity but the process that has revolutionary potential" (2006, 100). Thus "Schizophrenia is the potential for revolution, not the revolution itself" (2006, 100). Opposed to any particular being or entity in the world, the revolutionary plane of immanence, according to Holland, is the "principle of freedom in permanent revolution" (2006, 123).

Now, while I certainly think this reading is more faithful to the anti-representational dimension of Deleuze and Guattari's theory of revolution, I also want to steer clear of several dangers in this reading, as posed by recent critical scholarship. These dangers are worth recounting here at some length. Since 1997, three full-length books have been devoted to this critique: Alain Badiou's *Deleuze: the Clamor of Being* (1997); Slavoj Žižek's *Organs Without Bodies* (2003); and Peter Hallward's *Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation* (2006). From these works, and several other critical essays, we can discern three distinct criticisms that, while perhaps not entirely fair to Deleuze (and Guattari), do outline several dangers posed by their philosophy: political ambivalence, virtual hierarchy, and subjective paralysis.

(1) Political Ambivalence

"Affirming Difference in the state of permanent revolution" as Deleuze says in *Difference and Repetition* (53), or affirming "transformation as such" as a new revolutionary commitment that escapes the previous problems of vanguardism and the party-state, as

these authors argue, poses the danger that such "a becoming other" is ambivalent.[7] It *may* provide a new non-representational space of liberty, *or* it may provide a ruptured "open" domain for a new discourse of rights and military occupation by the state, *or* it may merely reproduce a complicity with the processes of capitalist deterritorialization necessary for new capitalist reterritorializations. Slavoj Žižek, in particular, frequently attributes this capitalist ambivalence to Deleuze and Guattari's politics (2004, 184).[8] But to say, with Alain Badiou, that affirming the potentiality for transformation as such is to affirm a "purely ideological radicality" that "inevitably changes over into its opposite: once the mass festivals of democracy and discourse are over, things make place for the modernist restoration of order among workers and bosses," would be to overstate the problem (Badiou and Balmès 1976, 83).

Rather, it would be much more appropriate to say, with Paolo Virno, that "[t]he multitude is a form of being that can give birth to one thing but also to the other: ambivalence" (Virno 2003, 131). Accordingly, the affirmation of this ambivalence as a political commitment, and the "politico-ontological optimism and unapologetic vitalism" it assumes in Hardt, Negri, and Deleuze's work, according to Bruno Bosteels, remains radically insufficient (2004, 95). While the purely creative power of the multitude may be the condition for global liberation from Empire, it is also the productive condition *for* Empire as well. With no clear political consistency to organize or motivate any particular political transformation, such a "vitalist optimism" can remain, at best, Bosteels argues, politically ambivalent, speculative, and spontaneous. Showing the non-foundational or ungrounded nature of politics provides no more of a contribution for organized politics than does the

---

[7] "Overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes the eternal return" (Deleuze 1994, 53). "To make the simulacra rise and affirm their rights" (1990, 262).

[8] "There are, effectively, features that justify calling Deleuze the ideologist of late capitalism" (Žižek 2004 184).

creative potentiality of desire. "A subject's intervention," Bosteels suggests, "cannot consist merely in showing or recognizing the traumatic impossibility, void, or antagonism around which the situation as a whole is structured" (2004, 104), but rather, following Badiou, a "political organization is necessary in order for the intervention, as wager, to make a process out of the trajectory that goes from an interruption to a fidelity. In this sense, organization is nothing but the consistency of politics" (Badiou 1985, 12). And in so far as Deleuze and Guattari, and those inspired by their work, do not offer developed concepts of political consistency and organization that would bring differential multiplicities into specific political interventions and distributions, they remain, at most, ambivalent toward revolutionary politics.

(2) Virtual Hierarchy

In addition to the first danger, the problem of ambivalence, Deleuze's concept of revolution, according to Badiou and Hallward, risks a second danger, namely, that of creating a political hierarchy of virtual potential. Badiou argues at length in *The Clamor of Being* that

> contrary to all egalitarian or "communitarian" norms, Deleuze's conception of thought is profoundly aristocratic. Thought only exists in a hierarchized space. This is because, for individuals to attain the point where they are seized by their preindividual determination and, thus, by the power of the One-All—of which they are, at the start, only meager local configurations—they have to go beyond their limits and endure the transfixion and disintegration of their actuality by infinite virtuality, which is actuality's veritable being. And individuals are not equally capable of this. Admittedly, Being is itself neutral, equal, outside all evaluation . . . . But 'things reside unequally in this equal being' (Deleuze 1994, 37). And, as a result, it is essential to think according to 'a hierarchy which considers things and beings from the point of view of power' (Deleuze 1994, 37). (Badiou 1999, 12–13)

The political thrust of this argument is that, if we understand revolutionary change as the virtual or potential for change as such, and not merely change for or against certain pre-existing powers, then, contrary to any kind of egalitarianism, there will instead be a hierarchy of actual political beings that more or less participate in this degree of pure potential

transformation. The more actual political beings renounce their specific and local determinations and affirm their participation in the larger processes of difference-in-itself, the more powerful they become. Thus, if the point of examining any local political intervention is in every case to show to what degree it renounces its concrete determinations and might "become other than it is" (as a virtuality or potentiality), there seems to be a risk of "asceticism" (Badiou 1999, 13) and hierarchy in such a relationship of potential.

Similarly, Peter Hallward has argued that Deleuze's political philosophy is "indifferent to the politics of this world" (2006, 162). Hallward claims that "once a social field is defined less by its conflicts and contradictions than by the lines of flight running through it" (2006, 62n16) any distinctive space for political action can only be subsumed within the more general dynamics of creation, life, and potential transformation. And since these dynamics are "themselves anti-dialectical if not anti-relational, there can be little room in Deleuze's philosophy for relations of conflict and solidarity" (2006, 162). If each concrete, localized, actual political being *is* only in so far as its actual being is subtracted from the situation into a virtual event, "and every mortal event in a single Event" (Deleuze 1990, 152), the processional "telos" of absolute political deterritorialization is completely indifferent to the actual politics of this world (2006, 97). By valorizing this pure potentiality for transformation as such against all actual political determinations, Hallward argues, Deleuze is guilty of affirming an impossible utopianism. "By posing the question of politics in the starkly dualistic terms of war machine or state," Hallward argues, "—by posing it, in the end, in the apocalyptic terms of a new people and a new earth or else no people and no earth—the political aspect of Deleuze's philosophy amounts to little more than utopian distraction" (2006, 162).

(3) Subjective Paralysis

The differential reading of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution may be able to avoid the problem of representational subjectivity: that it can reject or affirm particular desires but never change the nature of the "self that desires." But it does so finally, only at the risk of diffusing the self into an endless multiplicity of impersonal drives: a self in perpetual transformation. This leads to the third danger, that of subjective paralysis. Firstly, to read Deleuze and Guattari's theory of revolutionary subjectivity as the "simple fact of one's own existence as possibility or potentiality" (Agamben 1993, 43), or as Paul Patton calls it, one's "critical freedom" ("the freedom to transgress the limits of what one is presently capable of being or doing, rather than just the freedom to be or do those things" (2000, 85)) suggests, as Bosteel's previous critique implies, an ambivalence. It is both the capacity for emancipation as well as the potentiality for enslavement.

Secondly, without a pre-given unity of subjectivity, how do agents qua multiplicities deliberate between and distinguish (*in themselves*) different political decisions? Without the representational screen of reason, or the state-guaranteed grounds of political discourse, what might something like a dispute or agreement look like? If "becoming other is not a capacity liberated individuals possess to constitute themselves as autonomous singularities," but "what defines 'autonomy' itself" (2006, 146), as Simon Tormey argues, then the political danger, according to Hallward, is that the subject is simply replaced by the larger impersonal process of transformation as such: "pure autonomy." The radical affirmation of the ambivalent and unlocalizable processes of subjective potentiality (*qua* pure multiplicities) seems then to have nothing to contribute to an analysis of the basic function of participatory democracy and collective decision-making, which remains at the core of many of today's radical political struggles (See Starr, Martinez-Torres, and Rosset 2011). Insofar as a theory of subjectivity is defined only by its potential for transformation, it is stuck in a

kind of paralysis of endless potential change no less disempowering than subjective stasis. Or, as Hallward frames this criticism, Deleuze "abandons the decisive subject in favor of our more immediate subjection to the imperative of creative life or thought" (2006, 163).

Deleuze, Guattari, and Constructivism

While this ongoing debate over the implications of Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy, and in particular their concept of revolution, continues to be a productive one, I propose a third reading of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution that does not fall prey to the dangers of the two previous ones. I term this a "constructivst" reading, in a sense borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari's own writings. To explain this alternative reading, I proceed in three steps: first, I show how the concept of constructivism emerges in Deleuze and Guattari's work in the first place; secondly, I differentiate this approach from the previous two readings; and lastly I demonstrate its significance for the thesis of this dissertation.

Deleuze and Guattari's first major attempt at the creation of a concept of revolution came after the events of May, 1968, in France. Their first book together, *Capitalisme et schizophrénie: l'anti-Oedipe* (1972), set out as a critique of both psychoanalysis and Marxism in order to develop a new concept of revolutionary desire that was indexed neither to primitive, state, or capitalist power (in all their familial and oedipal formulations), nor to class analysis or the vanguard party apparatus "modeled after the state" in Marxism. Schizophrenia was their name for this new concept of revolution. These efforts were, however, subject to significant criticism. Critics immediately charged that Deleuze and Guattari had been too optimistic about the potentiality of art, "minimalized the role of class struggle," "militated in favor of an irrationalism of desire," and "identified revolutionaries with schizophrenics" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 379). After its publication the authors expended no small effort clarifying and even modifying the concepts proposed in *Anti-*

Oedipus (later, even criticizing them). Revolutionaries are neither "insane" nor self-marginalized, they insist:

> Some have said that we see the schizophrenic as the true revolutionary. We believe, rather that schizophrenia is the descent of a molecular process into a black hole. Marginals have always inspired fear in us, and a slight horror. (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 139)

Desire is neither irrational nor without determination in a particular political arrangement:

> We say quite the opposite: desire only exists when it is assembled or machined. You cannot grasp or conceive of a desire outside a determinate assemblage, on a plane which is not pre-existent but which must itself be constructed. (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 96)

Revolutionary desire does not just blow apart the social into a pure flux:

> It is in concrete social fields, at specific moments, that the comparative movements of deterritorialization, the continuums of intensity, and the combinations of flux that they form must be studied. (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 135)

Despite these qualifications, the concept of revolution in *Anti-Oedipus* remained admittedly under-developed. How were these lines of schizo-flight to provide a stable alternative to the history of representational politics (primitivism, statism, capitalism)? How were these "desiring machines" to be assembled into a revolutionary movement? And what are some of its concrete characteristics? A crucial shift, though, took place in their political writings between *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980). The move from emphasizing the unrestrained deterritorializations of desire to the careful and more sober transformations of the concrete political arrangement (constructivism) became decisive (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 382).

Eugene Holland was perhaps the first to highlight this shift in Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy. "In as much as deterritorialization designated the motor of permanent revolution, while reterritorialization designated the power relations imposed by the private ownership of capital…deterritorialization looked 'good' and reterritorialization looked 'bad'…but in *A Thousand Plateaus*, both de- and re-territorialization appear in a very different

light" (Holland 1991, 58–59). Aside from removing the last traces of humanism and anthropocentrism from the "psycho-social" machines of *Anti-Oedipus*, *A Thousand Plateaus*, Holland claims, introduces three kinds of deterritorialization—relative, absolute negative, and absolute positive (1991, 62). *A Thousand Plateaus* no longer valorizes the uncritical excitement for absolute deterritorialization or potential creativity found in *Anti-Oedipus* (and in Deleuze's previous works) but instead develops what they call the more sober task of a logics or constructivism of political assemblages. While Holland notes the "less revolutionary and less romantic" (1991, 63) character of *A Thousand Plateaus,* he also suggests that "any lingering suspicion of an earlier exaggerated or uncritical enthusiasm for 'schizophrenia' should now be dispelled by the very cautious, nuanced treatment of deterritorialization and the body-without-organs" (1991, 63).

A Thousand Plateaus also marks a shift away from Deleuze's earlier solo works, self-defined as the "merger of philosophy and ontology" (1990, 179).[9] While I disagree that Deleuze's previous works can be characterized as entirely "apolitical," as Badiou has argued, Deleuze had in fact developed very few political concepts, usually favoring more ontological or aesthetic ones. By contrast, *A Thousand Plateaus* clearly prioritizes politics over ontology. Against accusations of "ontological vitalism" and "other-worldly politics" made by Peter Hallward, *A Thousand Plateaus* claims (1) to overthrow ontology: to replace the logic of the "is" (*est*) with the logic of the "and" (*et*); and (2) that "politics precedes being" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 25, 203). *A Thousand Plateaus* should therefore be read more primarily as a political text than an ontological one, thus distancing it significantly from Deleuze's earlier solo works as well as from much of Badiou, Hallward, and Žižek's critical commentary that tends to focus almost exclusively on his pre-*A Thousand Plateaus* writings. While this by no means allows us to ignore the political dangers Badiou and others outline, it is important to

[9] On the question of Deleuze's ontology see (Zourabichvili 1996).

recognize that the constructivist turn that occurs in Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy has yet to be taken seriously (against the continuity thesis, for example, that is argued for explicitly by Hallward and implicitly by many others: that a single central thought guides all of Deleuze's work, such as immanence, the virtual, life, and so on).

More recent scholarship on Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy, though, has begun to shift more notably in the direction of the political constructivism begun in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Many scholars have noted the existence and importance of the constructivist (also called diagrammatic, pragmatic, or cartographic) turn in Deleuze and Guattari's later work. The terrain, according to Alberto Toscano, "seems to have shifted considerably with respect to the earlier [pre *A Thousand Plateaus*] preoccupation that seemed to afford a certain continuity with naturalized or materialist accounts of ontogenesis" (2006, 176). Eugene Holland speaks of the "importance that *A Thousand Plateaus* ascribes to devising planes of consistency or composition where lines of flight can intersect and become productive instead of spinning off into the void" (1998, 69). Bonta and Protevi, too, have emphasized the centrality of having a "working cartography…to experiment with real intervention" (2004, 23). Not only do Deleuze and Guattari "give us a theory of assemblages" (Patton 2006, 35) that "would map out the complex terrain and conditions in which new modes of existence appear" (Smith 1998, 264), according to Paul Patton and Dan Smith, but even Bruno Bosteels has admitted the political importance of the "basic scaffolding" of "a formal and political theory of cartography" (1998, 150) developed by Guattari. We can even find the admission by Hardt and Negri, in the final chapter of *Empire,* that "recognizing the potential autonomy of the mobile multitude, however, only points toward the real question. What we need to grasp is how the multitude is organized and redefined as a positive, political power" (394, 398). So the real question is not simply that of deterritorialization over reterritorialization or creative life versus the dead hand of capital,

but rather the *constructive* ways revolutionary action takes on a consistency, a commitment, and an organization, and what forms of antagonism and relation it produces in a specific struggle.

Thus, while there may be politically dangerous tendencies in Deleuze and Guattari-inspired political philosophy, more or less emphasized in certain works, it is clearly inaccurate to say that Deleuze and Guattari and their readers after *A Thousand Plateaus* are not aware of the dangers of naively "valorizing the potentiality" of revolutionary deterritorialization.[10] Revolution may, of course, move too quickly, too much, or end up in a black hole (marginality) with no consistency or connection at all. Contrary to the claim of *Anti-Oedipus* that "We can never go too far in the direction of deterritorialization" (382), *A Thousand Plateaus* warns us that we *can in fact* go too far and so must approach revolutionary struggles with sobriety, caution, and construction.

But scholarly awareness, promising gestures, and scaffolds hardly constitute a fully developed constructivist theory of revolution. Aside from the fact that no full-length work until now has been dedicated to developing Deleuze and Guattari's constructivist theory of revolution, there is a problem with such a project. Éric Alliez, in his essay, "Anti-Oedipus Thirty Years On," has been the most emphatic about the political importance of Deleuze and Guattari's later constructivist text *What is Philosophy?* (against the Badiouian charges of political spontaneity) (2006).[11] Yet, the problem is that *What is Philosophy?* does not even give politics its own proper register, like art (percepts), philosophy (concepts), or science (functives)! Accordingly, Alliez's book, *The Signature of the World*, devoted to Deleuze and

---

[10] Except Nick Land who continued to affirm deterritorialization as absolute escape without consistency. See (Land 1993).

[11] See also (Deleuze 1987, 70, 96, 103). "Desire is always assembled and fabricated (*machiné*) on a plane of immanence or composition which must itself be constructed at the same time as desire assembles and fabricates" (103).

Guattari's constructivism, contains absolutely no discussion of politics.[12]

Even Manuel DeLanda, who may have gone furthest in developing the details of such a social logic or what he calls a "theory of assemblages" in *A New Philosophy of Society,* has expressed concern with such a project. "The relatively few pages dedicated to assemblage theory in the work of Deleuze and Guattari hardly amount to a fully-fledged theory," he says. And "even in those cases where conceptual definitions are easy to locate, they are usually not given in a style that allows for a straightforward interpretation. This would seem to condemn a book on assemblage theory to spend most of its pages doing hermeneutics" (Delanda 2006, 3). But while DeLanda's solution to this problem is, as Alberto Toscano says, to "'naturalize' the theory of multiplicities by recasting it as an ontology of models; much as if Deleuze were the heir of Husserl's meatatheoretical project, now applied to the theory of complex systems" (2006, 86), the current work will not follow suit. The central concern of this dissertation is neither social nor ontological, but political and constructivist, interested explicitly in the revolutionary transformation of existing society. But this section has only framed the emergence of a constructivist turn in Deleuze and Guattari's work. The question now is how to define "constructivism" as a meaningful interpretive category against the previous two, and to show how it contributes to a philosophical return to the concept of revolution.

Toward a Constructivist Theory of Revolution

By "constructivism," I do not mean what is traditionally understood as "social constructivism" in sociology and philosophy, namely, that revolutions are by-products or "social constructs" produced by human minds, institutions, historical contexts, cultural values, and so on. Such theories presuppose what needs to be explained in the first place: mind, society, culture, and history themselves. Deleuze and Guattari rather define their

[12] *The Signature of the World* deals with ethics, not politics.

philosophical method as constructivist in the sense that it is about the "creative diagnosis and assembly of heterogenous elements into a plane of consistency" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 96).[13] But given such a broad definition and the often scattered appearance of this method in their later work, one is almost forced to make, as Delanda correctly observes, some kind of interpretative or extractive move. I will thus make two: firstly, I limit my own methodological work with this concept to a strictly political interpretation, and in particular its revolutionary dimension; secondly, I break this constructivist method down into what I see as its four distinct yet coherent philosophical activities and try to reassemble them around four of my own concepts.

Asked succinctly, the question of this dissertation is, "how is it possible to return to the theory-practice of revolution?" Answered succinctly, I argue that Deleuze and Guattari offer us several helpful concepts that respond to the four problematics of revolution mentioned previously. In response to the question of how to understand the dominant relations of power such that revolution is desirable, they propose the concept of "Historical Topology." In response to the question of how to transform those relations of power, they propose the concept of "Deterritorialization." In response to the question of what we can build in their place, they propose the concept of "Political Consistency," and in response to the question of who belongs to the struggle, they propose the concept of "Nomadic Solidarity." Their constructivst theory of revolution is, thus, neither a utopian program laid out in advance, the effect of "social constructs," the capture of state power, an evolutionary development, or the potentiality for revolutionary change as such, but rather the committed arrangement and distribution of heterogenous elements or singularities without vanguard,

[13] Constructivism is the concept Deleuze and Guattari mobilize to against accusations of political spontaneity. "In retrospect every assemblage expresses and creates a desire by constructing the plane which makes it possible and, by making it possible, brings it about…It is in itself an immanent revolutionary process. It is constructivist, not at all spontaneist" (Deleuze 1987, 96).

party, state, or capital: it is a politics based on autonomy and the self-management of political problems (1983, 380; Deleuze 1994, 158; Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 471).

Much closer to what Badiou, Hallward, Toscano, and Bosteels claim to be looking for in political concepts like "consistency," "intervention," "commitment," and "solidarity," the constructivist theory of revolution I am proposing is based on connecting the contingent and heterogeneous political practices that have broken free or been uprooted ("deterritorialized") through political crisis *to each other* to theorize the current revolutionary sequence (however nascent it may be) (See Žižek 2010). The current revolutionary sequence, and here I am in agreement with Toscano, has "sketched out new regimes of organization, new forms of subjectivity at a distance from the accepted forms of mediated representation [like] the Ejercito Zapatista de Liberaciòn Nacional in Mexico . . . [such that] that we might begin to think beyond the intra-State logic of representation" (2004). Thus, the valorization of "lines of flight," "rupture," and "heterogeneity" as they break free from or within power, without a positive account of how such lines compose a new consistency of their own, are —and here I am in agreement with Badiou and others—"the concrete definition of revolutionary failure," since revolutionary struggles cannot be sustained beyond the scope of isolated outbursts against or within power. Without a cohesive theory of how to diagnose, transform, and create new political bodies connected through mutual global solidarity, I argue, we cannot hope to understand the philosophy of the present revolutionary sequence.

Thus, in my reading, the political project of *A Thousand Plateaus* is to develop such a positive account of how "revolutionary consistencies" function and are sustained in the context of coexistent dangers. This positive account will address the following four questions: In what sense do the processes of representation pose dangers for revolutionary struggles? How do revolutions intervene politically in such situations? How are their conditions, elements, and agencies arranged and distributed? How do they connect up to

different struggles around the world? Drawing primarily from *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?,* I propose a constructivist theory of revolution that answers these questions without submitting revolution to an inevitable political representation or merely affirming a political potential to become-otherwise. But the philosophical elaboration of these concepts in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy is insufficient to develop the four theoretical-practices I am proposing. What is still required is their connection to the practical series of revolutionary actions offered by Zapatismo.

Zapatismo and Representation

Just as there are different ways to read the concept of revolution in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, so there are different ways to interpret the Zapatista uprising. Leaving aside all of those who reject the Zapatista's struggle for dignity, land, and democracy outright, readers of the Zapatistas fall more or less fall into two camps. On the one hand, there are those that see the uprising as an incomplete or failed struggle, insofar as it failed to mobilize the Mexican people to overthrow and capture the Mexican state (or even win significant representation for the Indigenous of Mexico). This view can be found in the work of Argentine political theorist Atilio Boron (author of *State, Capitalism, and Democracy in Latin America*, 1995), and British Pakistani political analyst Tariq Ali in his 2004 essay "Anti-neoliberalism in Latin America." Boron argues that the postmodern celebration of diversity and local autonomy around Zapatismo is symptomatic of the left's general retreat from class struggle. For Boron, popular movements, like Zapatismo, cannot afford the luxury of ignoring the struggle for state power and representation, especially in Latin America, where direct or indirect forms of U.S. imperialism have so often undermined national sovereignty. To the degree that the Zapatistas have made no real gains for class struggle or state representation, they have failed (Boron 2003, 143–82).

Similarly, Ali argues that the Zapatista's slogan, "we can change the world without

taking power," is a purely moral slogan with no real revolutionary teeth. As Ali says,

> I have to be very blunt here — [the Mexican State] [does not] feel threatened because there is an idealistic slogan within the social movements, which goes like this: "We can change the world without taking power." This slogan doesn't threaten anyone; it's a moral slogan. The Zapatistas — who I admire — when they marched from Chiapas to Mexico City, what did they think was going to happen? Nothing happened. It was a moral symbol, it was not even a moral victory because nothing happened. (Ali 2004)

There is certainly some truth to these claims: the Zapatistas (in their 1994 *First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle*) did declare war on the Mexican state but failed to mobilize the Mexican people, and they were technically unable to even win the reformist Peace Accords with the Mexican government. Such criticisms are not wrong so much as they reduce the criteria of revolutionary success to the very narrow categories of state representation and class struggle. Firstly, if we are going to analyze what the Zapatista's have done, we must consider all the different dimensions on which their struggle has taken place (media, solidarity, local autonomy, democracy, gender, race, and sexual orientation, as well as political economy and the state). The Zapatistas have won some things in some places but very little in others. Secondly, these narrow criticisms cover over one of the most original political contributions of the Zapatistas: not how they have been able to influence politicians and the state externally, but how they have created internally a new type of political consistency that has coherently organized a society of over 2,200 communities (over 200,000 people). These communities are federated into 32 "autonomous municipalities," each grouped into five local self-governments called the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (JBG) or Good Government Councils (Ross 2006, 194). Thirdly, although perhaps one can judge the immediate effectiveness of a given slogan, it would be naive to think that slogans or symbols as such are not able to mobilize millions of people around the world, because they have, and they do so now more than ever. And as far as slogans go, "change the world without taking power" has become a global one whose effects, I argue, have yet to be fully deployed,

although they nonetheless characterize an emerging desire for a new politics without States. Perhaps the force of this slogan is best felt, for reasons that I will explain, in the future anterior.

Zapatismo and Difference

On the other hand, there are readers who argue that the Zapatistas' most important contribution is their strong suspicion of all forms of political representation (patriarchy, statism, capitalism, etc.) and their affirmation of a political community and solidarity based on difference (across race, gender, class, sexual orientation, geography, and so on). Although perhaps the majority of scholarship on the Zapatistas falls generally under this category (even though most disagree about how far the Zapatistas go in achieving this goal), I want to look at two of its more philosophical proponents: Simon Tormey and John Holloway. Tormey's 2006 article, "'Not in my Name': Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation," argues that

> the stance and philosophy of the Zapatistas is . . . remarkable in itself, but also symptomatic of a more general shift in the underpinnings of the political 'field,' one that problematizes and points beyond 'representation.' This is a shift that first announced itself in relation to philosophy, ethics and literature some decades ago, in turn spreading to black studies, feminism, queer and lesbian studies, and latterly to postcolonial and subaltern studies. It can now be felt and heard in what is sometimes termed 'the new activism.' (138)

But, for Tormey, who draws theoretically on Deleuze's earlier work, *Différence et répétition* (1968), the Zapatistas, "as a group that insists that it is 'exercising power' not on *behalf* of the people of the Chiapas . . . but *with* the people of the Chiapas," not only articulate a *demand* against all forms of political representation, but they, like Deleuze, also "recognize and celebrate difference, not as negation . . . but as an affirmation, as something valued in itself" (2006, 142). Marcos, for example, does not represent the Zapatistas, but is himself a multiplicity; he "is gay in San Francisco, a black in South Africa, Asian in Europe, a Chicano in San Isidro, an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel . . . Marcos is every untolerated,

oppressed, exploited minority that is resisting and saying 'Enough!'" (Marcos 2001b, 101–6). Difference-in-itself, according to Tormey, is also realized in the internal organization of the Zapatistas, whose form of direct democracy "goes well beyond Marx's 'Paris Commune' model of immediate recall and rotation to embrace the demand that delegates listen to each and every 'campañero' who turns up" (2006, 148).

Similarly, Holloway, in his 2002 book, *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today,* argues that one of the most central contributions of the Zapatistas was to express a "scream" of negation, dissonance, and frustration with the present neoliberal system of political representation, which Holloway calls "Fetishism" (2002, 1). The Zapatistas' struggle is one not only against the State and Capital but against the entire system of political classification/representation as such. As Holloway puts it:

> We do not struggle as working class, we struggle against being working class, against being classified. Our struggle is not the struggle of labour: it is the struggle against labour. It is the unity of the process of classification (the unity of capital accumulation) that gives unity to our struggle, not our unity as members of a common class. Thus, for example, it is the significance of the Zapatista struggle against capitalist classification that gives it importance for class struggle, not the question of whether the indigenous inhabitants of the Lacandon Jungle are or are not members of the working class. (2002, 88)

But Zapatismo is not just a rejection of representation; it is an affirmation of the potential to recover a new means of living, a power-to or capacity for new action. As Holloway says,

> it not enough to scream. Negativity, our refusal of capital, is the crucial starting point, theoretically and politically. But mere refusal is easily recaptured by capital, simply because it comes up against capital's control of the means of production, means of doing, means of living. For the scream to grow in strength, there must be a recuperation of doing, a development of power-to. That implies a re-taking of the means of doing. (2002, 127)

While I remain, for the most part, sympathetic to this kind of reading and to Tormey and Holoway's readings in particular, I think that their points of emphasis are not so much wrong as they are philosophically and politically incomplete or insufficient. It may be true

that, with a few exceptions, the Zapatistas are critical of the dominant structure and categories of political representation (including narrow class analyses based on industrial development and factory labor) (Kingsnorth 2004, 29).[14] And it is also true that the Zapatistas, to some degree, affirm and respect the multiplicity of differences that make up the global opposition to Neoliberalism. However, the rejection of representation and the affirmation of difference or potential for "power-to" tell us almost nothing about what positive philosophical and political alternatives the Zapatistas propose. Both Tormey and Hollway spend only a few short pages theorizing the internal political organization of the Zapatistas (direct democracy, consensus, rotation, self-government, subjectivity, global solidarity, and so on), and when they do, their conclusion is that these types of organization (internal as well as global networks, etc.) all simply express the Zapatistas' rejection of representation and affirmation of potential transformation (difference). But a pivotal question remains: how is this new type of post-representational politics constructed? How does it work? In what ways does it offer us a real political alternative to capitalist nation-states? What new types of political subjectivity does it create and how do they work? If the Zapatistas are not just practical examples of the philosophical insight that "political representation has failed us, and we must become other than we are," then what do they offer us instead, philosophically and practically?

Perhaps many of the same criticisms addressed to "differential readers" of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of revolution equally apply here: political ambivalence, virtual hierarchy, and subjective paralysis. These are, in part, some of the Badiouian inspired criticisms laid out by Mihalis Mentinis in his book, *Zapatistas: The Chiapas Revolt and what it means for Radical Politics* (2006). After moving through Gramsci, Laclou and Mouffe, Hardt

---

[14] "We are not a proletariat, our land is not your means of production and we don't want to work in a tractor factory. All we want is to be listened to, and for you big-city smart-arses to stop telling us how to live. As for your dialectic—you can keep it. You never know when it might come in handy" (Kingsnorth 2004, 29).

and Negri, and Castoriadis, Mentinis argues for a Badiou-inspired theory of militant subjectivity previously lacking in Zapatista scholarship. Despite providing an otherwise excellent survey of radical political theory and Zapatismo, Mentinis fails to reconcile his position with Badiou's ambivalence toward Zapatismo as a truly universal event, and thus as having no real politically faithful subjects.[15] Perhaps this under-emphasis in scholarship is simply historical, since the Zapatistas only started focusing on their internal political organization in 2003. In any case, to sum up, difference-in-itself or the potential to develop our "power-to" tell us very little about how to build a revolution, or what concepts the Zapatistas offer for the reorganization of political life.

Zapatismo and Constructivism

Subsequently, I propose, as I did in the case of Deleuze and Guattari's work, a constructivist reading of the Zapatistas that recognizes not only their antagonism toward representation and their affirmation of political difference as the pre-condition for a radically inclusive global revolutionary movement, but more importantly, what they have created in place of representation and how they have reassembled or built a maximum of political difference into their political practice. To be clear, this does not mean that I am proposing to use Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical method of constructivism to understand the Zapatista uprising, despite the strong similarities between the two methods of construction. What I am proposing instead is that the Zapatistas have invented their own political constructivism. While philosophy creates concepts, politics creates practices.

Between the 8th and 10th of August, 2003, almost ten years after the 1994 uprising, and almost 20 years after Marcos and company's first descent into the Lacandon Jungle, the

---

[15] "The examples of popular organization we know today are, therefore, either extremely experimental and localized (like the Zapatista movement) or theologico-political (like Hezbollah)" (Badiou 2008a, 656). "Through a combination of constructions of thought, which are always global or universal, and political experiments, which are local or singular but can be transmitted universally, we can assure the new existence of the communist hypothesis, both in consciousness and in concrete situations" (Badiou 2008b, 117).

Zapatistas announced a new direction in their struggle with the birth of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (JGBs), Committees of Good Government. Whereas their political energies and critiques previously had been focused on (1) battling and negotiating with the Mexican government, paramilitary forces, and corporations (rejecting the forces of political representation), and (2) affirming their autonomy and enlarging their global visibility through alternative media and global gatherings of heterogeneous struggles (affirming political difference), the birth of the JBGs marked a significant turn toward the *creation* of something new. While the Zapatistas certainly did not call this turn "constructivist," I use this term to emphasize their turn toward creating new political practices, like building and sustaining their own *Autonomous Municipalities* of self-government, cooperative economics, and environmental stewardship. It is in this turn, I argue, that we can learn the most from Zapatismo.

Its also during this time that one can see in the Zapatistas communiqués, for the first time since the failure of the 1994 *First Declaration* to start a war against the Mexican government, a critique of themselves as they tried to build the world they wanted to see, in front of the world. It was announced that the *Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* (EZLN), the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, was overstepping its decision-making power in the *Municipalities* and local governments, women were not treated equally in terms of participation in the JBG and other areas, the environment was being harmed, drugs were being grown, human trafficking through Zapatista territory was occurring, and the five *Caracloes* (Regions of Zapatistas Territory) were developing unevenly (Marcos 2006). Accordingly, the Zapatistas had to expand and multiply their analysis of power within their own territory: in terms of gender, the environment, local law, cooperative production, and so on.

In undertaking this massive project of "learning how to self-govern," the Zapatistas

focused less on political reform with the state and more on creating a prefigurative politics: without overthrowing the state, they wanted to achieve a maximum of autonomy within it (and with others outside it). But one of the most difficult aspects of this was inventing a political body that would allow for the maximum inclusion of participation and autonomy with a minimum of exclusion and oppression. This was created using a mixture of Indigenous tradition, popular assemblies, consensus decision-making, and rotational governance (positions changed every 15 days to make sure everyone learned how to govern equally). In a word, they created a generalized direct democracy based on a maximum feed-back loop of political participation. While certainly a work-in-progress, these were its practical horizons (Marcos 2006).

But the Zapatistas have never been satisfied with local revolts, no matter how successful. While it may have appeared that during these years the Zapatistas became focused "inward," one of the central purposes of this constructivist turn (not to be mistaken with an inward turn) was to be able to sustain a certain level of cooperative productive development based on common property (not private or public) and to share it with others, not just within the *Caracoles*, but with the world. Since 1994, the Zapatistas were on the receiving end of international aid, but after 2003, one can see in their communiqués a sustained and novel effort to provide material and political support to struggles around the world against neoliberalism (textiles, dolls, maize, public endorsements, coffee, etc.) (Marcos. 2006). Where previous concepts of solidarity had all been, for the most part, one-way in direction (Soviet internationalism, third-world solidarity, international human rights, and even material aid in the case of natural disasters, etc.), the Zapatistas invented a whole new model of *mutual* global solidarity by sharing and encouraging others to mutually share support and aid even in cases where they have very little (like the Zapatistas). This kind of mutual support has resulted in a host of interesting solidarities, both political and economic

(Walker, 2005).

These years leading up to *La Otra Campaña* (the Other Campaign), from 2003 to 2006 and beyond, have been misunderstood as "years of silence" and under-theorized, in part due to a dearth of empirical research (compared to pre-2003 studies), but also perhaps in part from a waning of interest in the "newness" of Zapatismo. But it is from 2003 forward, in my view, that the Zapatistas have the most to contribute to a philosophical investigation into how a revolutionary alternative to neoliberalism will have been built. I argue that the Zapatistas offer us several helpful concepts that respond to the four problematics of revolution mentioned previously. In response to the question of how to understand the dominant relations of power such that revolution is desirable, they propose the practice of what Marcos calls a "*Diagnóstico del Sufrimiento*" (Diagnostic of Suffering) documented in *La Sexta* (Marcos 2010, 11). In response to the question of how to transform those relations of power, they propose the practice of building the autonomous "*Juntas de Buen Gobierno*." In response to the question of what kinds of institutions we can put in their place, they propose the practice of "rule by obeying" (*Mandar Obedeciendo*), and in response to the question of who belongs to the struggle, they propose the practice of the global "*Encuentro*" (the Encounter). In sum, their constructivst theory of revolution is quite similar to that of Deleuze and Guattari's: neither a utopian program laid out in advance, the effect of "social constructs," the capture of state power, an evolutionary development, or the potentiality for revolutionary change as such, but rather the committed arrangement and distribution of heterogenous elements or singularities without vanguard, party, state, or capital. This politics, like that championed by Deleuze and Guattari, is based on autonomy and the participatory self-management of political problems.

Overview

Guided by the methodology of conceptual assemblage and the intervention of a constructivist reading, this dissertation proposes to draw on the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas in order to extract a new political philosophy of revolution helpful for understanding and motivating the present, although perhaps young, revolutionary sequence. In particular, it proposes four specific theoretical practices or "tactical pointers for the conditional imperative of political struggle": (1) a multi-centered diagnostics, (2) prefigurative transformation, (3) a participatory process, and (4) mutual global solidarity. Accordingly, the chapters of this dissertation will propose and defend each of these conceptual tactics in turn. Additionally, each chapter is composed of three major subsections. The first section critically distinguishes the proposed concept from two others: one based on political representation and the other based on political differentiation without construction. The second section then draws on at least one major idea from Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy to help assemble the theoretical practice proposed in the chapter. And the third section draws on at least one major political practice from Zapatismo to help assemble the proposed theoretical practice.

Chapter II argues that the return to revolution located in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas can be characterized by a diagnostic theory of history motivated by the relative rejection of all previous forms of historical representation (patriarchy, racism, statism, capitalism, vanguardism, etc.) and a concern for their immanent diagnosis. Although this claim clearly rejects the representational readings of Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo, it is obviously quite similar to the philosophy of difference described earlier in this chapter. As such, it may seem relatively uncontroversial. But, my argument includes three crucial and under-emphasized dimensions of this rejection. Firstly, that it is a *relative* rejection, meaning that political representation always plays a more or less active role in political life even if only

in the mode of "being warded off" by more participatory practices. That is, even in its relative absence, it still exerts force as an immanent historical potential of any political practice. Secondly, I argue that political representation is not an homogenous philosophical category, since there are several distinctly different types of representation. These differences are found not only in terms of content, such as race, class, gender, economics, and so on, but also in formal structure, such as coding, overcoding, and axiomatization. Thirdly, I argue that these types of relative representation always intersect and coexist with each other to different degrees in every political situation. Against the *necessary* historical emergence of these different types of political representation, but also against their *merely contingent and coexistent* emergence, I argue instead, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's Historical Topology and what the Zapatistas call their Diagnostic of Suffering, that their return to revolution is characterized by their use of these types of representation as a way to understand the political dangers and opportunities presented in the situation to be transformed. But how then can one escape this matrix of political power and representation?

In chapter III I argue that this return to revolution found in the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas is also characterized by a prefigurative theory of political transformation aimed at constructing a new present within and alongside the old. Opposed to achieving revolutionary transformation by an evolutionary process of transition, progress, and reform in representation, or achieving it simply through a spontaneous rupture with the present, prefigurative political transformations emerge as what will have been underway along side the dominant political reality. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's theory of Deterritorialization and the Zapatista's theory of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno,* I argue that prefigurative revolutions are thus those types of transformation that are able to sustain the maximal creation of a new present as the expression of the past and future of their situation and connect it up to other struggles happening elsewhere. This type of political revolution is

thus neither tied entirely to the determinations of its past (with its pre-given possibilities) nor to the potentialities of its future always yet-to-come. Rather, it is constructive of a new present that transforms both the past and the future. But how then can these revolutionary transformations be sustained beyond their relative autonomy and prefiguration?

In chapter IV, I thus argue that we can locate in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas a participatory theory of a revolutionary body politic that is able to sustain these prefigurative transformations. A participatory body politic doe not simply establish new conditions for political life based on a "more just" sphere of political action whose foundational principles are still held independently from the constituted sphere where such principles are deployed. Nor does a participatory body politic merely aim to establish anti-institutions, whose sole purpose is to undermine all forms of representation and await the possibility that something new, and hopefully better, may emerge. Rather, a participatory and revolutionary body politic is built and sustained through an expressive process whose founding conditions are constantly undergoing a high degree of direct and immanent transformation by the various practices and people who are effected, to varying degrees, by its deployment. In particular, I argue in this chapter that this participatory "feedback loop" can be located in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Consistency, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?,* and in the Zapatista's political practice of Rule by Obeying (*Mandar Obedeciendo*). I argue that, in order to understand the structure and function of this consistency and of ruling by obeying in this new body politic, we need to understand how their conditions, elements, and agencies work differently than in representational and anti-representational institutions. I argue this by drawing on three concepts in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy that correspond to the conditions, elements, and agencies of consistent revolutionary institutions: the abstract machine, the concrete assemblage, and the

persona.[16] Just as these three concepts immanently transform one another in a relationship of "order without hierarchy," according to Deleuze and Guattari, so does ruling by obeying provide the egalitarian frame-work for the revolutionary institutions of the Zapatistas (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 90). But the participatory nature of a revolutionary body politic still leaves the the question, "how will these new political bodies be able to connect up with each other across their radical differences?"

Thus, chapter V draws on all the previous chapters in order to argue that we can locate in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas a theory of revolutionary political affinity based on the mutual global solidarity of such participatory political bodies. Revolutionary political affinity, I argue, is not simply a matter of integrating marginalized demands back into the dominant territorial-nation-state apparatus based on modifying specific criteria for citizenship or aiding those who need help. Nor is it a matter of recognizing the universal singularity of all beings to become other than they are. Rather, revolutionary political affinity is a matter of solidarity: when revolutionary political bodies, namely, those who remain un-represented or excluded from dominant forms of political affinity, find in each other, one by one, the trans-universality (transversality) and mutual aid of each other's singular struggles. Singular-universal solidarity is thus not a matter of recognition, charity, or even radical difference, but rather a mutually federated difference or "contingent holism" of heterogenous singular-universal events in world-wide struggle. The task of this chapter is thus to avoid the dangers of exclusion and universal singularity and propose a theory of political solidarity instead, drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Nomadism and the Zapatistas' global practice of *Encuentros Intercontinentales*. In particular, I argue first against

[16] There are many types of abstract machines according to Deleuze and Guattari. In chapter II I elaborate three kinds of abstract machines (territorial, statist, capitalist) but in the present chapter the the concept of the abstract machine, concrete assemblage, and machinic persona should be understood as referring only to the "consistent" type of machines.

the concepts of "citizenship" and "difference" as desirable models of political belonging insofar as the former is structurally exclusionary and the later is unable to theorize any concrete relations between multiple coexistent conditions. Secondly, I argue that, opposed to these two dangers, revolutionary solidarity should be defined instead by the federated connection between multiple singular-universal conditions without totality.

Finally, chapter VI concludes with a reconstruction and reflection upon the relative accomplishments of each chapter and the argument of the dissertation as a whole. In particular, chapter VI addresses the problem left remaining at the end of the dissertation: how can mutual global solidarity take on a decision-making power such that the world's organized struggles against neoliberalism can form an acting counter-power without private property, necessary political exclusion, economic exploitation, or a centralization of this counter-power itself? While Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas provide excellent resources for constructing a new political philosophy of revolution, they are only able to lay the ground work to deal with this problem that has also yet to be resolved in the present revolutionary sequence at the level of the World Social Forum. This is a significant barrier to a real transition away from global capitalism and requires a further philosophical investigation into the currently emerging forms of political and philosophical experimentation that contribute to this problem's resolution.

CHAPTER II

POLITICAL HISTORY AND THE DIAGNOSTIC OF REVOLUTIONARY PRAXIS

> . . . neither Marx nor Engels ever came close to developing a theory of history, in the sense of an unpredictable historical event, unique and aleatory, nor indeed to developing a theory of political practice. I refer here to the politico-ideologico-social practice of political activism, of mass movements and of their eventual organizations, for which we possess no concepts and even less a coherent theory, in order for it to be apprehended in thought. Lenin, Gramsci, and Mao were only ably to partially think such a practice. The only theorist to think the political history of political practice in the present, was Machiavelli. There is here another huge deficit to overcome, the importance of which is decisive, and which, once again, sends us back to philosophy.
> (Althusser 1994)

Introduction

In light of its apparent exhaustion, how is it possible to return to revolution? This is the central problematic of this dissertation. Given the scope of such a question, I proposed in the previous chapter to focus my philosophical interrogation of this question on two figures in the history of the present revolutionary sequence who have been particularly influential to its development: Deleuze and Guattari, and the Zapatistas. Thus, in order to shed some light on the larger revolutionary sequence that began to take place at the end of the 20th century, I also proposed four distinct theoretical practices that help us clarify and develop this new political philosophy of revolution: (1) a multi-centered diagnostic of political power; (2) a prefigurative theory of political transformation; (3) a participatory theory of the body politic; and (4) a political theory of belonging based on mutual global solidarity. These four theories respond to four important questions concerning revolution and correspond with each chapter of this dissertation: What is the relationship between history and revolution? What is revolutionary transformation? How is it possible to sustain and carry out the consequences of a revolutionary transformation? And how do revolutions connect up each other to produce a new form of world-wide solidarity?

The previous chapter not only laid out the larger task of the dissertation as a whole but proposed a method for creating the four proposed concepts and an interpretive intervention for locating them in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas. Insofar as the concept of revolution plays a central role in the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas but is not thematized as such, this dissertation is bound by necessity to extract and reassemble a philosophy of revolution from the fragments found across their work. My aim in doing this is not to represent the entirety of their thought on revolution, but to build a specific set of theoretical practices that others may find useful in taking up a common struggle. Along with this method I also proposed to make a contributing intervention into the literature on Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas by reading them not as political theories and practices aimed at merely reforming the process of political representation or aimed at simply affirming the ontologically differential conditions of their potential for transformation, but reading them instead as political constructivists engaged in the creation of positive alternatives to state, party, and vanguard politics.[1]

Given the above philosophical framework I have put forward, this chapter responds to the first of the four questions above: "what is the relationship between history and revolution today?" In reply, this chapter argues that the return to revolution influenced by Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas can be characterized by a "diagnostic" theory of political history motivated by the relative rejection of all previous forms of historical

---

[1] While Deleuze and Guattari's critics do well to pin-point certain shortcomings, risks, or tendencies, particularly in Deleuze and Guattari's pre-*A Thousand Plateaus* writings, (political ambivalence, virtual hierarchy, and subjective paralysis) I also argued in chapter I, that there is a third approach to re-theorizing the concept of revolution in their philosophy that has been left out of this debate. Namely, one that does not simply affirm deterritorialization or difference-in-itself as a sufficient political concept, nor that merely relies on a critical analysis of power, but rather picks up where Deleuze and Guattari left off: with the creation of political concepts proper to concrete revolutionary situations. By drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's work after their "constructivist turn" in *A Thousand Plateaus,* I maintain that a specifically constructivist theory of revolution provides a viable third reading of their political work that is better equipped to overcome the dangers hindering a return of the concept of revolution today. This is similarly the case with the Zapatistas whose post 2003 constructivist turn is so often misunderstand as an "inward" and "silent" one.

representation (patriarchy, racism, statism, capitalism, vanguardism, etc.) and a concern for their immanent diagnosis in revolutionary praxis. My argument includes three crucial dimensions of this rejection of representation. Firstly, that it is a *relative* rejection, meaning that political representation always plays a more or less active role in political life even if only in the mode of "being warded off" by revolutionary praxis. That is, even in its relative absence, it still exerts force as an immanent historical potential of any political practice. Secondly, I argue that political representation is not an homogenous philosophical category, since there are several distinctly different types of representation. These differences are found not only in terms of content, such as race, class, gender, economics, and so on, but also in formal structure, such as coding, overcoding, and axiomatization. Thirdly, I argue that these types of relative representation always intersect and coexist with each other to different degrees in every political situation.

In order to defend these claims, this chapter is divided into three sections. The first begins by rejecting two notions of universal history: the notion of the *necessary* and sequential emergence of different types of political power and the notion of the *merely contingent and coexistent* emergence of different types of political power. Both of these notions, I argue, are unable to conceive of a sustained alternative to representational politics. The next two sections then propose an alternative theory of history based on its specifically diagnostic usage to help discern the immanent political dangers and opportunities of revolutionary praxis. Section two argues that Deleuze and Guattari's theory of historical topology functions as such a multi-centered political diagnostic. And section three argues that the Zapatistas practice of "diagnosing suffering" used in *La Otra Campagna* also functions as such a multi-centered political diagnostic (Marcos 2004b, 314).

Revolution and Universal History

In this first section, I distinguish the concept of a multi-centered political diagnostic from two competing and notions of universal history both unable to conceive of a sustained alternative to representational politics.

The Universal History of Succession

According to the first concept, universal history is the succession of inevitable moments of crisis moving toward increasingly superior forms of political organization. Revolution is thus a progressive, evolutionary, and teleological force. The notion that political history functions through the sequential passing of distinct instants or epochs relies on the idea of a unity, ground, or identity beneath these epochs such that they can both be distinguished from each other and from the ground upon which they pass. Each epoch is distinct but connected causally to the previous one under the condition of an underlying arrow of history itself. But whether this universal political succession is teleological, evolutionary, or progressive, it still defines revolution as the transformation of one state into another, guided by the knowledge of an underlying historical continuity between them. Revolutionary movements, according to this theory, proceed by a successive and increasingly accurate transformative repetition of states toward their predefined goal: the perfect state-form itself, state-liberalism, state-communism, state-capitalism, etc.

The problem that this theory of universal historical succession poses, however, is that because it assumes a pre-given synthesis of identity to account for the passing of causally different instants, it ends up reproducing only repetitions of the same historico-political presupposition without the possibility of external change: a universal history of states and their capture. It defines history as the tendency of the development of "x," where x is the perfection of the present dominant political ideology: the state form. In other words, the concept of succession pre-supposes a given present moment and then understands the

past and future as repetitions of this present moment: as effects of its primary cause. Unfortunately, this closes off the possibility that a contingent and revolutionary event might undermine this unity as such; that it might change the very presuppositions of history (and not simply repeat its underlying laws of relation: resemblance, representation, acquisition of state power, etc.). Historical succession can thus allow for change, but only within pre-given parameters themselves unchanged by new political events: there may be non-state power, but only as a developmental stage moving toward the perfection of state power.

What this theory of revolutionary history has failed to think, however, is a concept of non-state historical novelty. The question of a revolution's positive composition as a real form of power apart from the *telos* of state seizer has not yet been taken seriously. Revolutionary Marxism historically aimed to replace the bourgeois State-body with the communist Party-State-body, but what has yet to be thought today is a new kind of non-State body that would replace them both.[2]

The Universal History of Contingency

According to the second concept, universal history is the coexistent potentiality of multiple and contingent forces. Revolution in this case is the potentiality of transformation as such. The universal history of contingency rejects the concept of historical progress, teleology, the state, and an underlying historical unity. Unfortunately, the mere contingency and coexistence of historical political forms is insufficient for understanding how it is that revolutions actually emerge. One way of reading Deleuze and Guattari's concept of political history is to read it as the universal history of contingency and coexistence.

In *Deleuze and Guattari's Philosophy of History*, Jay Lampert argues precisely this. The universal history of succession "assumes," Lampart argues, "that events have their primary causal impact on just those events which they resemble; it treats events as if they were

[2] A "collective" or "participatory-body:" a political horizontalism.

entirely determined by prior causes unaffected either by chance or by subsequent events, and it reads events teleologically" (2006, 7). Opposed to succession, Lampert argues instead that

> we might think of time as the folding and unfolding of a topological field. When folded over on to itself, the field is present one small square at a time, with its other parts moved around back—present but backgrounded. When unfolded out again, the presents get reorganized, and new foregroundings take place. Instants are always being reformulated on the shifting topology; as the smallest possible points of view, they are in a sense real. In sum, the smallest points, and their order of presentation, are dependent on the folds and unfoldings of the general field that envelops them (2006, 16).

If we consider "universal history [as] the history of contingencies, and not the history of necessity" and historical events as folded intersections of all "previous, present, and future" events (some more foregrounded, others more backgrounded), then there can be no necessary or pre-given teleology, evolution, or progress in history, only different arrangements of temporally heterogenous moments continually open to recomposition (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 163). According to Deleuze and Guattari

> It is thus right to understand retrospectively all of history in the light of capitalism, on condition that we follow exactly the rules formulated by Marx: first, universal history is one of contingencies, and not of necessity; of breaks and limits, and not of continuity. For it required great chances, astonishing encounters, which could have been produced elsewhere, previously, or might never have been produced, in order that fluxes escape coding, and, escaping, would constitute no less a new machine determinable as a capitalist *socius*. . . . In short, universal history is not only retrospective, it is contingent, singular, ironic, and critical. (1983, 140)

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of universal history is thus ironic in the sense that it begins from the perspective of the "end" of history (capitalism), but that this "end" is not its final end. It is critical in the sense that it is continually pushing beyond the limits of capitalism toward the ever new elements that continue to break free from it, and it is singular in the sense that historical events are based on contingent encounters that do not express the same unified condition.

History is universal, for Deleuze and Guattari, not because a pre-given social identity is able to see itself in all its predecessors, but because capitalism has detached beings from

their "natural" or "proper" space-times to be exchanged on a world market. *These deterritorialized historical events are then able to bear directly upon the constitution of the present.* According to Lampert, the way around the neo-liberal *cul-de-sac* of political history is thus the "revolutionary potential of co-existential history" (140). "In short," Lampert argues, following Deleuze and Guattari's claim that "the undecidable is *par excellence* the germ and the place of revolutionary decisions" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 473), that "[revolutionary] events are contingent not because they do something new, but because they do something undecidable" (Lampert 2006, 169). If history is universally contingent and some or any of its revolutionary events of the past, present, or future may be contingently revived at any moment (the French revolution, May 1968, events-to-come, etc.) then the concept of revolution can never be exhausted and "the Deleuzian historian" becomes "the revolutionary who reorganizes bodies into war machines" and affirms the undecidable coexistence of all events as the potential for a new revolution (2006, 111).

But while I believe Lampert's account is well written and not inaccurate, I also believe that its contribution to a political philosophy of revolution is, as it is in *Anti-Oedipus*, radically insufficient. While it is true that a universal history of contingency and coexistence can be located in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy and is able to avoid the problems of succession, the undecidable affirmation of revolutionary co-existential potentiality, however, remains ultimately ambivalent. On this point I am in agreement with Badiou's criticisms of *Anti-Oedipus* in "Flux and the Party." Simply valorizing or affirming the historical potentiality of the political situation to "become other than it is" through the aleatory re-emergence of revolutionary historical events may be emancipatory just as much as it may mean the return of more archaically violent forms of repression or a new market opportunity for capitalism. While the universal history of contingency certainly admits the possibility of revolution, it does not directly contribute to its clarification or development.

In some places, however, Lampert's reading of Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of history does seem to offer us some clues to continue developing a theory of revolution based on this contingent coexistence of political events. "For a historical event," Lampert insists, "to be actualized at a particular moment in time means nothing other than for it to exhibit all four kinds of temporal relations [territorial, statist, capitalist, and nomadic] at once, all of which are real, and all of which are diagrammed together concretely" (2006, 17). Lampert may not have used this method to understand the actualization of revolutionary praxis, but it is the aim of this chapter to do so.

Deleuze and Guattari's Historical Topology

What Is Political History?

How then are we to understand political history such that non-representational revolutionary praxis is not only possible but actually constructed? So far I have argued that it cannot be by necessity, progress, and state-seizer, nor can it be by mere contingency and coexistence. Neither of these offer us a way to understand a sustained political alternative to the history of representational politics. Taking Lampert's lead seriously however, I argue in this next section that we can use Deleuze and Guattari's theory of historical topology as a multi-centered diagnostic of revolutionary praxis. Doing so, we can extract a truly revolutionary use of political history untethered to representation and the affirmation of undecidable contingency. Although first begun in *Anti-Oedipus*, I believe the best resources for reading Deleuze and Guattari's theory of history as a revolutionary diagnostic are to be found in *A Thousand Plateaus*. While Deleuze and Guattari do not directly describe their theory of historical topology as a "multi-centered political diagnostic," nor do they use it for the sole purpose of assessing the positive power of revolutionary struggle, I argue that doing so will resolve our dilemma and help us asses the dangers of building a revolutionary praxis:

by "diagramming all its four kinds of temporal relations together, concretely" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 435).[3]

To this end, and following the above quote from *A Thousand Plateaus*, in this section I describe three of the different historical political processes described by Deleuze and Guattari in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* and argue that these processes are useful for diagnosing the dangers and opportunities for revolutionary transformation, even though Deleuze and Guattari did not completely do so themselves. To what degree does a revolutionary situation operate by territorial coding, statist overcoding, or capitalist axiomatics? What dangers do these pose to revolutionary praxis? But the argument that Deleuze and Guattari's theory of history should be used as a political diagnostic is not an original argument on my part and has, to some degree, been made by others, whose work I draw on in my own reading (Bell and Colebrook 2009). What *is* original in my reading however, is that I focus this diagnostic specifically on the question of the actualization of revolution and the dangers it faces as a *positive* (not merely potential or undecidable) form of power.

At this point, however, the reader might be wondering where Deleuze and Guattari have derived these three political processes and why we should draw on them to understand the contemporary return to revolution. Firstly, the political processes of territorial coding, statist overcoding, and capitalist axiomatization did not fall from the sky. Deleuze and Guattari spend the vast majority of *Anti-Oedipus* and a good part of *A Thousand Plateaus* extracting the general characteristics of these processes from the concrete practices and events of political history by drawing on a variety of well known sociologists, anthropologists, archeologists, and historians. For Deleuze and Guattari, these political processes are not universal categories imposed upon history and political life from the

[3] I deal with the fourth kind of temporal relation in chapter IV and V.

outside. But neither are they merely reducible to the concrete empirical phenomena that they are meant to characterize. Statist overcoding, for example, is not an empirical state nor is it a universal category given in advance and by necessity; it is, as Foucault says, a "process of statification" (2008, 77). For Deleuze and Guattari, these three processes of political power have no fixed essence or universality independent from the contingent and concrete effects that compose them. In fact, they are themselves nothing but effects, the mobile shape of a perpetual process in the sense that they are incessant transactions which modify, move, or change. But within these changes there are still general characteristics of each process that remain "transcendentally empirical" (See Bryant 2008). That is, they are transcendental in the sense that they describe the conditions under which a wide variety of phenomena occur, but they are also empirical in the sense that they are real, singular, mutable, and historically contingent themselves. Being contingent, however, also means that they may reappear and disappear at different moments in history and in different combinations.[4]

Secondly, and accordingly, we should use Deleuze and Guattari's theory of historical topology to understand the relationship between history and revolution because unlike the political history of succession, which Lampert rightly critiques, historical topology is able to theorize the possibility of the novel and non-representational process that characterizes the contemporary return to revolution. Opposed to assuming a prior historical unity based on states, and here I am in full agreement with Lampert, Deleuze and Guattari develop a political history of contingency based on revolutionary potential. If we want to be able to think a return to revolution that is not based on the teleological political development of state, party, or vanguard representation, then we need to be able to think of history as both contingent and topological. Exactly how Deleuze and Guattari succeed at this task is the subject of several scholarly works (Burchill 2007). However, the argument I put forward in

[4] Beyond their usefulness as diagnostic tools, these processes have no universally descriptive power.

this section moves beyond the scholarship on this topic that has for the most part read Deleuze and Guattari as proposing a *merely* potential and topological theory of history. I argue instead that Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of political history it is not merely topological, but that it should be used as a *diagnostic* of political power in order to construct a positive revolutionary praxis. We should use Deleuze and Guattari's historical topology as more than the mere accurate description of the world and its potential for transformation; we should use it to build another world within it that actively wards off representational politics.

Before describing the general characteristics of each of these processes and arguing for their use as a multi-centered political diagnostic of revolutionary praxis, I want to highlight the four central characteristics of Deleuze and Guattari's topological theory of political history that guide my argument. Political history, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is (1) topological, (2) applied immanently "in the course of events" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 251), (3) exists as a mix of political processes, and (4) is able to help us to avoid the dangers of political representation.

(1) Political History Is Topological

> It was a decisive event when the mathematician Riemann uprooted the multiple from its predicate state and made it a noun, "multiplicity." It marked the end of dialectics and the beginning of a typology and topology of multiplicities. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 482–83)

Taken from mathematics, the concept of a topological field is a single surface composed of multiple heterogeneous points that are connected together by foldings or morphisms in their surface (like a piece of origami). Independent of linear contiguity, succession, or dialectics, topological shapes move and change by folding themselves into new

networks of relations. Sierpiński's sponge, Von Koch's curve without tangent, and Mandelbrot's fractals are examples of iterated topological fields in geometry.[5]

The concept of a specifically topological theory of political history thus provides a way to consider political events as having several overlapping and contingent tendencies at once, each to a greater or lesser degree. For example, perhaps a political event has a strong anti-capitalist tendency but also has a strong territorial or religious tendency toward patriarchal norms that weakly manifests as a non-national solidarity across borders. This heterogeneity is not a matter of contradiction or exclusion. Topologically speaking, there is no central axis or "essential political ideology" operating here. There is only a relative mix of political tendencies folded on top of each other without a fixed center or necessary relationship. Each of these political tendencies, according to Deleuze and Guattari, acts as the "loci of a topology that defines primitive societies here, States there, and elsewhere war machines" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 430). Thus, topologically speaking these political tendencies or types are really distinct insofar as they occupy different locations, and yet they can also be contingently connected insofar as the coexistent space itself folds them together. If we imagine political events as successive points on a line, then there is no way for one point to directly affect another except through a mediated chain of causal unity. However if we imagine political events as heterogeneous points on a one-dimensional folded surface, then any event can be directly connected to any other in any combination by spatial proximity: without mediation or causal unity.[6]

The consequence of this political coexistence, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is that "these directions are equally present in all social fields, in all periods. It even happens that they partially merge" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 360). All political types merge and

---

[5] See (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 487) for diagrams of these images.

[6] This point is similarly argued in (Lampert 2006, 16).

coexist simultaneously in all social fields at once in the sense that they actively ward each other off and prevent what is to come while also providing the conditions for their replacement. Kinship relations in primitive societies, for example, Deleuze and Guattari argue, actively anticipate the state capture of their surplus storage and the decoded flows of capital, but also actively ward them off through specific practices of *potlatch* and alliance (marriages, dowries) with other tribes. In this sense there is a "presentiment" or action of the inexistent future upon the present already in action, even if the "future" form does not empirically exist yet.

Primitive societies cannot ward off the formation of an empire or State without anticipating it, and they cannot anticipate it without its already being there, forming part of their horizon. And States cannot effect a capture unless what is captured coexists, resists in primitive societies, or escapes under new forms, as towns or war machines (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 435). Thus, "To ward off is also to anticipate" they say (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 431). Even contemporary physics and biology have developed similar notions of "reverse causalities" that are without finality but testify to the action of the future on the present, or of the present on the past (Prigogine and Stengers 1997).

(2) Political History Is Applied in the Course of Events

But Deleuze and Guattari's historical topology or "speculative cartography…is not there to provide an inventory of modes of existence" (Stivale 1998), or provide an exhaustive taxonomy of beings. Such an inventory would presuppose a higher unity or totality of being from which to derive its universality. Only when a political history, Deleuze and Guattari say, "ceases to express a hidden unity, becoming itself a dimension of the multiplicity under consideration" does it cease to represent a political situation and become constitutive *of* it (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 22). That is, the revolutionary situation does not pre-exist its topological construction, it "must be made" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 6),

or expressed *through* the diagnostic labor itself, such "that one cannot distinguish it from the existential territory" (Stivale 1998, 219). There is thus, as Deleuze and Guattari say, "no difference between the map and the territory. That means that there is no transposition, that there is no translatability, and therefore no possible taxonomy. The modelization here is a producer of existence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 219).

When Deleuze and Guattari describe the kinship relations of credit and debt in primitive societies or the desert wanderings of moses' nomads, these are not anthropological or historical claims meant to represent or factually reference some past "state of affairs" accurately or inaccurately as some critics have misunderstood (Miller 1993). Representational anthropology and history presuppose a prior unity of humanity and time such that one point may stand in for another through succession and identity. Rather, Deleuze and Guattari draw on anthropology and history "to isolate certain political concepts, concepts which are proper to politics, but which can only be formed philosophically" (Deleuze 1989, 280). Such political concepts do not bear any resemblance to the situation but are a dimension of it, constitutive and expressive of it.

Thus, historical topology does not ask if characteristics accurately represent the truth of the state of affairs or what they mean, signify, symbolize, or stand for. Instead it composes a practical dimension of how they work and what they *do*. Topology is thus a creative practice: a constructivism itself transformed by what it transforms.

(3) Political History Exists as a Mix of Political Processes

But if political history is not the continuous evolution of a single *telos*, or the pure potentiality of coexistence as such, but rather the contingent, multiple, and folded mix of "aggregates of consistency," or "consolidations of very heterogeneous elements, " in co-existing historical events, then how can we explain time: the quasi-historical phenomena of limited political sequences, retroactive interpretations, dates, causes, and breakdowns

(Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 335)? If every event in history is coexistent then how are we to distinguished different topologically mixed "blocks of becoming" from one another?

Every situation or "block of becoming," as Deleuze and Guattari call it, has its own particular admixture of political types that are more or less anticipated or prevented. For instance, different political processes may create blockages to transformation in a situation through different modes of historico-political succession: territorial successions of genealogy and filiation, state successions-in-coexistence of pre-given laws and despots, and capitalist coexistences of successions through axiomatic exchange on the world market.[7] Succession exists then, not with a presupposed unity of time, but as a secondary effect of a more primary network of folds in a political topology.

These "mixed regimes," Deleuze and Guattari say, "presuppose these transformations from one regime to another, past, present, or potential (*as a function of the creation of new regimes*)" [my italics] (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 436). That is, because all political events are potentially or virtually active in any given event (and must be warded off or precipitated) they do not constitute a necessary succession but can produce the effect of one. A political topology based on thresholds and neighborhoods (statism here, territorial formations there, etc.) accounts for distinct "sequences" through transhistorical folding. Completely heterogenous space-times are held together through a particular "sequence" of resurrected and prefiguring components given a historical name and date to mark their configuration. Sequence is then constructed from topological heterogeneity. Dates and names thus do not refer to or represent past or future political events but are simply markers indicating the creation of a "sequence."

"Contrary to the Marxist view," according to Paul Patton, "no single logic of development governs the direction of history understood in these terms. All events are the

[7] I use here Jay Lampert's historico-political distinction between these three regimes of representation.

effects of the interplay of forces, as things are transformed or reinterpreted to serve new ends" (2000, 56). Instead of asking how a political event further articulates the becoming of a pre-given "end of history," we should ask instead, "what are the relative blockages, anticipations and mixed political processes at work in a given event?," "how do future events transform those of the past and present, and how do those of the past transform those of the future?" That is, "what is the relative mixture of the event's political anticipations and repressions?" and "how can we avoid the dangers of representation while creating a constructive alternative?" In this way we can use Deleuze and Guattari's political topology as a diagnostic to avoid the blockage of an identity-based universal history (that understands difference only as a difference *from* the same) and the ambivalence of a universal history that merely affirms the potentiality of revolutionary coexistence.

(4) Political History Helps us Avoid the Dangers of Political Representation

The goal of political history is to aid in determining the dangers that confront a revolutionary praxis. As Deleuze and Guattari pose the issue after writing *Anti-Oedipus*, "the problem one always comes up against is how to ensure that the movements of decoding, the movements of deterritorialization, are revolutionarily positive, but at the same time that they do not recreate artificial forms like perversion or the family, that is, that they do not create in their own way types of codes and territorialities" (Deleuze 1972).[8]

In order to effectively avoid "social orders of representation," as Deleuze and Guattari call them, a political and topological history must be able to distinguish between types and deselect the ones that isolate, self-destruct, or try and capture all other modes of valorization (1983, 262). The mono-mania of movements demanding recognition of their

[8] Deleuze, Seminar of 7 March 1972. "*Le problème auquel on se heurte toujours, c'est comment faire pour que les mouvements de décodage, les mouvements de déterritorialisation soit à la fois révolutionnairement positifs et qu'à la fois ils ne recréent pas des formes comme perverses ou des formes artificielles de famille, c'est à dire qu'ils ne recréent pas à leur manière des espèces de codes et de territorialités*."

single-issue causes, the subjection of citizens by legal and representational statism, the global machinic enslavement by techno-capitalist market production, and no less the lines of escape from these dangers that fail to create new alternatives, potentially falling instead into the black holes of revolutionary purity, drugs, or cynicism, are all coexisting potential dangers.

But as Deleuze and Guattari say, "politics is by no means an apodictic science. It proceeds by experimentation, groping in the dark, injection, withdrawal, advances, retreats. The factors of decision and prediction are limited" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 461). Since the very practice of historical topology is, as they define it, constitutive of the situation, any "identification" of "what types are functioning here" is both effective and effected by acts of determination. Hence historical topology is by no means axiomatic or formally unaffected by the determinations it makes. Rather, it is at each point reciprocally transformed in an experimental feedback loop always in danger and requiring caution. Revolution is thus not an unrestrained unleashing of desire, freedom, or lines of flight, nor is it a matter of having "the right plan." Rather it's a risky experimentation requiring caution and commitment to lay out a practical diagnostic of action: adding one more dimension or fold to the last.

Revolution is neither about a progressive strategic assault on state power, nor its absolute potential to contingently allow things to become other than they are. Rather, a revolutionary situation is a specifically held tension of heterogenous historical/political forces of anticipation and prevention. It is the diagnostic creation of new space-times or consistent events simultaneous and coexistent to the forces and dangers of political representation. It is not a radically external force, but rather an exterior force folded into the interior of the situation: it is, or can be, as Guattari says, an "anti-capitalist force within capitalism" (1996, 89).[9] How then should we use Deleuze and Guattari's concept of

[9] "I am in favor of market economy but not geared only at profit and its valorization of status, hierarchy and power. I am in favor of an institutional market economy, one founded on another mode of valorization. Instead of being more capitalistic, we want to make anti-capitalism within capitalism" (Guattari 1996, 89).

historical topology as a creative diagnostic of the positive (not merely potential) power of revolutionary praxis?

Historical Topology as Diagnostic of Revolutionary Praxis

I have thus far argued two points. Firstly, that the renewal of the concept of a non-representational revolution is blocked by two theories of universal history. If history is the unity of successive moments culminating in political representation, then non-representational revolutionary novelty is impossible. If history is a virtual coexistence of contingent moments, then revolutionary novelty is possible but ambivalent. Secondly, I argued that Deleuze and Guattari's concept of political history provides an alternative to both these theories insofar as it is (1) topological, (2) applied immanently "in the course of events," (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 251). (3) exists as a mix of political processes, and (4) is able to help us to avoid the dangers of political representation (although the exact details of these dangers will be addressed in the following section). In what follows I will argue in this next section that this historical topology should be understood as indicative of a new revolutionary strategy based on its use as a diagnostic of revolutionary praxis.

In order to do this I examine each one of the political processes described by Deleuze and Guattari (territorial coding, statist overcoding, and capitalist axiomatization) in detail and show how each diagnoses a type of representational process that poses a danger for revolutionary praxis: (a) territorial representation poses the dangers of mono-mania and micro-fascism; (b) state representation poses the dangers of fear, machinic enslavement, and subjectification; and (c) capitalist representation poses the dangers of total war, and a new form of machinic enslavement.

(1) Territorial Representation

Territorial political representation, a concept Deleuze and Guattari extract[10] from the practices of "primitive societies," is characterized by what they call coding, supple segmentation, and itinerancy. But "why return to the primitives, when it is a question of our own life?" Deleuze and Guattari ask (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 209). One of the more politically significant (and yet under-attended) moves Deleuze and Guattari make away from *Anti-Oedipus* is to extend their political typology, previously restricted to libidinal and economic domains, into a broader "general logic of assemblages" in *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze 2006, 177). According to Deleuze, the features that previously characterized the historical, libidinal, and economic sequences of primitivism, statism, and capitalism in *Anti-Oedipus* become, in *A Thousand Plateaus,* the general political and topological features of all kinds of assemblages. Following this, the present approach extracts only the most basic and transferable aspects of these three logics without suturing their origins to the narrowly historical context in which they emerge in *Anti-Oedipus*. Topologically, as I have shown, the basic characteristics of all historical political processes can be just as operative in the past as they can be in the present or future.[11]

(i) Coding, Supple Segmentation, and Itinerancy

Territorial representation, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is characterized by the use of polyvocal codes, supple kinds of segmentation, and itinerant territories. These are the basic processes, according to Jason Read, by which social "traditions, prescriptions, and rules bearing on the production and distribution of goods, prestige, and desire" are represented in a political situation (2006, 142). They are the "natural" norms of social life. Territorial

[10] Deleuze and Guattari do not claim to be representing actual primitive peoples lives or doing an anthropology (even though they cite anthropologists). Their goal it so create concepts that are heterogenous to these practices and yet connect to them and coexist along side them.

[11] Nick Thoburn offers and excellent account of this topology in action on the subject of political militancy. See (Thoburn 2009).

processes express the pre-given, essential, and proper limits and usage of persons and objects in a given situation by repressing decoded flows (the unexplainable) and re-presenting others as coded (meaningful) ones. Codes are thus naturalized as "related to the past, to an inscription of memory, 'this is how things are done, how they have always been done'" (1983, 142). According to *Anti-Oedipus*, these "qualitatively different chains of mobile and limited code" are formed by three basic actions: 1) "a selection cut" allowing something to pass through and circulate, 2) "a detachment cut" that blocks part of that circulation, and 3) a "redistribution of the remainder" to begin a new chain of code (1983, 247).

The processes of coding, Deleuze and Guattari say, begins not on the basis of a primary code but from a territorial repression of "uncoded or decoded flows": a kind of primordial ch1983,s inherent to the earth itself. Before there are any social norms or traditions there is a more primary "scission" (1983, 153) where the "whole process of production is inscribed, on which the forces and means of labor are recorded, and the agents and the products distributed" (1983, 141). Confronted with the "terrifying nightmare" (1983, 140) of this essentially ch1983,tic and fragmented world, territorial peoples repress these uncoded flows and inscribe upon this ch1983,s their own territorial representations (140).

The first synthesis of territorial coding (the synthesis of connection) attempts to ward off this chaos by making a "selection cut" from these uncoded flows allowing some of them to pass through while others are blocked. This primary repression of non-codable flows accomplishes two things: it wards off an absolutely chaotic world by deselecting some of its flows, and it puts into circulation and connection the others to be coded. By marking a separation of *some* of these non-coded flows the connective synthesis is able to serialize and qualitatively organize them into an identity, "coded stock" or what Deleuze and Guattari call an "inscription on a full body" or "socius." The "entry pole" of selection here initiates a

filiative line following a genealogical or hereditary decent of hierarchically coded stock: codes of kinship, codes of worship, codes of communication, codes of exchange, codes of location (places of worship, places for eating, places for trash). Everything has its proper code: the proper time for revolution, the proper people to undertake it.

The second synthesis of territorial coding (the disjunctive synthesis or "detachment cut") also accomplishes two tasks: it blocks some of these connections from attaching themselves to the political body (by code prohibitions, limits, etc.) so that a finite stock of code may circulate within a qualitatively distinct territory, and detaches a remainder or "residual energy" in order to begin a new chain of code further along. These are the borders to towns, prohibitions on kinship, and boundaries to racial, ethnic, and gender identities. The revolutionary vanguard similarly detaches itself from the proletariat mass and forges ahead of them. These are the limits produced by the disjunctive synthesis.

The third synthesis of territorial coding (the conjunctive synthesis or the "redistribution of the remainder") wards off the fusion of all codes into a single qualitative stock by producing a residuum, but also begins a new line of code by redistributing this surplus through an alliance with different lines of code. There are many different mechanisms for warding off the fusion of codes and redistributing surplus code through alliances with other lines of code: practices of *potlatch* (giving away wealth in order to gain prestige), practices of *struggle* (itinerant raids and theft eliminating accumulation), practices of *dowry* (giving away wealth and establishing alliances with other kinship lines) gifts and counter gifts, etc.

These codes, lineages, and territories "form a fabric of relatively supple segmentarity" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 208). Codes and territorial representations segment us from all around and in every direction, Deleuze and Guattari say in *A Thousand Plateaus* (208). "The house is segmented according to its rooms' assigned purposes; streets,

according to the order of the city; the factory, according to the nature of the work and operations performed in it" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 208). There are, according to Deleuze and Guattari,

> multiple *binary* segments "following the great major dualist oppositions: social classes, but also men-women, adults-children, and so on," *circular* segments, "in ever larger circles, ever wider disks or coronas, like Joyce's 'letter': my affairs, my neighborhood's affairs, my city's, my country's, the world's," and *linear* segments, "along a straight line or a number of straight lines, of which each segment represents an episode or 'proceeding': as soon as we finish one proceeding we begin another, forever proceduring or procedured, in the family, in school, in the army, on the job. School tells us, 'You're not at home anymore'; the army tells us, 'You're not in school anymore.'" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 208)

Sometimes the segments belong to individuals or groups, and sometimes the individuals or groups belong to many segments at once and change according to the perspective. Territorial segments frequently have a leeway between the two poles of chaotic scission and static fusion. They have considerable communicability between heterogeneous elements such that one segment may fit with another in many ways without the prior determination of a base domain (economic, political juridical, artistic, etc.). They have situated properties and relations independent of any structure and have a continuous activity such that segmentarity is always segmentarity-in-progress, operating by outgrowths, detachments, and mergings.

Finally, "by switching territories at the conclusion of each operation period (itinerancy, itineration)," and within each operation period repeating a temporal series that tends toward its marginal or limit object, primitive political distributions create a "disequilibrium of excess and deficiency" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 440). That is, every time a territory is delimited, an outside or surplus is produced through this process of delimitation or "detachment." This surplus or credit is then redistributed to another line (through an alliance) where it will again produce a surplus and so on in a perpetual disequilibrium: making its very dysfunction an essential element of its ability to function

(1983, 151). But what would it mean to use this as a diagnostic of a positive revolutionary praxis?

(ii) Errors and Dangers of Territorial Representation for Revolutionary Praxis

As a diagnostic tool, and not as a mere historical contingency, territorial representation reveals two errors and two dangers within revolutionary praxis. "The first [error]," Deleuze and Guattari say, "is axiological and consists in believing that a little suppleness is enough to make things 'better'" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 215).

Supple reforms based on the representation of an essential group identity only appear to be transformative when in fact they leave deeper structural problems intact. That is, if revolutionary movements produce their own coded values, essential meanings, and segmented territories, they may appear to have made important reforms by legitimating their own identities/values. But by representing their culture as a coded identity, they are only that much easier to incorporate into a flexible but not radically transformable state-capitalism with a "human face."

"The second [error], Deleuze and Guattari say, "is psychological, as if the molecular [territorial] were in the realm of the imagination and applied only to the individual and interindividual. But there is just as much social-Real on one line as on the other" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 215). That is, territorial social struggles may not be state politics but that does not mean that they are "social-imaginaries," reducible to psychological or phenomenological cases of subjects-who-imagine. Segmentary distributions are real political representations even if they are not represented by the state.[12]

The first danger of supple segmentarity, Deleuze and Guattari say, is the clarity of

[12] There are two other dangers. "Third, the two forms [state and primitive] are not simply distinguished by size," but by type of distribution. Fourth Finally, the qualitative distinction between the two [state overcoding and territorial coding] does not preclude the two cutting into each other or boosting each other in inverse proportion (215).

"monomania." That is,

> Interactions without resonance. Instead of the great paranoid fear [of the state], we are trapped in a thousand little monomanias, self-evident truths, and clarities that gush from every black hole and no longer form a system, but are only rumble and buzz, blinding lights giving any and everybody the mission of self-appointed judge, dispenser of justice, policeman, neighborhood SS man. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 228)

Monomania is the danger that revolutionary movements can become what Deleuze and Guattari call "neoterritorialities," gangs, bands, minorities, margins, and "tribalisms" that "continue to affirm the rights of segmentary societies" but tend to persist within the interiority of the state. These neoterritorialities remain relatively independent from each other by presuming a coded clarity of their own issue, campaign, or identity. However, the clarity afforded by independent single-issue struggles is ultimately unable to form a cohesive alternative to state-capitalism.

> These modern archaisms are extremely complex and varied. Some are mainly folkloric, but they nonetheless represent social and potentially political forces (from domino players to home brewers via the Veterans of Foreign Wars). Others are enclaves whose archaism is just as capable of nourishing a modern fascism as of freeing a revolutionary charge (the ethnic minorities, the Basque problem, the Irish Catholics, the Indian reservations)…(neighborhood territorialities, territorialities of the large aggregates, "gangs"). Others are organized or promoted by the State, even though they might turn against the State and cause it serious problems (regionalism, nationalism). (1983, 257–58)

While the revolutionary potential of these groups is not to be dismissed entirely (the second error), the danger of political isolation and single-issue reform campaigns, without the larger horizons of revolution, remain as exceptions that only prove the rule of state-capitalism (Žižek 1997).

The second danger of supple segmentarity for revolutionary praxis is what Deleuze and Guattari call "microfascism." Coded revolutionary movements, bands, gangs, sects, families, towns, and neighborhoods can recreate, on their own territorial scale, the hierarchical, authoritarian organization present at the state bureaucratic level. Within

revolutionary struggles, patriarchal, racist, classist, etc., codes and segments can all reappear. These microfascisims spare no one. "Leftist organizations will not be the last to secrete microfascisms," Deleuze and Guattari warn us. "It's too easy to be antifascist on the molar level, and not even see the fascist inside you, the fascist you yourself sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 215). Supple segmentarity may undermine the rigid state segments, "but everything that it dismantles it reassembles on its own level: micro-Oedipuses, microformations of power, microfascisms" (1987, 205).

But what dangers are posed for revolutionary praxis when these segmentary processes begin to resonate together in a process of state overcoding?

(2) State Representation

The second type of historical political process that Deleuze and Guattari describe in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* and that I argue can be used as a diagnostic of revolutionary praxis, is state representation. Just as territorial representation operates between the two poles of fusion and scission, state representation operates between two poles: the despotic and the juridical. While the first pole of the state brings coded territories into a resonance of concentric circles through the process of what Deleuze and Guattari call "overcoding" and "machinic enslavement," the more developed juridical pole of the state disciplines the territories through law and "social subjection." While the first creates public stocks of land, work, and money in order to extract rent, profit, and tax, the second creates private property and legal contracts in order to circulate land, work, and money horizontally among symmetrically related citizens. The despotic pole of the state is characterized by overcoding and rigid segmentation and poses two dangers for revolutionary movements, fear and machinic enslavement, while the juridical pole of the state poses the danger of social subjection. I examine each pole of the state and its dangers for revolutionary praxis in turn.

(i) The Despotic State Pole

Despotic state representation is characterized by its overcoding of territorial codes and its rigid segmentation of territorially supple segments. Instead of the surplus code generated through territorial representation that would normally form an alliance with other blocks of code, this surplus of code may instead begin to form an unchecked accumulation (agricultural, social, political, etc.) requiring the maintenance of a specialized body. This special body of accumulation then reacts back upon the territories and brings them into resonance around a centralized point of transcendence: the despot. The extended filitations of old communities and groups are then replaced by the direct filiation of the despot to his deity while the lateral alliances are replaced by a new alliance of the despot with his people. Overcoding, according to Deleuze and Guattari, thus:

> makes points resonate together, points that are not necessarily already town-poles but very diverse points of order, geographic, ethnic, linguistic, moral, economic, technological particularities. It makes the town resonate with the countryside. It operates by stratification; in other words, it forms a vertical, hierarchized aggregate that spans the horizontal lines in a dimension of depth. In retaining given elements, it necessarily cuts off their relations with other elements, which become exterior, it inhibits, slows down, or controls those relations; if the State has a circuit of its own, it is an internal circuit dependent primarily upon resonance, it is a zone of recurrence that isolates itself from the remainder of the network, even if in order to do so it must exert even stricter controls over its relations with that remainder. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 433)

State overcoding is thus characterized by centralized accumulation, forced resonance of diverse points of order, "laying out a divisible homogenous space striated in all directions" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 223), and by its vertical and redundant center (on top), scanning all the radii. The figure of the despot or emperor, as he is called in *A Thousand Plateaus,* is the "sole and transcendent public-property owner, the master of the surplus or the stock and the source of public functions and bureaucracy" (427–28). The state is the bond or knot that deterritorializes the polyvocal political segments and forces them into a new regime of overcoding.

Just as there are three kinds of supple segmentation, Deleuze and Guattari also describe three kinds of rigid segmentation proper to the process of statification: binary, circular, and linear. Whereas binary supple segmentations are defined by multiple binaries that are always determined by a third (an alliance between the two), binary rigid segmentations are self-sufficient and assure the prevalence of one segment over the other (hierarchy). Whereas circular supple segments do not imply the same center but a multiplicity of centers (round but not quite circular), circular rigid segments form a resonance of concentric circles around an axis of rotation, converging on a single point of accumulation. Whereas linear supple segmentation functions by "segments-in-progress," alignments but no straight line, and supple morphological formations, linear rigid segments function by homogenized segments geometrically organized around a dominant segment through which they pass: a space or "*spatio*" rather than a place or territory.

But there remains no opposition between the central and the territorial. The state is a global whole, unified and unifying, but it is so only because it implies a constellation of juxtaposed, imbricated, ordered subsystems: a whole micropolitical fabric (pedagogical, juridical, economic, familial, sexual). As Foucault similarly observes, the most general character of the statification consists in organizing these micropolitical arts of governmentality around a sovereign agency (Foucault 2007, 11–12). Hierarchy is, thus, not simply pyramidal, it is differential because territorial and State distributions are "inseparable, overlapping and entangled… forming a supple fabric without which their rigid segments would not hold" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 213).

(ii) The Dangers of State Representation for Revolutionary Praxis

Despotic state representation, I argue, poses at least two significant dangers for revolutionary praxis: fear and "machinic enslavement." Despotic regimes create a generalized terror and paranoia of scission resolvable only by a transcendent unity, "national security is

at risk! Let the executive decide." "The more rigid the segmentarity, the more reassuring it is for us," Deleuze and Guattari say (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 227). States often declare a "state of emergency" in order to suspend normal law and stop riots, demonstrations, or potential revolutions. The more violent the state's response to popular revolt, the "safer" the population is under the state's protection. Revolutions themselves also risk creating a party-state apparatus that makes everyone a piece in a single megamachine. "There is enslavement," Deleuze and Guattari say, "when human beings themselves are constituent pieces of a machine that they compose among themselves and with other things (animals, tools) under the control and direction of a higher unity" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 456–457). Really existing socialist states in Russia and China were examples of revolutions turned state megamachines.

(iii) The Juridical State Pole

At the other pole of the state overcoding process is the juridical pole of the city-state defined by its topical conjugations and its danger of social subjection. According to Deleuze and Guattari, while despotic States certainly included towns, depending on how complete the State's monopoly over foreign trade is, town distributions tend to "break free when the State's overcoding itself provoke[s] decoded flows" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 434). Eastern empires, they continue, had created large stockpiles that *trading towns* (like ancient Athens) took advantage of without having to constitute a stock of their own (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 432). Juridical town distributions thus formed topical conjunctions that were achieved through this autonomy, or else through corporative and commercial networks freed from the despotic State-form of asiatic production.

As despotic rigid segmentations unleash flows of decoded functionaries necessary for collecting taxes, rent, and profit, keeping laws, and policing, so legal conjunctions harness and engender these flows into towns but keep them from streaming together. Topical

conjunctions are magisterial or legal structures immanent to towns that "stand as so many knots or recodings" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 452) and act as distinct focal points in resonance with the State. Yet they also form their own network of camps, fortifications, and "boundary lines" in place of the previous territorial segments-in-progress. Imperial law thus undergoes a mutation, becoming subjective, disciplinary, and conjunctive. "And unlike the relatively uniform imperial pole, this second pole presents the most diverse of forms. But as varied as relations of personal dependence are, they always mark qualified and topical conjunctions" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 451).

(iv) The Danger of Juridical Representation for Revolutionary Praxis

> There is subjection when the higher unity constitutes the human subject linked to a now exterior object, which can be an animal, tool, or even a machine. The human being is no longer a component of the machine but a worker, a user. He or she is subjected *to* the machine and no longer enslaved *by* the machine. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 457)

Opposed to being a cog in a megamachine, the processes of juridical subjectification constitutes human beings as subjects of an external machine. Revolutionary praxis risks either subordinating itself to juridical representation as a form of resistance against the despotic state (law suits, human rights, and legal representation, etc.), or it risks re-creating juridical representation in its own autonomous territories (popular justice, Maoist people's courts, etc.). Laws, contracts, and conventions discipline and create private citizens. These laws are then enforced by local revolutionary officials. Private individuals are users of contracts and workers of animals, tools, and machines, no longer just one more part in a megamachine. They are users of machines held together by the transconsistency of being subjects of the law. But the egalitarian pretensions and human face of such subjection should not conceal the local centralization of power, hierarchy, and disciplinary apparatuses of juridical representation set in motion to force the coordination of subjects.[13]

---

[13] See "On popular justice: a discussion with Maoists" in (Foucault 1980, 1–37).

(3) Capitalist Representation

The third type of historical political process that Deleuze and Guattari describe in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* and that I argue can be used as a diagnostic of revolutionary praxis, is capitalist representation. Where Deleuze and Guattari defined territorial representation by its codes and microfascisms, despotic representation by its overcoding and machinic enslavements, and juridical representation by its topical conjugations and social subjections, they define capitalist representation by its axiomatization and its new form of machinic enslavement.

(i) Axiomatics

Deleuze and Guattari define capitalist representation by its processes of axiomatization. An axiom, they say, is an independent or disengaged point that forces unqualified elements into homologous quantitative relations (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 138). Axioms are not theoretical propositions, they say, but "operative statements that enter as component parts into the assemblages of production, circulation, and consumption" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987 461). That is, Deleuze and Guattari do not mean the word "axiomatic" as a scientific "metaphor;" *social* axiomatics are not derived from scientific, mathematical, or logical axiomatics,[14] but the reverse: "The true axiomatic is that of the social machine itself, which takes the place of the old codings and organizes all the decoded flows, including the flows of scientific and technical code, for the benefit of the capitalist system and in the service of its ends" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 233).

So whereas codes determine the *qualities* of flows (types of places, types of goods, types of activity) and establish indirect relations (of alliance) between these

[14] Badiou claims that mathematics (specifically axiomatic set theory) alone is the thinking of Being qua Being. Social and political being, for Badiou, are thus derived from the more primary ontological axioms of set theory that are independent from phenomenological or political transformations and their affections. So when Badiou claims that Deleuze has no political philosophy but only an ethics, this cannot be the case since axiomatics, according to Deleuze and Guattari, are primarily social and political mechanisms they are not purely mathematical but an effect of a larger social axiomatic.

incommensurable, qualified, mobile, limited codes, and overcodes (as well as topical conjunctions) capture and recode these flows through extra-economic forces (political or juridical), capitalist axioms establish a strictly economic general equivalence between purely *unqualified* (decoded) flows.

The axiomatic, however, is not the invention of capitalism, Deleuze and Guattari say, since it is identical with capitalism itself. Rather, capitalism is the offspring or result, which merely insures the regulation of the axiomatic; "it watches over or directs progress toward a saturation of the axiomatic and the corresponding widening of the limits" (1983, 252–53). Capitalist axiomatics create denumerable finite representations of social processes divested of their qualities. Each independent from the others, they are added, subtracted, and multiplied to form more or less saturated markets for the generation of wealth.

Just like the other political types, two poles also form capitalist distributions. What capitalism continually decodes at one pole, it axiomatizes at the other (1983, 246). Deleuze and Guattari give several examples of the "decoded flows" constituting capitalist axiomatization. For the free worker decoding means: (1) the deterritorialization of the soil through privatization, (2) the loss of the means of consumption through the dissolution of the family, and the decoding of the worker in favor of the work itself or of the machine (industrial production). For capital it means: (1) the deterritorialization of wealth through monetary abstraction, (2) the decoding of the flows of production through merchant capital, (3) the decoding of States through financial capital and public debts, and 4) the decoding of the means of production through the formation of industrial capital (1983, 225).

While territorial representation "implies" that qualified pieces of labor correspond to a particular quanta of abstract labor (activity required to create a given artifact), and State exchange introduces the general equivalent of currency formally uniting "partial objects" (goods and services) whose overcoded value is determined by non-capitalist

(imperial or juridical) decisions, neither decode or de-qualify exchange to the degree that capitalism does.

In Rome, for example, Deleuze and Guattari say, there may have been a privatization of property, a decoding of money through the formations of great fortunes, the decoding of producers through expropriation and proletariazation. But despite all these decoded conditions it did not produce a capitalist economy, but rather reinforced feudal offices and relations in a regime based on slavery (1983, 223). Capitalism goes further. At one pole it decodes qualitative relationships through the privatization of all aspects of social life, free trade, advertising, freeing of labor and capital, imperialism; and, at the other pole it axiomatizes them as "productions for the market."

Here, however, it is crucial not to make the error Slavoj Žižek and others have made by concluding from this that all "decoded flows," are necessarily contributions to capitalism (Žižek 2004, 184). Neither, I argue, should we conclude the opposite: that decoded flows are necessarily revolutionary. The struggle over the assembly of decoded flows is a revolutionary struggle and far from decidable in advance. Revolutionary praxis struggles to unite a consistency of decoded flows, and capitalism struggles to have them "bound into a world axiomatic that always opposes the revolutionary potential of decoded flows with new interior limits" (1983, 246). The details of this struggle are developed at length in chapter IV.

Capitalism is thus constituted by two decoded flows: on the one hand, the flow of naked labor, freed from serfdom and able to sell its labor capacity, and on the other hand the pure flow of capital, independent from landed wealth, that is capable of buying labor. The first "has its roots in simple circulation where money develops as means of payment (bills of exchange falling due on a fixed date, which constitute a monetary form of finite debt)" (1983, 229), and is distributed as "income" to wage earners for the purchase of products and services. The second, however, is the money inscribed on the balance sheet of

the firm, and is based on the circulation of drafts rather than money. This second money constitutes what Deleuze and Guattari call the capitalist form of infinite debt.

Rather than using preexisting currency as a means of payment, finance capital is an instantaneous creative flow that banks create spontaneously as a debt owing to themselves, a creation *ex nihilo* that

> hollows out at one extreme of the full body a negative money (a debt entered as a liability of the banks), and projects at the other extreme a positive money (a credit granted the productive economy by the banks)-'a flow possessing a power of mutation' *that does not enter into income and is not assigned to purchases,* a pure availability, non-possession and non-wealth. (1983, 237)

This so-called stateless, monetary mass that circulates through foreign exchange and across borders forms a supranational ecumenical organization in many ways untouched by governmental decisions. For example, 96% of money circulated in the United States alone is financial capital. This money does not exist as concrete payment or exchange-money but rather as credit or investment money loaned out by banks (to other banks, or other investors) at specific interest rates. How much this investment-capital is "worth" at any given moment depends on an incredibly complex host of speculations, desires, predictions, interest rates, stock prices, etc., that no one can predict with total accuracy. At any given time U.S. banks are required to have no less than 3% of their total money as payment-money to distribute for bank withdraws.[15]

This dualism between types of money—"the formation of means of payment and the structure of financing, between the management of money and the financing of capitalist accumulation, between exchange money and credit money" (1983, 229)—is fundamental to the capitalist system: but how are such unqualified monetary flows then quantified by an axiomatic?

---

[15] According to the Monetary Control Act of 1980.

It would be a simplistic reading of Deleuze and Guattari's analysis to say that capitalist axiomatics were defined solely by the "abstract quantification of decoded flows." In part, this is the case because the quantification of the creative flow of financial capital poses a real difficulty: "no one knows exactly where to draw the line" on this speculative, non-existent monetary mass. But what makes the capitalist social field unique is that its quantifications are based on "differential conjunctions" between flows of unqualified labor and flows of unqualified capital. That is, simple "quantity" as a *variable* relation between independent terms (goods and services) has taken upon *itself* the independence. Denumerable quantification no longer depends on the independent qualities of the terms being exchanged, but is determined independently from these concrete terms. Just as axioms remain "independent" and "disengaged" from their social or mathematical demonstrations, so the capitalist market also determines the quantitative value of commodities independently of their qualification, that is, determines them "axiomatically."

The capitalist machine thus begins when capital ceases to be a capital of alliance (a variable relation between two qualified terms) to become filiative capital (an independent determination of abstract quantities) where "money begets money, or value a surplus value" (1983, 227). Capitalism's "differential conjunctions," as Deleuze and Guattari describe them, are precisely the axiomatization of this "differential relationship," "…where *Dy* derives from labor power and constitutes the fluctuation of variable capital, and where *Dx* derives from capital itself and constitutes the fluctuation of constant capital ('the definition of constant capital by no means excludes the possibility of a change in the value of its constituent parts') (1983, 227–28). The relation is differential (dy/dx) because both terms are decoded and unqualified. But by measuring (quantifying) these two orders of magnitude, non-existent (unqualified) finance capital and variable (unqualified) labor, in terms of the same analytical unit, Deleuze and Guattari claim that capitalist axiomatics are "a pure fiction,

a cosmic swindle, as if one were to measure intergalactic or intra-atomic distances in meters and centimeters" (1983, 230).

These "cosmic fictions" are the basis of an endless accumulation of profit. Unlike a surplus value of code, defined by the difference between labor capacity and the value created by labor capacity, capitalist "surplus values of flux" are defined by the incommensurability between two flows that are immanent to each other (free capital and free labor). The difference between what labor can do and what it can be sold for is its profit. But by completely decoding labor and capital and axiomatizing their incommensurable relation, capitalism is able to generate "surplus flux" or profit without the limitations created by certain kinds of codes (or qualities). "Anything whatever" can be axiomatized and circulated on the world market. Under the capitalist axiomatic, according to Deleuze and Guattari, profit accumulation has been unleashed from any external limitations.

(ii) The Dangers of the Axiomatic for Revolutionary Praxis

The first danger of axiomatization is that it harnesses a world-wide war machine that sets out to reorganize the entire world based on the exploitation of planetary resources. "War," as Deleuze and Guattari say, "clearly follows the same movement as capitalism" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 466). The growing importance of finance capital in the axiomatic means that the depreciation of existing capital and the formation of new capital take on the speed of a war machine incarnated in the State as models of realization that "actively contribute to the redistributions of the world necessary for the exploitation of maritime and planetary resources…The power of war always supersaturates the system's saturations, as its necessary condition" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 466). States no longer appropriate the war machine but constitute a war machine of which they themselves are only the parts: the worldwide capitalist war machine. As States increase military, techno-scientific spending to absorb or compensate for the massive surplus values of corporations, they find

their new object in the absolute "peace" of terror or deterrence, Deleuze and Guattari argue. State-organized capitalism operates against an "unspecified enemy" as an organized insecurity. The danger for revolutionary praxis is that this war-machine, unlike the state, has no center that can be "overthrown." Capitalist resistance then must take a very different form than mere capture.

Another danger of capitalism is the disappearance of enjoyment as an end, and its replacement with the sole end of abstract wealth and its realization in forms other than consumption. Where the despotic State had emperors of anti-production to consume surplus, the bourgeois field of immanence has no such external limit and has integrated anti-production inside production itself. It has instituted an unrivaled slavery, an unprecedented subjugation. No longer are there any masters but rather only slaves commanding other slaves, slaves of the social machine. "The bourgeois sets the example," Deleuze and Guattari argue; "he absorbs surplus value for ends that, taken as a whole, have nothing to do with his own enjoyment: more utterly enslaved than the lowest slaves, he is the first servant of the ravenous machine, the beast of the reproduction of capital, internalization of the infinite debt. 'I too am a slave'—these are the new words spoken by the master" (1983, 254). The social subjection of juridical statism combined with the machinic enslavement of states by the market create a new form of machinic enslavement in which States and capitalists alike are merely parts of a larger social machine that no one is in control of: the capitalist world market. The excessive surpluses are so large they cannot be enjoyed but merely absorbed through other mechanisms. The danger for revolutionary praxis is to be enslaved by this process.

In response to the question, "what is the relationship between history and revolution?" I have argued in the the above section that what I am calling the "return to revolution," influenced by the political philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari, can be

characterized less by the theory of necessary historical succession (whether chronological or dialectical) or by the theory of a purely contingent historical rupture, but rather by a historico-political diagnostic of multiple coexisting political dangers to be warded off by revolutionary praxis. Deleuze and Guattari were the first to lay the philosophical groundwork for this theory of diagnostic analysis based on the topological mixture of past, present, and future political forms. Today, the field of political struggle is not dominated by a single or central figure like the state, proletariat, capital, etc., that can orient all revolutionary analysis. Rather, it is much more like "a motley painting of everything that has ever been believed" (1983, 34). The challenge then is to understand and avoid all these motely processes of political representation and create something new. But this chapter has so far only been a theoretical interrogation. In the next and final section, I argue that the Zapatistas invent the practice of a multi-centered political diagnostic.

The Zapatista's Diagnostic of Suffering

Practically, Zapatismo is one of the first and most sustained non-representational revolutionary efforts to diagnose political power from the perspective that "there is no single front of struggle." The Zapatista's return to revolution can thus be characterized by a practical analysis of power based on a multi-centered diagnostic of political history. This analysis is motivated by the relative rejection of all previous forms of historical representation in both form (coding, overcoding, and axiomatization) and in content (patriarchy, racism, statism, capitalism, vanguardism, etc.) as well as a concern for their immanent diagnosis. The Zapatista's rejection and diagnostic of these processes is demonstrated through the practice of what Marcos calls a "diagnostic of suffering" used in, *La Otra Campagna*: the Zapatistas literally traveled across Mexico listening and taking note of peoples problems and sufferings. The Zapatistas, contrary to centrist or vanguard analyses

that revolve around a privileged method/science, site, or dimension of struggle, offer instead an inclusive intersectional analysis that does not necessarily privilege any single method, front, or site of struggle. Revolution, according to Marcos

> is about a process which incorporates different methods, different fronts, different and various levels of commitment and participation. This means that all methods have their place, that all the fronts of struggle are necessary, and that all levels of participation are important. This is about an inclusive process, which is anti-vanguard and collective. The problem with the revolution (pay attention to the small letters) is then no longer a problem of THE organization, THE method, THE caudillo [dictator, political boss]. It becomes rather a problem which concerns all those who see that revolution is necessary and possible, and whose achievement, is important for everyone. (Marcos 2004b, 164)

Even the Zapatista's own uprising forms a "motley historical assemblage." Consider the way in which they have selected some moments from Mexican history (Emilio Zapata's peasant uprising of 1910–1917), some components from Marxist history (red stars, the use of the word "comrade," etc.), some components from their own indigenous history (consensus decision-making, autonomous village networks, etc.) as well as some components of the future (a non-neoliberal future) to compose the historical hodgepodge of their own political event. In what follows, I argue that the Zapatistas use a practical diagnostic to understand and ward off the three coexisting political dangers found in the parallel historical topology of Deleuze and Guattari: territorial coding, statist overcoding, and capitalist axiomatization.

Zapatismo and Territorial Representation

By 2004, the Zapatistas had lost many battles but still held strong in their commitment to autonomy and autonomy. It is around this time that the Zapatistas also turned their critical diagnostic to their own forms of organization. They began to look at the various different ways that their movement was creating forms of political representation: not at the traditional level of the state or capital, but at the territorial level. That is, they began a multi-centered or intersectional diagnostic of their own revolutionary praxis.

"[T]here are two mistakes," Subcomandante Marcos says in a 2004 communiqué,

> which seem to have persisted in our political work (and which flagrantly contradict our principles): the place of women, on the one hand, and, on the other, the relationship between the political-military structure and the autonomous governments. (Marcos 2004a)

These are two mistakes/dangers that have been historically neglected by revolutionary movements, in part because they are more supple non-state kinds of social power ignored by dialectical and insurrectionist theories of history. Rejecting the premise that the only revolutionary praxis that matters is that of the historical progress of the state, the proletariat, etc. the Zapatistas have attempted to diagnosis and ward off the processes of territorial coding. But the problem of patriarchy in the Zapatista revolution existed in the indigenous communities well before the EZLN arrived in Chiapas in 1983.

> Before Zapatismo the conditions women lived in were dreadful: sexual abuse was rife through rape or early forced marriage, domestic violence was high, giving birth to large families ruined a woman's body and gave them a heavy responsibility for social reproduction through household chores. Moreover they were expected to reduce their food intake so that the husband and children could eat sufficiently, though even this was unable to staunch the high rates of infant mortality. In short they were virtual slaves in their own villages. (Yakubu 2000)

This type of patriarchy uses a process of territorial coding. Certain patriarchal and filial lines of hierarchically coded male stock are selected (genealogically) from the decoded flows of the earth, and detached at certain places through violence (domestic and otherwise) to create the essential ethnic, gender, and spatial boundaries/identities between men and women, adults and children, and different linages of indigenous peoples. Without forming a complete fusion of all these codes, however, the remaining surplus code (an unmarried woman) is then used to form itinerant alliances between male filiations through arranged marriages. As Deleuze and Guattari say,

> Through women, men establish their own connections; through the man woman disjunction, which is always the outcome of filiation, alliance places in connection men from different filiations. (1983, 185)

The pre-given linear codes of male power and violence are then repeated and represented

through each new alliance.

But allowing women *insurgentas* and *comandantas* the EZLN political-military structure (by no means entirely egalitarian) creates a relative decoding of this patriarchal filiation and alliance by permitting "young indigenous women [to] go to the mountains and develop their capacities more, [creating] consequences in the communities" (Ramírez 2008, 312), and giving them "the right to choose their partner and not [be] obliged to enter into marriage," to "occupy positions of leadership in the organization and hold military ranks in the revolutionary armed forces," as well as other rights detailed in the EZLN's *Women's Revolutionary Law* (EZLN 1994). These laws are being increasingly implemented in the Autonomous Townships through new women's alliances (craft cooperatives, women's councils, etc.). However, the decoding of certain patriarchal traditions comes at the risk of creating a new set of vanguard military codes. Hence the second territorial mistake or danger.

> These groups operate through detachment, election, and residual selection: they detach a supposedly expertavant-garde; they elect a disciplined, organized, hierarchized proletariat; they select a residual sub-proletariat to be excluded or reeducated. (Deleuze 2004, 198)

As Deleuze warns (and the EZLN is well aware) the detachment of EZLN commanders living in the mountains (particularly from 1983 to 1993) that elects/recruits *campasin@s* from the villages to be disciplined, organized, hierarchized into the EZLN, and then creates a residual selection of *campasin@s* to be excluded/reeducated in ever widening circular segmentations, risks creating new military codes that undermine the autonomy and self-management of the Zapatistas. As Marcos says,

> The idea we had originally was that the EZLN should accompany and support the peoples in the building of their autonomy. However, accompaniment has sometimes turned into management, advice into orders and support into a hindrance. I've already spoken previously about the fact that the hierarchical, pyramid structure is not characteristic of the indigenous communities. The fact that the EZLN is a political-military and clandestine organization still corrupts processes

that should and must be democratic. (Marcos 2004a)

Patriarchy and militarism in Zapatismo are two examples of what Deleuze and Guattari call micro-fascism. Micro-fascism is a significant threat to be diagnosed in revolutionary praxis: "everything that [supple segmentation and coding] dismantles [at the level of the state] it reassembles on its own level: micro-Oedipuses, microformations of power, microfascisms" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 205). Zapatismo, as a revolutionary movement, also risks falling prey to what Deleuze and Guattari call "monomania" by becoming a strictly ethnic struggle for indigenous rights. Segmentary societies, indigenous peoples, gangs, and ethnic minorities without a "shared acceleration" or solidarity beyond the narrow "self-evident clarities" of their individual causes (for indigenous rights, etc.) risk, at worst, extermination by the state, and at best becoming a "rumble or buzz" under its heal. As a revolutionary movement with an intersectional diagnostic, the Zapatistas have rejected this monomania by universalizing their struggle and making it a global one against neoliberalism, inclusive of everyone engaged in this struggle: "We are all Zapatistas!"[16] But what dangers does the process of statification pose to the Zapatista uprising?

Zapatismo and Despotic State Representation

In addition to their diagnosis of territorial coding, the Zapatistas also deployed a significant and vocal diagnostic analysis of the danger of state overcoding. What external and internal dangers does it pose to the flourishing of their revolutionary praxis? Despotic state representation (over-coding) in the executive branch of the Mexican government aims to force indigenous "activity" into *work,* to extract taxes from its communities, to create a concentric political resonance of its territories (states, cities, neighborhoods, and autonomous territories) into exchangeable and rentable *land* through forced relocation and redistribution to large land owners (*latifundistas*), and to establish a stockpile of *exchange* into

[16] Along with other strategies discussed in chapter V.

currency (the *peso*) mostly withheld from the *campasin@s*. While the modern Mexican state certainly has more than just despotic components, its despotic components, more or less socialist or capitalist, threaten to enslave every aspect of life into the Work-model.

Any and all States, according to the Zapatistas, pose similar dangers and threats of capture for revolutionary struggles insofar as collective action becomes the mere representation or resemblance of this central executive authority. In the case of Mexico, the agricultural surpluses of indigenous labor (controlled by the *latifundistas,* through sugar, coffee, and rubber production) create an unchecked accumulation requiring the maintenance of a specialized (politico-military) body for its management that replaces the multi-lineal filiations of the older coded communities with the direct filiation of a despot or president. The Mexican executive system thus makes a very diverse group of points (geographic, ethnic, linguistic, moral, economic, and technological) resonate together under a single hierarchized and transcendent unity.

The Mexican state captures the territories not by the opposition of over-coding to diverse territorial codes, but by unifying the constellation of imbricated, micro-political systems. Each territory is given a place as a piece of a single mega-machine of public-works. The state's hierarchy is thus not pyramidal but vertically held together by innumerable coded territories. On the one hand, Zapatismo confronts this danger as an external one because state over-coding, despite its juridical pretensions to negotiation (the betrayal of the San Andreas Accords),[17] is unable to accept decoded flows or coded ones that do not resonate around its central unity. The state thus aims to exterminate them or bring them into

[17] The Mexican government negotiated and agreed to the San Andres Peace Accords but never followed through with them. While they negotiated they also escalated military relocation, murder, and harassment of the indigenous. "In these agreements [San Andres] the government promised to recognize the right to autonomy of indian peoples in the constitution, to broaden their political representation, to guarantee full access to the justice system, and to build a new legal framework that guaranteed political rights, legal rights and cultural rights. The government promised also to recognize indigenous people as subjects of public rights" (Ramírez 2008, 138).

resonance as subordinate parts of its central machine.[18]

> More than 6,000 displaced by the war are the result of the attacks of paramilitary bands and state police, both directed by the state government, with the blessing of the federal government. (Ramírez 2008, 162)

> Assassinations, intimidations, dozens of arrested, tortured and jailed, military and paramilitary harassment, thousands displaced, and the burning of autonomous townships were the norm during these seven months of the year 1998. (Ramírez 2008, 175)

However, Zapatismo also confronts the danger of statist overcoding as an internal one. In both its early (1983) vanguard strategy to militarily overthrow the Mexican government and seize power in a popular revolutionary style familiar to Mexico and Latin America, and in its later (1994–2007) strategy to intervene in electoral politics without becoming partisan or a political party Zapatismo risked overcoding. While the likelihood of the Zapatista's actually seizing state power is slim, the dangers of reproducing the processes of over-coding are real. As Macros says, "The worst that could happen to [the EZLN] . . . would be to come to power and install itself there as a revolutionary army" (Marcos 2001a).

> Every vanguard imagines itself to be representative of the majority. We not only think that is false in our case, but that even in the best of cases it is little more than wishful thinking, and in the worst cases an outright usurpation. The moment social forces come into play, it becomes clear that the vanguard is not such a vanguard and that those it represents do not recognize themselves in it. (Marcos 2001c)

Mexican state representation and rigid segmentation, according to Marcos, deploy the paranoiac fear that national security will crumble if the indigenous are given autonomy. War, the state threatens, will only continue if the rigid state segments do not prevail. This fear, the state claims, can only be resolved if everyone submits to being part of a machinic

---

[18] "There was the scene when on Dec. 22, 1997, one of the most atrocious and sadly predictable massacres in the history of the nation occurred. In the community of Acteal, located in the township of Chenalho in Los Altos of Chiapas, forty-five indigenous people, most children and women belonging to the civilian group "Las Abejas," were massacred with firearms and machetes by sixty armed men from a paramilitary band made up of indigenous from the PRI and the Cardenist Front (PFCRN). The shooting lasted over six hours, while dozens of Public Security police remained 200 meters away from where the killings took place, listening to the shots and screams without lifting a finger" (Ramírez 2008, 164).

enslavement orchestrated by the state. But this is only half the story of the danger of the state. Zapatismo also confronts the danger of being subjected to the juridical power of the state.

Zapatismo and Juridical State Representation

Despite their early interest in establishing legal rights and representation for indigenous people across Mexico, the Zapatistas have remained diagnostically aware of the danger of becoming merely incorporated into the judicial norms of the state by having their demands satisfied and/or redefined. Marcos describes the Juridical State Pole as "the aspect which incorporates popular struggles and their demands, and regulates, through judicial norms, the satisfaction of such demands and/or their redefinition" (Marcos 2004b, 311). Once revolutionary demands are met, the revolution is over, over-coded and conjuncted as one more subject of law.

Additionally, what Mexican despotic/federal over-codes are not entirely able to capture (autonomous peasant movements, local laws, personal contracts, state functionaries, tax collectors, and local ranchers), other channels of unofficial power in Chiapas, like paramilitary groups and the *caciques* (local self-appointed bosses and landowners) juridical conjunctions, are able to recode through legal structures immanent to the region. Much more flexible, diverse, and personal, these recoding focal points for the state are all the processes that endlessly negotiate with the peasants and indigenous movements without ever granting them autonomy, create local laws like not allowing *campasin@s* to walk in the street in San Cristóbal de las Casas, harass and abuse Zapatista communities in the name of "tax collection," legally sanction paramilitary groups like the ones responsible for the Acteal Massacre (while federal troops 200 meters away did nothing) (Ramírez 2008, 164), and fund local *caciques* who

> deliver some of the basic demands of the campesino and mediate his needs. They are usually older men who are involved in local commercial activities and have a reputation as fixers, usually with some access to local state funds. Many are PRIistas, most are corrupt and violent and all believe they 'serve the people'. In fact they serve to demobilize and suppress rural struggle and are invaluable to the landowners. (Yakubu 2000)

But such legal mediations and democratic pretensions found in city halls, private property owners, and local law enforcement should not disguise the real disciplinary apparatuses of juridical representation set in motion to force the coordination (recoding) of revolutionary subjects like the Zapatistas.

Zapatismo and Capitalist Representation

The Zapatistas political diagnosis of capitalism is no more central or foundational than any of their other analysis of power. The territorial coding of patriarchy and militarism within Zapatista communities; the statist overcoding of fear, war, and centralization; and the juridical recoding of legalization and local management are all equally important dangers that need to be diagnosed and avoided within their revolutionary praxis. As they say, "all fronts are important," not just the front against state power or capitalism. That said, they do have a diagnosis of capitalist representation.

In Chiapas, the previous (1876) forms of non-innovatory local capital (private cattle ranchers and cotton, sugar, and coffee *latifundistas*) that had turned many small landholders and *ejidos* (communal production units) into either poorly-paid day-laborers (i.e. seasonally employed) or debt-peons (little more than slaves), gave way to new patterns of accumulation in the 1970's: free/unqualified labor and mobile decoded capital. As capital increasingly freed itself from national boundaries, transforming itself into highly mobile finance capital, investment flooded away from the industrial heartlands of both North America and Mexico to the Pacific Rim economies (Yakubu 2000).

The local farmers and ranchers that previously needed very small amounts of

> quasi-slave labor and large areas of land in Chiapas are now selling their land to make way for the region's new importance as a resource for hydroelectric power, oil, eco-tourism, patented genetic technology, and uranium for national and international accumulation.[19]

And while it may make up a small part of this accumulation, Zapatismo itself has been turned into a market in several ways that it is well aware of: as a revolutionary tourist destination, as a cultural commodity, as the content of revolutionary kitsch sold around the world (even by those who do not sympathize with the EZLN) like Zapatista dolls, posters, t-shirts, and condoms ("for those who rise up") (Kersten 1997). In other words, what the processes of capitalism decode with one hand (land, family, work, wealth, states, and production),[20] they continually axiomatize with the other. By privatizing previously coded and over-coded relations in Chiapas and placing them all for sale or investment on a world market, their "qualities" or "unique specificities" have become completely relative to the speculative investment patterns of a transnational ecumenical organization (themselves relative to the abstract "forces of the market") (Yakubu 2000).

Capitalist representation, as the differential relation (dy/dx) between these decoded flows of unqualified *campesin@* labor, Lacandón jungle, rivers, culture (participatory democracy, Zapatismo resistance, etc.) on the one hand, and the decoded flows of financial

---

[19] "New dams were built in this period to provide electricity for petrochemical plants in Tabasco and Veracruz: Chiapas is Mexico's largest producer of hydroelectricity, though half of its homes have no power. Dam construction has provided sporadic employment for some parts of the indigenous population, while others have had to abandon their villages to rising flood waters. Further dam construction is planned, much of it targeted at the Zapatista stronghold of Las Canadas (the Canyons), a region of Los Altos. . . . The importance of hydroelectricity pales in comparison with the discovery of oil, however. The deposits in the north-east of the state are part of the Gulf of Mexico field that produces 81% of Mexico's crude export. But new deposits have also been found in the east, just north of the Guatemalan border (the so-called Ocosingo field), bang in the middle of Zapatista territory. Most of this new oil is not yet being pumped, but exploratory wells have been drilled both by PEMEX, the national oil company, and international oil interests" (Yakubu 2000).

[20] Deleuze and Guattari describe several modes of deterritorialization that occurred in Chiapas. For the free worker: 1) the deterritorialization of the soil through privatization, 2) the loss of the means of consumption through the dissolution of the family and the corporation, and the decoding of the worker in favor of the work itself or of the machine (industrial production). For capital: 1) the deterritorialization of wealth through monetary abstraction, 2) the decoding of the flows of production through merchant capital, 3) the decoding of States through financial capital and public debts, and 4) the decoding of the means of production through the formation of industrial capital. See (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 225).

capital (world stock speculation, bank finance, international investment, etc.) on the other, fixes both into an abstract "differential" quantification or axiomatic equivalence for the sole purposes of profit.

The "war in Chiapas" is an instance of how the Mexican state has become a "model [or axiom] for the realization of international capital" by "actively contribut[ing] to the redistributions of [Chiapas] necessary for the exploitation of maritime and planetary resources" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 466). As Marcos says, "the indigenous peoples at a global level (who number more than 300 million) are located in zones that possess 60% of the natural resources of the planet. The reconquest of these territories is one of the principal objectives of the capitalist war" (Fuentes 2007). The Mexican state is now less an appropriation of its own war machine (a standing army), but rather forms a mere part in the larger worldwide capitalist war machine aimed at securing the axiomatization of the unqualified flows of oil, water, biogenetic code, and Zapatista resistance culture for their exchange on the global market.[21] "Neoliberalism," as Marcos puts it, "is the catastrophic political management of catastrophe" (Marcos 1995). This new form of capitalist machinic enslavement, as Deleuze and Guattari call it, however, takes little enjoyment in the massacres, humanitarian crises, and ecological devastations that result from its "structural readjustments" in Chiapas. Rather, capitalist axiomatization has de-qualified all other coded values of enjoyment except for one pre-given condition for representation that everyone is enslaved to (to a certain degree): the abstract accumulation of wealth. Zapatismo faces an external capitalist war of resource extraction against Chiapas, but also faces an internal appropriation of its resistance by the culture industry.

---

[21] The Mexican government has aimed to secure international capital in a variety of ways. (1) The creation of highways into Zapatista territory for the construction of dams, extraction of oil, and militarization of ecological preserves. (2) The forced relocation of indigenous people from their land that has been sold by the Mexican government to private companies. (3) The harassment of indigenous peoples living in these "capital rich" areas by tanks, airplanes, and government funded paramilitary attacks. See (Ramírez 2008).

But here the reader may wonder if this analysis of Zapatismo might be significantly undermined if the Zapatistas were to do something that suddenly rejected their previous use of a multi-centered diagnostic. Since I am not arguing that the Zapatistas are a model by which we should hold future revolutionary strategy to, this would not be the case. A multi-centered political diagnostic, especially considered topologically, would still remain a practice that they created and that could be adapted for use elsewhere.

Conclusion

What is the relationship between history and revolution in the contemporary return to revolution? In a word, I have argued that political history is used as a multi-centered political diagnostic to develop a non-representational revolutionary praxis. In order to defend this response I drew on two early and influential figures of its practical and theoretical use: Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas. Deleuze and Guattari were the first to develop the philosophical basis for an analysis of interlocking forms of oppression based on a topology of multiple heterogenous axes of political power, in content (class, race, gender, etc.) and in form (coding, overcoding, axiomatization). Contrary to the universal history of succession and necessity based on the political body of the state and its representation, political topology understands history as a single folded and refolded surface. Events are not tied by chronological or dialectical causality but by contingency and proximity to one another in space-time. Without unity or identity, political history is thus capable of producing non-representational revolutionary political forms. However, beyond the mere affirmation of revolutionary historical potential, my argument was that this historical topology should be used instead as a diagnostic by which we can asses the dangers confronting revolutionary praxis itself.

Practically, Zapatismo is one of the first and most sustained non-representational revolutionary efforts to diagnose political power from the perspective that "there is no single front of struggle." No one single type of power threatens their autonomy and self-determination "in the last instance," but rather a mix of several different processes from history coexist in recombined forms both external and internal to their struggle. With no single front or axis on which power turns, there is also no single type of marginalized subject, nor is there a single axis or pivot by which to discern the proper direction, critique, or teleology of history. There are simply different types of multiplicities in need of diagnosis and redirection. My argument was that without the predicative power of Marxist science, or a determinate universal history, the Zapatista's revolution has become contingent, non-representational, and flexible like a folded topological shape. Zapata's peasant rebellion can emerge from the past, direct democracy can emerge from the future, and both can bear directly on the transformation of the present. Zapatismo is a creation of the past and a nostalgia for the future at the same time.

These arguments were accomplished in three sections. The first outlined and problematized two theories of universal history (succession and contingency) and showed how each failed to conceive of a sustained alternative to representational politics. The second laid out, in turn, four basic characteristics of an alternative concept of revolutionary history drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's historical topology. I then expanded this theory and argued that it should be used as a political diagnostic based on three contingent, coexisting, and recombinable political processes: territorial coding, state overcoding, and capitalist axiomatization. Each of these types was developed in turn to show how they inform revolutionary praxis. The third and final section showed how the Zapatistas also practice a multi-centered political diagnostic based on their "diagnostic of suffering." What remains to be addressed, however, is how such a folded intersection of representational

processes is transformed through the process of revolutionary intervention. This will be the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

INTERVENTION AND THE FUTURE ANTERIOR

> Unlike history, becoming cannot be conceptualized in terms of past and future. Becoming revolutionary remains indifferent to questions of a future and a past of the revolution; it passes between the two. Every becoming is a block of coexistence.
> (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 292)

Introduction

In chapter II I argued that political history should be used as a multi-centered political diagnostic used to construct a revolutionary praxis. In order to defend this response I drew on two early and influential figures of its practical and theoretical use: Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas. I argued first against two conceptual blockages confronting the relationship between history and revolution: on the one hand, the concept of succession based on the repetition of a pre-given unity of history (and its capture by the state) that blocks the emergence of non-state political events, and on the other, the concept of revolutionary contingency based on the affirmation that history may become other than it is (that remains politically ambivalent). The contemporary return to revolution I argued, is not a successive or inevitable moment of crisis moving toward an increasingly superior form of political organization, nor is it merely an undecidable moment of contingency. Rather, it takes place at the intersection of various coexistent political processes of representation (territorial coding, state overcoding, and capitalist axiomatization) irreducible to (but inseparable from) historical phenomena. Accordingly, this return to revolution is neither a matter of historical necessity, or even potentiality. Rather, it can be characterized by a continual diagnostic examination of the limits and dangers of its own praxis in order to identify and actively ward them off by other means.

This concept was drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's theory of historical topology because it proposes, as an alternative to succession and coexistence, a way to conceive

contingent and non-representational revolutionary events. That is, it conceives of them as topologically folded spaces of heterogenous political processes that simultaneously anticipate, ward off, and overlap with each other to a greater or lesser degree and provides the tools to analyze these processes within revolutionary praxis. It is then by practically *mobilizing* this immanent diagnostic of multiple, intersecting processes of representation that the Zapatistas have been able to determine the political dangers they face without falling back on the theory of a central "axis of historical struggle," (the party, state, class, race, etc.), a revolutionary teleology, or an undecidable coexistent matrix of heterogenous forces. The goal of chapter II was to propose and defend a non-linear theory of political history that moved beyond state teleology and undecidable propositions and toward a theoretical practice of determining simultaneously occurring heterogeneous forms of political representation as they immanently posed dangers to revolutionary praxis.

But how do revolutionary events emerge from this polyvalent intersection of representational processes (coding, overcoding, axiomatization) and sustain something new? How are these processes "warded off by other means?" This is an important question left unanswered both by Deleuze and Guattari's concept of historical topology and my proposed concept of a multi-centered diagnostic. While Deleuze and Guattari's theory of political topology may be able to provide us with the tools to diagnose the three processes of political representation, it is unable to account for how they changed or warded off by revolutionary interventions. That is, if a political arrangement is composed of multiple, coexistent processes (present to varying degrees), as discerned by an immanent diagnostic of the event, how can the situation then be transformed? How can we assess the risks of such an intervention? Who and what is intervening, and upon what do they intervene?

This chapter is organized into three sections. In the first section I argue that the contemporary return to revolution is defined neither by opposing reactions against pre-

existing political ills (processes of representation), nor is it defined by an absolute insurrectionary break with the dominant situation. In the second section I argue instead that the return to revolution is characterized by a transformation that emerges through a careful labor of evental prefiguration, connection, and condensation that brings together what seemed to be inexistent and invisible elements within the arrangement into a new existence and visibility. This process of revolutionary intervention brings into existence a new world of the present, not as a consequence of the past, or as the potential for a new future "to come," but through the construction of a new present in a future anterior that "will have been." My argument here is that such a theory of prefiguration is able to provide an alternative to the transformative methods posed by opposition and insurrection. To help develop this concept of prefiguration I draw on two concepts from Deleuze and Guattari: *Aeon* (the time of the future anterior) and deterritorialization (their theory of change). In the third section I further develop this argument drawing on its practical deployment in the Zapatista's creation and maintenance of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (Committees of Good Government).

Revolution and Political Intervention

Opposition | Negation

Revolutionary interventions can create change in the dominant mix of political power by opposing or negating them. That is, given a certain mixture of codes, overcodes, and axioms that define the heterogeneous field of political subjects and objects, opposition *to*, negation *of*, or a difference *from* these processes of representation can create change, but only by first accepting the pre-given parameters of the political problem at hand to-be-changed: it must accept *a priori* the identity and unity of what it is in opposition *to*. Revolutionary interventions and transformations, in this way, aim at a modification of this

unity. They intervene in the internal development and transformation of legitimate political processes (territorial, legal, economic, etc.) by accepting the terms in which the political problems and questions are posed and then modifying their relations.

In more traditional revolutionary struggles oppositional interventions can be seen in the teleological imperative to seize the state apparatus and re-appropriate its bureaucratic, legal, and military mechanisms toward other ends. What remains the same in these struggles, however, is the identity of their initial parameters for collective social organization: hierarchy, militarism, and state bureaucracy. In the case of more social democratic struggles, this internal reform of legal and economic processes opposes the present mechanisms of representation, not from a different non-representational ground but from the grounds of mis-representation and its rectification or correction. Its transformative intervention aims for an increasingly accurate representation of the differences not-yet-represented.

This kind of oppositional intervention, however, is always an *internal* difference: an oppositional difference subsumed into the unity of a state apparatus, an economic market, or a new identity. Revolutionary opposition can thus create political change, but only insofar as such a change is a change *within the regime of representation*: a new election, a new more environmentally friendly capitalist market, or a new, more democratic state apparatus. We can thus define such an interventional tendency as "the modification of an existing domain of objects and identities without a change in the fundamental conditions and coordinates of the political problem itself."

Insurrection and the Revolutionary Conditions for the Production of the New

In, "Events, Becoming, and History" Paul Patton argues that Deleuze and Guattari propose a compelling alternative to revolutionary opposition. "Far from being the actualisations of a particular pre-existing event," Patton argues, "[revolutions] are eruptions of 'eventality,' pure eventness or becoming: absolute deterritorialisation" (Patton 2009, 43).

Rather than define revolutionary events as simply expressing oppositions or internal reforms to the pre-existing domain of political givens (identities, subjects, rights, private property, etc.) that would condition in advance what new forms of collective action were possible in a situation, Patton argues that Deleuze and Guattari provide a theory of revolution based on difference or deterritorialization in-itself.

> Deleuze defines the pure event as that part of every event that escapes its own actualisation. Pure eventness in this sense is the highest object of historical thought. It is what must be thought from [a] historical point of view, but at the same time that which can never, or never exhaustively, be thought since it is only given to us through what actually happens. (2009, 47)

Revolution, according to Patton, is a groundless, unconditioned, unthinkable (in-itself) difference "that is the condition of there being events at all" (2009, 42). Insofar as actual political struggles exhibit this "hermeneutical sublime in the highest degree . . . they realize the potential break with existing frameworks of understanding" (2009, 43). They constitute a "pure exteriority and metamorphosis" (2000, 114) (absolute deterritorialization) from the state of affairs and its processes of representation. Rather than presuppose existing political conditions, revolution, or the pure eventness of transformation, change, and becoming itself, Patton argues, must be considered as "the source or condition of the emergence of the new" (2009, 50).

Similarly, as Dan Smith argues in "Deleuze and the Production of the New," "if identity (A is A) were the primary principle, that is, if identities were already pregiven, then there would in principle be no production of the new (no new differences)" (2008, 151). Thus, Smith continues, "for Deleuze, the conditions of the new can be found only in a principle of difference" (2008, 151), "no less capable of dissolving and destroying individuals than of constituting them temporarily" (Deleuze 1994, 38). While Patton and Smith accurately develop the important concept of "difference-in-itself" drawn from Deleuze's earlier works, I believe that this concept not only remains unable to account for a

theory of revolutionary intervention and political change but even risks blocking it by affirming the unconditioned ambivalence and non-relational "exteriority" of political action. By valorizing revolution as the unconditioned (real) potentiality for "change as such" (liberatory change as well as non-liberatory change) or what Patton calls, "critical freedom" (2000, 83), radical politics remains optimistically tied to an ultimately indifferent and ambivalent principle of difference for its own sake: the aleatory "temporal constitution no less than the destruction of individuals:" spontaneous insurrection.

However, the contemporary return to revolution, I argue, is more than an affirmation that "another world is possible." And insofar as revolution affirms pure eventness "as that part of every event that escapes its own actualisation" exterior to history, it remains ultimately (in its pure form) abstracted from all actual and concrete political relations as well as different political events in their specificity. To be clear, this is not the same criticism well refuted by John Protevi in his review of Peter Hallward's *Out of This World* (Protevi, John. 2006). It is not the case that the virtual simply remains abstractly above the actual as a spiritual realm. Insofar as revolution is the "general transformative movement *between* actualization and counter-actualization" it remains non-related to any *determinate* quasi-causal political event and its singular concrete consequences. It remains unable to conceptualize the multiple intermediate stages of any local political intervention. I disagree that concrete revolutionary struggles are radical only insofar as they abandon their actual relations and affirm "only" their capacity to become-other-as-such in a pure becoming-actual-becoming-virtual.

A Time for Revolution

The Future Anterior

How then are we to understand political transformation such that a non-

representational revolutionary praxis is not merely possible but actually constructed? Distinct from the notion that revolutionary intervention is based on opposition and from the notion that it is a form of pure "eventness" that conditions all events as such, in this next section I argue that in order to understand the contemporary return to revolution we need to analyze four intermediate and concrete stages *between* the various processes of representation (developed in chapter II) on the one hand, and the so-called pure exteriority of "eventness" or "absolute deterritorialization" on the other. Between the pre-given facts, subjects, and objects of the situation and their history (the past), and the radically unconditioned potentiality for their transformation "to come" (the future), I argue, there are four intermediate stages of political transformation distributed by a revolutionary event.

Within these four intermediate stages of political transformation the fourth stage, in particular, describes the type of revolutionary transformation that defines the contemporary return to revolution. This fourth type of revolutionary transformation is prefigurative and takes place in the time of the future anterior. But the purpose of this concept is not to re-establish a "pure becoming" of the past and future as such or to privilege one against the other (the pre-evental over the post-evental or *vice-versa*). Rather, what I propose instead in this section is a theory of revolutionary intervention that accounts for both the concepts of revolutionary precipitation *and* its post-evental consequences. My aim is to understand this process as a theoretical practice of what I call prefiguration. In order to help develop this theoretical practice I draw on Deleuze and Guattari's theory of deterritorialization that describes four modes of change. The first type of change is what they call "relative negative deterritorialization." This is a change that is able to break free from the processes of political representation (coding, overcoding, and axiomatization) but only momentarily and in such a way that obstructs further transformations. The second type of change is what they call a "relatively positive deterritorialization." This type of change succeeds in creating an

undecidable point of tension within the processes of political representation that might lead to revolution, but may also lead to a mere reform of power. The third type of change is what Deleuze and Guattari call an "absolutely negative deterritorialization." This type of change creates a radical rupture within the processes of representation but fails to connect to any others and enters a line of isolated self-destruction. The fourth type of change is what they call an "absolutely positive deterritorialization." This type of change is not only able to break free from from power but is able to connect up to other such ruptures and create a collective alternative to representational politics in the future anterior.

These different modes of change, their mixtures, temporalities, and *relations* are the conceptual tools Deleuze and Guattari have to offer for understanding the process of revolutionary transformation. This chapter aims to demonstrate their usefulness first conceptually against the concepts of opposition and insurrection and then practically as they are paralleled in the Zapatista's prefigurative strategy. However, before continuing with this demonstration two problems pertaining to the usage of the temporality of the future anterior need be clarified and avoided up front. In the next three subsections I argue that the future anterior should (1) not be understood as a complete synthesis of the past and future (an "event of becoming"), (2) nor should it be understood as merely privileging pre- or post-evental actions, but should rather (3) be understood as the creation of a new present.

(1) The Future Anterior Is not an Event of Becoming

The process of revolutionary prefiguration, I am arguing, takes place in the time of the future anterior, that is, as an event which will have been. But the conjunction of past, present, and future that creates the future anterior should not at all be understood as a global synthesis of these three times as such. If we define revolutionary transformation as the synthesis (even the differential one Deleuze describes in *Difference and Repetition,* 70–128), of the past, present, and future, then the revolutionary future anterior would be the absolute

conditions for *all change* as such. That is, the revolutionary future anterior would be the principle of difference-in-itself. As such, revolution would have no actual, concrete existence or political force by which to offer an alternative to the competing processes of political representation.[1] It would be the mere potentiality of change, not any actual, positive political power. Put simply, if revolution is an "event of pure becoming" between all pasts, presents, and futures, then there is only one ambivalent event that conditions all types of political power.

Truly different revolutionary events with their own conditions for action, agency, and organization could therefore not exist but would instead only be derived as effects from a single eternal event: genesis, "*the event of being*."[2] Following many others who also hold that *Logic of Sense* "is Deleuze's most noteworthy effort to clarify his concept of the event" (Badiou 2009, 382), Alain Badiou locates what I believe to be a significant danger for a Deleuzian theory of revolutionary intervention: if the condition for all transformation itself is an event, then there can be no *real change,* only the endless *modification* of a single event. In *Logics of Worlds*, Badiou argues that if, as Deleuze says in *Logic of Sense*, there is only, "one single event for all events; one and the same *aliquid* for that which happens and that which is said; and one and the same being for the impossible, the possible, and the real" (Deleuze 1990, 180), then such an ontological condition becomes both the condition and the conditioned, leaving no room for real disjunction, rupture, and change (Badiou 2009, 385).

If, Badiou continues, "the event is always a synthesis of past and future. . . . The expression of the One within becomings," or "what lies between a past and a future, between the end of one world and the beginning of another," it expresses the eternal and

---

[1] This is precisely why Deleuze cant offer a theory of concrete political topology in *Difference and Repetition.*

[2] "By removing the abyss from between being and event, his ontology opens the way for the *event of being* from within what presents itself in actual situations" (Egyed 2006, 83).

continual being of time itself, and NOT the separation or disjunction necessary for thinking a determinate political change in the world (2009, 382–83). Ultimately, Deleuze's theory of the event is caught between two poles, neither of which are able to think the emergence of a new revolutionary present: either the present is split entirely into the future and past and thus does not exist, or the present is the eternal synthesis of all futures and pasts and is thus everything.

However, while it may be the case that Deleuze's earlier works, *Difference and Repetition* and *Logic of Sense,* develop the concepts of "event" and "becoming" at length, I maintain, following Alberto Toscano, that in *A Thousand Plateaus*,

> the terrain seems to have shifted considerably with respect to [Deleuze's] earlier preoccupation with conditions of realization—a preoccupation that seemed to afford a certain continuity with naturalized or materialist accounts of ontogenesis. The individuations that Deleuze and Guattari foreground in *A Thousand Plateaus* are not of the sort that engender individuals; rather, they traverse already constituted individuals, drawing them towards impersonal becomings, compositions of one multiplicity with another. (2006, 176)

In *A Thousand Plateaus* (a work Badiou and other critics rarely draw from), Deleuze and Guattari no longer privilege the so-called "ontological conditions for the production of events as such," but proceed from the principle that "politics precedes being," replacing earlier theories of "structure and genesis" with a theory of *political relation* and a *logics of assemblages* (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 203, 266; Deleuze 2006, 177). That is, rather than aiming to show that "difference in-itself" or "pure becoming" is the ontological condition and singular "event of being," Deleuze and Guattari's later work instead develops a complex political logic (or constructivism) of the various types of abstract and concrete machines that compose the immanent relations of and among events and their degrees of transformation. Lacking the political typology and the more nuanced theory of change (deterritorialization) found only in *A Thousand Plateaus*, *Logic of Sense* and *Difference and*

Repetition remain, I believe, not unhelpful or "pre-political," but wholly *inadequate* for retrieving a concept of revolutionary intervention based on the future anterior.[3]

(2) The Future Anterior Is Neither "Pre" Nor "Post" Evental

Just as the revolutionary future anterior cannot be understood in terms of an absolute synthesis of the future and past (the "event of becoming"), neither can it be understood as a "pre" or "post" evental intervention. In his essay, "What is a Political Event?" Iain Mackenzie distinguishes between two approaches to understanding the emergence of political events: a pre-evental approach developed by Deleuze and a post-evental approach developed by Badiou. Ultimately, Mackenzie concludes that "Deleuze's 'pre-occurrence' approach is more persuasive than Badiou's 'post-occurrence' theorisation" because it does not require a subject to miraculously nominate the event (Mackenzie 2008, 2). True or not, what I find interesting about this account is the way that Mackenzie and others have framed the problem of political transformation.

> From a Deleuzean perspective, and in stark contrast to Badiou's emphasis upon the revolutionary event, events usually occur when we are least aware of them. Yet, it is as an effect of these apparently insignificant moments that significance is produced; the possibility of meaning enters the world, we might say, behind our backs. (Mackenzie 2008, 15)

For Deleuze, Mackenzie argues, it is only when we are least aware, or at our most impersonal, that a whole host of seemingly insignificant elements that we do not control can come out of nowhere and create an evental disjunction with the (actual) state of affairs. Rather than requiring any active precipitation, construction, or evental surveillance, the Deleuzian pre-occurrence of potential forces will suddenly raise up from behind our backs and disjoint us from the actual pre-determinations of the past and toward the revolutionary

---

[3] For example, what would it mean to "affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution" (Deleuze 1994, 53), without an analysis of how this same continual revolution is also valorized by capitalist deterritorialization and axiomatization? Or in *Logic of Sense*, what it mean to argue that "*Counter-actualisation* is revolutionary" (Egyed 2006, 83), without the warnings, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* of "self-destruction" and "fascism" that temper such the process of political transformation?

future "to come." Far from being reducible to identifiable, epochal shifts, Deleuzian pre-evental singularities are according to Paul Patton "molecular," "indiscernible," and "happening all the time" (2000, 108).

This is in contrast to the post-evental philosophy of Alain Badiou that is concerned primarily with the consequences, fidelities or "truth procedures," that happen only after an event has occurred and vanished. "Self-belonging" or the evental site, as Badiou says, "annuls itself as soon as it appears. A site is a vanishing term: it appears only as disappearing. The problem consists in registering the consequences of the appearing" (2009, 392). Badiou's clear privileging of evental "retroaction" and "post-evental commitment" has lead critics (Hallward 2003; Bensaïd 2004; Marchart 2005) to argue that such a clear denial of pre-evental conditions leads Badiou into a kind of quasi-religious mysticism of evental miracles. That is, if there are no "pre-evental subjects" and one is unable to pre-eventaly precipitate events or even locate their precursors, then how and why events happen seems entirely miraculous. All that remains coherent are the militantly faithful subjects to events past. While this dilemma has led others like Adrian Johnston and Nick Srnicek to try and supplement this pre-evental shortcoming in Badiou's work, I would like to proceed in a different direction (Johnston 2007; Srnicek 2008).

The apparent split between Deleuze's "pre" and Badiou's "post" theory of the event, as Badiou himself observes, "exposes the original ambiguity in the notion" of the event (2009, 382). Adopting either position (the future-looking pre-evental or the backward-looking post-evental), it seems, we end up affirming a kind of mysticism of the political event. Either we simply sit around, do nothing, and wait for the invisible, pre-evental, and spontaneous potentialities to mystically congeal and bring about real revolutionary transformation behind our backs, or the mystical event has "always-already" occurred (insofar as we are subjects of it) and we just need to "get out there" and be militantly faithful

to its consequences. This characterization may seem like a straw man or polarization of the problematic, and perhaps I have over emphasized to demonstrate a debate in the literature on this topic. But even Deleuze and Badiou's most generous readers have acknowledged a real difference in emphasis between these two temporalities (Johnston 2007; Srnicek 2008).

Thus, it must also be admitted that the issue is a bit more subtle than this. Traces of the pre-evental exist in Badiou (both in *Being and Event* and *Logics of Worlds*), just as traces of the post-evental exist in Deleuze and Guattari (*Logic of Sense* and *A Thousand Plateaus*). But even this observation still misses the point. "Traces" hardly constitute a full resolution to this problem. The temporality of political intervention in Deleuze, Guattari, and Badiou is poorly understood in terms of pre- and post- eventality. What I am arguing instead is that Deleuze, Guattari, and Badiou all share a theory of political intervention based in the future anterior that has yet to be sufficiently examined (Badiou 2005b, 201–11; Badiou 2009, 357–80; Deleuze 1990, 58–65; Deleuze and Guattari 1987; 232–309). So while Deleuze, Guattari, and Badiou have all, at one point or another, clearly stated that revolutionary events do not emerge miraculously *ex nihilo,*[4] what remains to be developed in detail is a theory of such a revolutionary intervention that is demonstrably consistent with such a position. This is the aim of the present chapter.

(3) The Future Anterior Is a New Present

With the aim of proposing a theory and practice of revolutionary prefiguration I have first distinguished two perilous sides of the future anterior to be avoided: on the one

[4] "First of all, it is necessary to point out that as far as its material is concerned, the event is not a miracle. What I mean is that what composes an event is always extracted from a situation, always related back to a singular multiplicity, to its state, to the language connected to it, etc. In fact if we want to avoid lapsing into an obscurantist theory of creation *ex nihilo*, we must accept that an event is nothing but a part of a given situation, nothing but a fragment of being" (Badiou 2004, 98).
"In other words, the issue of the singular assemblages of enunciation does not emerege *ex nihilo* from a chaotic reality: there are thousands of outlines, thousands of catalyzing elements, highly differentiated and capable of being articulated to one another or being engaged in a creative process, or entering into phenomena of implosion, self-destruction, or microfascism—which, even then, does not transform them into chaos." (Guattari 2008, 317).

hand, a past and future fused together in the "eventess" of a "pure becoming" where the revolutionary present has disappeared, and on the other hand a past and future divided into pre- and post- evental worlds where the present has been infinitely divided into an empty or absent time. The first fails by equating revolutionary events with the absolute condition for all events as such. The second fails by positing a miraculous origin at the heart of any given event. What I am proposing instead is a concept of the future anterior that functions as a new present moment within and along side the other processes of political and temporal representation. This new present moment is not an infinitely split time but a productive one that both projects a new future and retrojects a new past.[5] It is, as Deleuze says, the creation of a whole new space-time (Deleuze 1995, 176).

In the last few lines of series twenty three (of Aion), in *Logic of Sense,* Deleuze distinguishes between three kinds of presents: (1) a subverted present (empty and infinitely split), (2) an actualized present (diffused into everything), and (3) a third present that acts as the "quasi-cause" of a distinctly new past and future: a present-past and present-future (1990, 168). "It would seem, no doubt," Deleuze says, "that the Aion cannot have any present at all, since in it the instance is always dividing into future and past. But this is only appearance" (1990, 168). In reality, the third present (of the future anterior) is a real "quasi-causal" condition for a new past and future transformed immanently within the old. But, how exactly is this new present precipitated? How are its consequences *concretely* distributed

[5] Husserl proposes a similar notion in his theory of time consciousness. But this is not nearly radical enough since for Husserl time consciousness is immanent to something else outside time. What I am proposing instead is that revolutionary political events themselves establish new truly immanent space-times that do not transcend the matrix of political representation but are equally immanent to it. Here I am in agreement with Deleuze and Guattari when the say that with Husserl discovers "the mole of the transcendent within immanence itself. Husserl conceives of immanence as that of the flux lived by subjectivity. But since all this pure and even untamed lived does not belong completely to the self that represents it to itself, something transcendent is reestablished...first, in the form of an 'immanent or primordial transcendence' of a world populated by intentional objects; second, as the privileged transcendence of an intersubjective world populated by other selves; and third, as objective transcendence of an ideal world populated by cultural formations and the human community" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 46).

without becoming representational? What are its dangers? How are we to understand the more intermediate degrees of such a transformation? And what is its relationship to the political situation and its typology of different representational processes? These questions are not fully answered in the *Logic of Sense*.

In fact, Deleuze and Guattari are not able to fully answer them until 1980 when they co-write *A Thousand Plateaus*: their first constructivist effort.[6] What is important to distinguish, however, in this concept of the third present of the future anterior, introduced in *Logic of Sense,*[7] is that such a present is capable of becoming the "quasi-causal" or real condition for a new world neither diffused or split. Once this "moment" emerges it re-conditions not only the political situation of the new present, but also that of a new past and future. Revolution is thus not an opposition nor an *ex nihilo* insurrection, it is a prefiguration in the sense that it creates a new world parallel to the old one. This prefiguration takes place in the future anterior in the sense that it does not assume a pre-given past which it opposes or a merely possible future which it hopes to attain. Revolutionary prefiguration is instead future anterior insofar as it creates, as Deleuze says, an entirely new space-time of its own (1995, 176). It creates the past and future it wants to see in the present. According to Deleuze and Guattari this is the positive meaning of presentiment. Not the inert hope that "another world is possible," but the direct action of that particular world within the present.

> In order to give a positive meaning to the idea of a "presentiment" of what does not yet exist, it is necessary to demonstrate that what does not yet exist is already in action, in a different form than that of its existence. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 431)

---

[6] Deleuze and Guattari refer to *Anti-Oedipus* as a constructivist work only retroactively. *Anti-Oedipus* may have introduced the concept of schizonanalysis that Deleuze and Guattari equate to constructivism in *A Thousand Plateaus*, but *Anti-Oedipus* also lacks a fully developed theory of revolutionary "consistency" and "nomadism." "Desire has always been a constructivism" (Stivale 2004).

[7] The concept of the future anterior is not present in *Difference and Repetition*.

This real action of the constructed past and future within the present is what Deleuze and Guattari call "neo-archaism" and "ex-futurism" (1983, 257). If space-time is a topological plane of various contingent and heterogenous processes connected together through folding and morphism, as was argued in chapter II, then a revolutionary intervention does not emerge dialectically or developmentally, or *ex nihilo*, it emerges by creating a new fold or connection between various points in space-time: a new arrangement of past, present, and future. Thus, revolution today does not seize the state, it creates something better from below and outside it.

I will return to this concept of revolutionary prefiguration and the future anterior in my development of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of absolute positive deterritorialization. But with the concept of the future anterior, distinguished from a synthesis for the past and future and from a complete split between past and future, the problem now is how to understand the role this revolutionary prefiguration plays and what dangers it faces in the larger process of political transformation. In order to do so in the next four sub-sections I draw on Deleuze and Guattari's theory of transformation, or what they call "deterritorialization."

Four Concepts of Change or "Deterritorialization"

The concept of change is arguably one of the most central concepts throughout Deleuze and Guattari's work. And while it has undergone many different names and terminological shifts over time, it remains safe to say that there are two concepts in their work that are the most important for understanding this concept: "becoming" and "deterritorialization." It is of no coincidence then, that the chapter most centrally devoted to these two concepts not only composes the *largest* of all the chapters in *A Thousand Plateaus* (77 pages) but is also the only place in the book where the concept of the future anterior (Aeon) is deployed: *1730: Becoming-Intense, Becoming-Animal, Becoming-Imperceptible. . . .*

Given the clear centrality of this chapter and these two concepts in their work, I propose to draw from them a theory of revolutionary transformation that provides an alternative to strategic opposition and revolutionary "eventness," as well as the synthetic and divided concepts of the future anterior. Additionally, my argument is that a theory of revolutionary intervention in the future anterior or what I am calling prefiguration, cannot be understood without also understanding the four concepts of change in the theory of deterritorialization. In the next four sub-sections I thus develop the four concepts of change briefly outlined at the beginning of this section (relative negative, relative positive, absolute negative, and absolute positive deterritorialization). Afterward, in the third and final major section of this chapter, I argue that the Zapatistas deploy a practice of revolutionary prefiguration.

(1) Relative Negative Deterritorialization

The first type of change is what Deleuze and Guattari call "relative negative deterritorialization." This is a change that is able to break free from the processes of political representation (coding, overcoding, and axiomatization) but only momentarily and in such a way that the change obstructs further transformations. A relative negative deterritorialization is a normalized transformation internal to the functioning of a representational process that secures its further expansion. It is a mistake to think that power is ever total or homogenous. Rather, the opposite is true. Representational power, according to Deleuze and Guattari, functions only through its internal breakdowns: relative negative deterritorializations.

In the processes of territorial coding for example, there are certain prohibitions and boundaries that define the limits proper to a society: how things are to be used, how desire is to be directed, where activities are to take place, etc. A coded territory is thus what it is only by virtue of where it draws the disjunctive limits of its code. On one side it connects qualitative codes, while on the other side it disjuncts a remainder or surplus yet-to-be-coded.

But since territorial coding is based on the primary repression of "uncoded or decoded flows" (absolute deterritorialization), something is always remerging outside the limits of a given block of code. As each coded territory approaches its marginal limits, after which it will cease to be what it is, it undergoes an internal transformation by conjuncting and redistributing the surplus to another line of code (through alliance). "By switching territories at the conclusion of each operation period" territorial coding becomes itinerant (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 440): creating multiple binary segments-in-progress. That is to say, its power to represent the natural codes of social life function only through a perpetual "disequilibrium of excess and deficiency" (1983, 150). Relative negative deterritorialization (stabilized dysfunction) is thus an essential element of its very ability to function (1983, 151). Elements are structurally excluded only to be reintegrated under a new hierarchy later on.

Statist overcoding also functions through internal break-down and transformation, but in a different way. Opposed to the territorial coding of primarily unstable flows of absolute deterritorialization, statism is itself a deterritorialized and uncoded remainder from the territorial stock that becomes a centralized point of accumulation (of land, work, currency, etc). This point of accumulation in turn performs a relative negative deterritorialization back upon the qualitative territorial codes by removing their heterogeneous qualities and stratifying them into a single vertical and hierarchical line of machinic enslavement within a central overcoding apparatus (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 427–28). But in retaining given coded elements, the state necessarily cuts off relations with other elements, which become exterior to it. Opposed to territorial itinerancy that merely begins a new line of code with the remainder, the state's form of relative negative deterritorialization aims to either destroy all remainders or capture them "once and for all." But since neither of these are possible (due to the inexhaustible contingencies of political history discussed in chapter II) the state is continually entering into increasingly violent states

of security, emergency, and internal change: relative negative deterritorialization. The state is thus paranoiac and ultimately impotent. But, "it is precisely its impotence that makes power so dangerous," as Deleuze and Guattari say (1987, 229). The more power and security a state deploys the more its impotence grows. The more its impotence grows, the more power is required to secure it, and so on.

> This is both the principle of their power and the basis of their impotence. Far from being opposites, power and impotence complement and reinforce each other in a kind of fascinating satisfaction that is found above all in the most mediocre Statesmen, and defines their "glory." For they extract glory from their shortsightedness, and power from their impotence. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 225)

Above all, capitalist axiomatization is the representational process most adapted to the rapid and fluid process of internal transformation, that is, relative negative deterritorialization. Opposed to the paranoiac and totalitarian drive toward total capture or destruction that requires so many "states of emergency" and paranoiac suspensions of law, capitalist axiomatization takes non-totality and incompleteness to be its point of departure. Opposed to codes that qualify, and overcodes that bring codes into a single resonance, axioms function by directly conjugating unqualified and decoded flows themselves. Thus capitalism goes furthest in its relative negative deterritorialization. At one pole it deploys an aggressive decoding of qualitative relationships through the privatization of all aspects of social life, free trade, advertising, freeing of labor and capital, imperialism, and at the other pole conjugates them as abstract quantities for exchange on the world market (1983, 246).[8] Where the despotic states had emperors of anti-production to consume and capture surplus, the bourgeois field of immanence has no such external limit; it has integrated anti-production inside production itself. Since axiomatization takes contingency, change, and deterritorialization to be its presupposition, it also makes the internal and inevitable destruction or saturation of markets themselves the condition for its ever widening limits

[8] "It axiomatizes with one hand what it decodes with the other" (1983, 246).

(1983, 253). "War," as a type of relative negative deterritorialization, Deleuze and Guattari say, thus

> clearly follows the same movement as capitalism . . . actively contribut[ing] to the redistributions of the world necessary for the exploitation of maritime and planetary resources . . . [thus] the power of war always supersaturates the system's saturations, as its necessary condition. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 466)

(2) Relative Positive Deterritorialization

The second type of political change described by Deleuze and Guattari is defined as a real transformation of political representation that prevails over secondary reterritorializations (codes, overcodes, and axioms) but fails to connect with other positively deterritorialized elements or create a new arrangement. Relative positive deterritorialization on its own is thus only the mere affirmation that something has escaped the dominant regimes of political representation at the borderlines. This kind of change is ultimately insufficient to sustain a revolutionary struggle. It is thus a mistake to think that just because something has escaped political representation that it is inherently revolutionary. Again, the opposite is true. Political transformations, according to Deleuze and Guattari, are experimental and require sustained and committed connections with others to become revolutionary.

> It is because no one, not even God, can say in advance whether two borderlines will string together or form a fiber, whether a given multiplicity will or will not cross over into another given multiplicity, or even if given heterogeneous elements will enter symbiosis, will form a consistent, or cofunctioning, multiplicity susceptible to transformation. No one can say where the line of flight will pass: Will it let itself get bogged down . . . Or will it succumb to another danger, for example, turning into a line of abolition, annihilation, self-destruction, Ahab, Ahab... ? We are all too familiar with the dangers of the line of flight, and with its ambiguities. The risks are ever-present, but it is always possible to have the good fortune of avoiding them. Case by case, we can tell whether the line is consistent, in other words, whether the heterogeneities effectively function in a multiplicity of symbiosis, whether the multiplicities are effectively transformed through the becomings of passage. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 250)

Relative positive deterritorialization is thus a borderline phenomena, a "Thing, which arrives and passes at the edge," that functions as the two-sided limit of political representation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 244). Because "the politics of becomings," for Deleuze and Guattari, are so "extremely ambiguous," this borderline is split in two: on one side it exists as an "Anomalous" element unaccounted for within the state of affairs but still recognizable as an exception, and on the other side it exists as an "exceptional individual" that holds together the increasing connections of a new world in formation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 247). Insofar as it "ceases to be a definable aggregate in relation to the majority," it both reveals the possibility of further connection as well as the possibility of inevitable co-optation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 291).

(3) Absolute Negative Deterritorialization

The third type of political change described by Deleuze and Guattari is defined as a real transformation that moves absolutely beyond all the borderlines of territorial, state, and capitalist representation.[9] But in doing so it not only fails to connect with other deterritorialized elements and create a new arrangement, it deterritorializes too fast, too much, and becomes self-destructive. Ultimately, it ends up strengthening the processes of political representation. Radical political transformation is thus not merely ambiguous. This would be putting things too lightly, it is dangerous. "Staying stratified—organized, signified, subjected—is not the worst that can happen;" Deleuze and Guattari warn, "the worst that can happen is if you throw the strata into demented or suicidal collapse, which brings them back down on us heavier than ever" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 161).

[9] Absolute deterritorialization though, does not simply come after relative deterritorialization. Rather, "relative Deterritorialization itself requires an absolute for its operation," and "conversely, absolute Deterritorialization necessarily proceeds by way of relative Deterritorialization, precisely because it is not transcendent" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 510).

When a "line of flight" or a degree of political transformation "makes [change] an unlimited movement with no other aim than itself," this is what Deleuze and Guattari call fascism (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 421).[10] Provided that we do not strictly apply this concept to its narrow and literal reference in the traditional categories of political ideology, there can be all kinds of fascisms to the degree to which they exhibit a certain "passion for self-destruction." There is a molar fascism when a totalitarian state values war over its own self-preservation, as in the case of Nazi germany, in Hitler's final days. "*If the war is lost, may the nation perish*," Hitler declares in telegram 71. "Here," Deleuze and Guattari say, "Hitler decides to join forces with his enemies in order to complete the destruction of his own people, by obliterating the last remaining resources of its life-support system, civil reserves of every kind (potable water, fuel, provisions, etc.)" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 231; Virilio, 1993, 1–15; Arendt 1966, 326). There is a molecular fascism when groups or individuals collapse in on themselves in isolation: "a rural fascism and city or neighborhood fascism, youth fascism and war veterans fascism, fascism of the left and of the right, fascism of the couple, family, school and office" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 214). It is a general thirst for every kind of destruction, "whose only outcome is death" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 162).

Therefore, it is because one is unable to "reach the . . . plane of consistency, by wildly destratifying," that Deleuze and Guattari, for the first time in their work together, advise, not wisdom, but "injections of caution" into the process of political transformation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 160, 150).

---

[10] Deleuze and Guattari are not referring to the merely historical phenomena of Fascism. Rather they are extracting a concept from it strictly defined as a "war machine of self abolition" that may apply to some historical situations in some ways and not in others. Nazi Germany was a totalitarian state plus an impulse for war and national self-destruction (the murder of its own people and the liquidation of industry for the sake of the war effort). Nick Land thus misunderstands Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Fascism when he asks, "does anyone think Nazism is like letting go?" (Land 1993, 76).

(4) Absolute Positive Deterritorialization

The fourth, final, and most important type of political change described by Deleuze and Guattari is a kind of transformation that not only escapes the absolute limits and borders of political representation, but connects up to an increasing number of other absolutely positive deterritorialized elements whose ultimate collective aim is the immanent transformation of the present intersection of political processes *through* the prefigurative construction of a new world (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 142). But it would be a mistake to think that this radical transformation is a kind of *ex nihilo* miracle or absolute Other/Outside of political representation. Deleuze and Guattari are quite clear, and the previous types of change have shown, that absolute deterritorialization is already presupposed as the absolute *internal* limit immanently confronted by all other forms of social organization. Absolute positive deterritorialization is thus in no way transcendent, oppositional, or merely potential, but rather a kind of immanent and creative process from within the situation that harnesses all of its inevitable breakdowns and exclusions. It does so not in order to develop a new form of political representation, or stabilize the old ones, but to create a new non-representational social body.

But is it really sufficient to say that absolute positive deterritorialization is merely the connection of all such heterogenous breakdowns and exclusions? Not at all. It is precisely this move that reads absolute positive deterritorialization as a transcendental condition for all political change as such: difference-in-itself, potentiality, or pure becoming. While Peter Hallward's book, *Out of This World*, is perhaps the most extreme formulation of this "theophantic" conclusion, it should indicate to us the risks of such a position and the necessity of thinking absolute positive deterritorialization as a real, concrete revolutionary force. I thus present the following alternative reading.

Absolute positive deterritorialization does not form a single transcendental or ontological condition for all revolutionary change. Deleuze and Guattari are extremely clear about this when they say that "politics precedes being," and that "the plane of consistency does not preexist the movements of deterritorialization that unravel it, the lines of flight that draw it and cause it to rise to the surface, the becomings that compose it" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 25, 270). Rather case by case, very specific, singular elements become dislodged, marginalized, and deterritorialized from the intersection of representational political processes (or what Deleuze and Guattari call, "the plane of organization"). These singular elements then "combine into blocks [of becoming]" based on a "topological zone of proximity that marks their belonging to [each other]" in a given situation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 268, 273).

Far from forming a muddy and inconsistent multitude, each relational "block of becoming" that is assembled from the immanent breakdowns and unrepresentable elements within the situation, "does not have the same forces or even speeds of deterritorialization as another; in each instance, the indices and coefficients must be calculated according to the block of becoming under consideration, and in relation to the mutations of an abstract machine" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 306–7). Far from affirming the vague and ambivalent potentiality of transformation as such, Deleuze and Guattari insist on the "fragment by fragment" political calculation, comparison, and assembly of powers of deterritorialization (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 146; Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 307). Thus, and this is crucial to the entire thesis of this dissertation, "it is in concrete social fields, at specific moments, that the comparative movements of deterritorialization, the continuums of intensity, and the combinations of flux that they form must be studied" (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 135).

Absolute positive deterritorialization is prefigurative in the sense that it follows out the consequences of a specific event immanent and parallel to the processes of

representation. "The question" of sustaining the event, as Guattari puts it, "is how to ensure that the singular processes—which almost swerve into the incommunicable—are maintained by articulating them in a work, a text, a way of living with oneself or with others, or the invention of areas of life and freedom to create" (2008, 259). In other words, absolute positive deterritorialization doesn't just lay preparatory groundwork for an event, it also "captures the [unrepresentable] elements of the situation" and "constructs its own types of practical and theoretical references, without remaining dependent in relation to global power, whether in terms of economy, knowledge, technology, or segregations, and prestige that are disseminated" (2008, 62).

To return to the central thesis of this chapter, revolutionary political transformation occurs as the prefigurative emergence of a particular new present (within and along side the old) that both "rewrites and reinterprets the totality of potentials that already existed in stratified form," as well as creates "an action of the future on the present," and "the present on the past" (Guattari 2008, 252; Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 431). This is what Deleuze and Guattari call "reverse causalities." More than a break or zig zag in history, they argue, what is to come already acts upon "what is" before the future can appear, insofar as it acts as a limit or threshold continually being warded off by the past's attempt to preserve itself. But once a new present emerges it is seen to have been on its way the entire time (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 431). If, from the perspective of the plane of organization, revolutionary novelty may seem to emerge "out of nowhere," this is only because it was unable to see or represent the prefigurative labor of deterritorialization before it had transformed the political conditions under which it could be seen and understood as such. However, from the perspective of the revolutionary struggle, the emerging event appears entirely consistent and intelligible as that which will have been. This prefigurative labor, according to Guattari,

> consists in detecting the outlines, indicators, and crystals of molecular productivity. If there is a micropolitics to be practiced, it consists in ensuring that these molecular levels do not always succumb to systems that coopt them, systems of neutralization, or processes of implosion or self-destruction. It consists in apprehending how other assemblages of the production of life, the production of art, or the production of whatever you want might find their full expansion, so that the problematics of power find a response. This certainly involves modes of response of a new kind. (2008, 339)

The new revolutionary present thus emerges from strategic sites of struggle that draw it "in negative outline," Deleuze and Guattari say. "But for it to be realized there must be a whole integral of decoded flows, a whole generalized conjunction that overspills and over-turns the preceding apparatuses" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 452). That is, it must "cause the other elements to cross a threshold enabling a conjunction of their respective deterritorializations, a shared acceleration. This is . . . absolute, positive deterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 142), not only an escape but the creation of "new weapons" (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 136): "the creation of great machines of struggle" (Guattari 2008, 210).

However, lest I risk arguing in favor of a purely subterranean and imperceptible form of revolutionary transformation, I should highlight, because some often forget to, that the purpose of absolute positive deterritorialization is not simply to become-imperceptible in relation to the plane of organization for the sake of doing so: this has too much fascist potential. The purpose of prefigurative revolutionary interventions are to render everything "fragment by fragment" imperceptible from the plane of organization in order to create "the plane of consistency, which is nevertheless precisely where the imperceptible is seen and heard (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 252). The task is not to relish the theory of an impossible and invisible revolution, but rather to "bring the imperceptible to perception" by changing the dominant conditions for visibility (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 267). It is neither by oppositional destruction or by *ex nihilo* creation but "by conjugating, by continuing with

other lines, other pieces, that one makes a world that can overlay the first one, like a transparency" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 280).

The Prefigurative Politics of Zapatismo

It would be a mistake to think that the Zapatistas or any other revolutionary political struggle were ever confined to expressing only a single type of political transformation. Just as in the previous chapter we saw how the Zapatistas use an intersectional diagnostic to asses the external and internal dangers of their struggle on all fronts, so in this chapter we see to what degree they have chosen to intervene in each of the above four ways. Zapatismo thus takes place at a particular intersection of all four types of political change, although ultimately, I argue, their greatest degree of intervention is in the prefigurative future anterior.

Relative Negative Deterritorialization: the EZLN, the Peace Accords, and Biopiracy

Power is never total or homogenous, and thus change, disfunction, and break-down are inevitable aspects of any intersection of social orders. To the degree that the Zapatistas intervene in their political situation, they always risk having any transformations they contribute not only neutralized or coopted, but turned into changes that actually expand the power of political representation. For example, given the territorial codes of representation sustaining the patriarchal culture of indigenous life in Chiapas, the EZLN made a very specific intervention at the limits of this coding process: the creation of the *Women's Revolutionary Law*. By allowing women (regardless of race) to join the resistance, to work and receive fair wages, to be educated, to choose their partner to choose the number of children they have, and to be free from sexual violence, etc. (EZLN 1994), they were able to deterritorialize the coded lines of patriarchal filiation and forced marriage alliance (to some degree). However, in doing so they faced the danger of merely deploying a relative negative deterritorialization that only strengthened the vanguard military apparatus (EZLN) and

initiated a new hierarchal line of filiation and military order still dominated to some degree my men and male values. As Marcos says of the EZLN,

> accompaniment has sometimes turned into management, advice into orders and support into a hindrance. I've already spoken previously about the fact that the hierarchical, pyramid structure is not characteristic of the indigenous communities. The fact that the EZLN is a political-military and clandestine organization still corrupts processes that should and must be democratic. (Marcos 2004)

The Zapatistas also risked a relative negative deterritorialization with their intervention into the overcoding state apparatus in their early attempts from 1994 to 1996 to negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Mexican government.

> In the [San Andres] agreements the government promised to recognize the right to autonomy of Indian peoples in the constitution, to broaden their political representation, to guarantee full access to the justice system, and to build a new legal framework that guaranteed political rights, legal rights and cultural rights. The government promised also to recognize indigenous people as subjects of public rights." (Ramírez 2008, 138)

But it was not the bare fact of negotiation with the Mexican government that made the Zapatista's intervention a relative negative one (winning these rights would have been a historic victory, even if it was through a state juridical process). What made them relatively negative was the fact that the government negotiated and agreed to the *San Andres Peace Accords* but never followed through with them. During these years of negotiation the Zapatistas tried not to take any risky or radical actions or retaliations that might jeopardize the Peace Accords. Meanwhile, however, paramilitary forces, permitted by the government, as well as military troops and local police, escalated their attacks on Zapatista and Indigenous communities in Chiapas (including murder, assassination, harassment, and military relocation). The entire *Peace Accords* process was nothing but a temporary deterritorialization that allowed for the Mexican state's paranoid and impotent attempt at extermination and total capture.

Finally, after being murdered, harassed, and relocated, the Zapatistas were forced further and further back into the Lacandon Jungle. As food, building materials, and water became scarce, the Zapatistas increasingly entered into a mutual deterritorialization with the Jungle: they relied more on their traditional knowledges of the forest, wild plants, and animals, while they ultimately ate less and tried not to damage the jungle ecosystem. But this deterritorialization was soon transformed into a relatively negative one as the Indigenous people were accused by the government and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) of "exacerbat[ing] already existing deforestation pressures in the Lacandon jungle" (O'Brien 2000). Police, military, and environmental conservationists were brought in, not just to secure the jungle from the indigenous people, but to protect the increasing private axiomatization of the newly deterritorialized "biopolitical market" of indigenous knowledge, plants, animals, and tourism that had been opened up both by state and NGO protection as well as the actions of the Indigenous people themselves whose environmental "damage" needed "repairing" by conservation scientists and/or bioprospectors.

Relative Positive Deterritorialization: the First Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle

Is its also possible, however, that revolutionary interventions really split political life down the middle and force people to take action, or not. For example, the Zapatista's *January 1st Uprising* in 1994 marked out the real limits of political life in Mexico. The day that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect, the Zapatistas "burst upon a world that denied their existence," as Zapatista scholar John Holloway says. Armed men and women from the indigenous communities took by force 7 towns and over 500 privately owned ranches in the state of Chiapas (Holloway 1998, 1). From the perspective of Mexican politics and the dominant referents of politicians, corporations, voting citizens, etc., the Zapatistas surely "appeared" to "burst onto the scene" from nowhere. The existence of the Zapatistas was thus definitely at the borderline of popular political intelligibility. Who are

"the Zapatistas" and what is the meaning of their call to "Revolutionary War on the Mexican government?" The *First Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle* was this first call for the radical deterritorialization of Mexican politics.

> To the People of Mexico: We, the men and women, full and free, are conscious that the war that we have declared is our last resort, but also a just one. The dictators are applying an undeclared genocidal war against our people for many years. Therefore we ask for your participation, your decision to support this plan that struggles for work, land, housing, food, health care, education, independence, freedom, democracy, justice and peace. We declare that we will not stop fighting until the basic demands of our people have been met by forming a government of our country that is free and democratic. JOIN THE INSURGENT FORCES OF THE ZAPATISTA ARMY OF NATIONAL LIBERATION
> —General Command of the EZLN, 31 December 1993 (Marcos 2004b, 642)

This evental call to popular revolutionary war split political reality in two. On one side it is still possible to see the *January Uprising* as a temporary anomalous (although not immediately recuperable) blip of resistance in the prevailing political world; on the other side it is also the first visible manifestation of what will have been the beginning of a revolutionary war for popular and direct democracy across Mexico. But what clearly marks this event as a relative positive deterritorialization is that when confronted with this evental splitting of the situation, the Mexican people (for the most part) chose to *both* support the Zapatista's struggle *and* tolerate the Mexican government's continued existence as a negotiator in the *Peace Accords*. Thus without a sufficient popular mobilization of deterritorialized connections across Mexico, the event remained mostly affirmed in name without a large scale-connection of increasingly deterritorialized elements or building of alternative institutions. This type of political intervention is perhaps best exemplified in the creation of *counter institutions*: institutions that both affirm revolutionary struggles like the Zapatistas' and want to protect it, but also do so through the struggle for rights, peace accords, negotiations, and legal reforms within representational politics.

Absolute Negative Deterritorialization: a War Against the Mexican Government?

But these kinds of revolutionary failures are not the worst thing that can happen. In addition to failing to connect to other vectors of deterritorialization sufficient to sustain a revolutionary struggle, interventions can also become suicidal. For example, the EZLN no doubt had to seriously assess the Mexican people's degree of support for the *First Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle's Declaration of War* in relation to the Mexican military and paramilitary power. Who are the "Mexican people?" What is the minimal support needed for a successful "advance to the capital of the country, overcoming the Mexican federal army, protecting in our advance the civilian population and permitting the people in the liberated area the right to freely and democratically elect their own administrative authorities" (Marcos 2004b, 642)? What is the strength of our army? Are we prepared for death in combat?

When popular support turned out to be (or was diagnosed as such) largely against revolutionary war, the EZLN had to decide to either continue a prolonged guerrilla war (something for which they had been training for the past ten years) surrender, or proceed by other means. Had they chosen to fight an unpopular military war against the Mexican government, knowing that they would likely lose, and were unable to find another way out of their situation, there is clearly a potential for revolutionary fascism and self-destruction.[11]

Thus we can see in the Zapatista's *Second Declaration* (June, 1994) the adherence to an "offensive cease-fire," and a call-out for a "peaceful and civic mobilization effort" by the Mexican people against the government. This begins a new long-term strategy of popular mobilization efforts across Mexico and around the world. Clearly aware of the potential fascism that any revolutionary movement faces, Marcos writes:

> We don't want to impose our solutions by force, we want to create a democratic space. We don't see armed struggle in the classic sense of previous guerrilla wars,

[11] Like the revolutionary fascism of militant terrorists groups of the 60's and 70's: the Red Army Faction, the Weather Underground Organization, etc.

> that is, as the only way and the only all-powerful truth around which everything is organized. In a war, the decisive thing is not the military confrontation but the politics at stake in the confrontation. We didn't go to war to kill or be killed. We went to war in order to be heard. (Marcos 2009)

Absolute Positive Deterritorialization: Prefiguration and the Juntas de Buen Gobierno

Perhaps most interesting, however, is when political interventions not only escape the secondary reterritorializations of power but manage to connect up with others to transform the dominant political conditions through the creation of a new world. For example, despite their initial failure to incite a revolutionary war against the Mexican government, or perhaps because of this failure, the Zapatistas proceeded to initiate another kind of warfare no less revolutionary, or perhaps more so: the popular organization of civil society and the creation of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (Councils of Good Government). In addition to many country-wide tours in previous years (to mobilize popular solidarity), in 2006 the Zapatista's began a concerted national effort to meet with and mobilize a popular unity of Left forces in Mexico around the up-coming electoral campaign: they called it *La Otra Campaña*.

The purpose was not to form a party or select a candidate but to build connections and networks between left and radical groups across Mexico: to strengthen their shared deterritorializations. Along with the sustained use of internet communiqués, calls and responses for national and international support, the Zapatistas began holding large annual international events (*Intercontinental Encuentros for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism)* and participating in annual *Peoples Global Action* and *World Social Forum* events in order to further increase their connections and solidarities with other deterritorialized groups around the world. What remains so unique about the Zapatistas as a revolutionary movement is the degree to which they have increasingly broadened their struggle beyond their own indigenous territorial situation and taken on others' struggles as their own (against racism,

homophobia, sexism, imperialism, neoliberalism, and environmental destruction). Many Marxists had previously denied the possibility of a non-industrial-working-class revolution, much less one specifically focusing on indigenous autonomy. But through a much more radical form of mutual deterritorialization, the Zapatistas participate in a whole new type of revolutionary sequence.

Secondly, the Zapatistas have also deployed a prefigurative revolutionary intervention in two ways. First, the only way one could possibly say that the Zapatistas "burst onto the scene of Mexican politics out of nowhere" is if they had not been aware of the ten years of revolutionary activity, training, and indigenous mobilizations sustained in the jungles of the Lacandon since 1983. Marcos and three others began as Che-inspired military vanguardists living outside indigenous communities and slowly earning the trust of, and radicalizing, the indigenous population. Far from appearing out of nowhere, there was a long and ultimately collective decision by the assembly of indigenous *campasin@s* to go to war. During this time the event of Zapatismo certainly existed as a new present that had constructed a past (based on the justice of Emiliano Zapata's peasant revolution) and a future (of directly democratic autonomous communes). Both the past of Zapata and the future of the communes, although technically non-existent, acted directly on the new present of Zapatismo. During these ten years Zapatismo existed as a form of invisibility that will have been visible. The future anterior of Zapatismo is thus the revolutionary belief that the past (Zapata) can be resurrected and requires us to follow out its consequences against the Mexican government and towards the creation of a federated network of autonomous communes. Despite objective evidence of the fact, a Zapatista believes that Zapatismo *will have been* a revolutionary event. There is no objectivity or science of the revolution, only committed experimentation. One either takes it up in the future anterior and wagers on its existence or one does not take it up.

The second example, and perhaps the most original one, is the scale on which the Zapatistas have refused to "take power" and have instead continued their revolution by creating in the present the world they want to see in their own autonomous municipalities. They began in August of 2003 to create the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno*: directly democratic institutional frameworks for collective and autonomous decision-making. One JBG was created in each of the *Caracoles* (regional communities, or snails) to

> promote and approve the participation of compa@eros and compa@eras . . . to mediate conflicts which might arise between Autonomous Municipalities . . . to monitor the implementation of projects and community work in the Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities . . . to serve and guide national and international civil society so that they can visit communities, carry out productive projects, set up peace camps, carry out research, etc. (Marcos 2004b, 619)

Currently over 2,200 communities (over 100,000 people) are federated into 32 autonomous municipalities, each grouped into five local self-governments (JBGs). Today the Zapatistas remain committed to, among other things, autonomy, participatory self-government, consensus decision-making, respect for nature and life without the use of pesticides, dams, unnecessary logging, and the inclusion of "everybody without distinctions of party, religion, sex, or color" (Marcos 2006).

By forming a specific block of becoming through rotational self-government, the federation of their communes, and ultimately their solidarity with an international network of shared social struggle, the Zapatistas continue to make political interventions and alternative institutions that prefigure the kind of democratic and equalitarian world they and their allies want to live in. Opposed to directly declaring war on the Mexican government and instituting a regime change in the state, or simply affirming the radical possibility that "another world is possible," the Zapatistas are building, to what degree they can, another world within and alongside the old.

The determination, including my own, that Zapatismo "will have been" a revolutionary event, however, has no objective status, only a conditional and experimental one: *if* you believe that Zapatismo is an event, *then* that belief functions in the future anterior and can be supported by the network of evidence I have outlined above. If not, then Zapatismo is an inconsequential moment to be co-opted or crushed. Similarly, the normative sounding description of "positive" or "negative" types of deterritorialization can only be determined as such given the conditional engagement in revolutionary struggle. Radical political transformation is "positive" when it irrecoverably transforms representational power and "negative" when it does not. From the perspective of representational power, however, this would seem not to be the case.

Conclusion

In chapter II I argued that the problem of history and revolution should be understood neither as a universal history of succession or contingency but rather as a diagnostic activity that examines several specific types of coexistent political processes at once in order to assess the risks and dangers of a given revolutionary struggle. But in the process of this diagnostic practice we were confronted with the problem of intervention and political transformation. In the practice of diagnosing, where and how have we already intervened? How and where will we direct our future interventions based on a given intersectional analysis of power, and what new political world are we creating within the old, if any?

In this chapter I responded to this problem of revolutionary intervention in three ways. I responded first by arguing that a post-representational revolutionary intervention can not be defined as an oppositional or reactionary struggle based on the same presuppositions of political representation that it wishes to transform, nor can it be defined by the

ontological affirmation of difference-in-itself as the absolute condition for all political transformation. I responded secondly by arguing that contemporary revolutionary intervention is defined primarily by its prefigurative connections and constructions in the future anterior. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of Aeon and Deterritorialization in *A Thousand Plateaus,* I supported this argument by showing that future anterior intervention can be distinguished from three other types of political transformation: relative negative, relative positive, and absolute negative deterritorializations, remain insufficient to support a revolutionary political transformation of the plane of organization into a plane of consistency. Finally, I responded by arguing that all revolutionary movements to some degree deploy, or confront the possibility of deploying, all four of these kinds of interventions. However, what distinguishes successful revolutionary interventions from others is the degree to which they deploy absolutely positive deterritorializations. By showing the degree to which the Zapatista revolutionary movement has made such deployments I have argued that they have, to a relatively high degree, been successful in transforming their political situation based on revolutionary prefiguration.

But while the theory of prefigurative political intervention and deterritorialization developed in this chapter may provide an account of how political change occurs and begins to connect up with other deterritorialized elements, it remains radically insufficient for understanding how it is that such prefigurative elements are able to cohere and organize themselves into distinctly non-representational kinds of political bodies. Revolutionary organizations constantly risk falling back into patterns of political representation on the one hand, and embracing the unrepresentable conditions for transformation as such on the other. Thus the task of chapter IV is to avoid both of these dangers and propose a theory of political participation drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of "consistency" and the Zapatista's participatory practice of Rule by Obeying (*Mandar Obedeciendo).*

CHAPTER IV

THE BODY POLITIC AND THE PROCESS OF PARTICIPATION

> It's not a question of worrying or of hoping for the best, but of finding new weapons.
> (Deleuze and Parnet 1987, 178)

Introduction

What is revolutionary political change? In chapter III I proposed three responses to this question. First, I argued that the return to revolution could not be defined as an oppositional or reactionary struggle based on the same presuppositions of political representation that it aims to transform: the coding processes of military vanguardism, the overcoding processes of statism, or the axiomatic processes of capitalism. Nor can the return to revolutionary change be defined by the ontological affirmation of difference-in-itself, as the absolute condition for all political transformation as such. The mere assertion that things may "become other than they are" is an entirely insufficient and ambivalent definition of revolutionary change.

Secondly, I argued that revolutionary intervention in the current return should be defined primarily by its prefigurative connections and constructions in the future anterior. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of Aeon and deterritorialization in *A Thousand Plateaus,* I supported this argument by showing that future anterior intervention not only provides a way to conceptualize the emergence of a new present from within the old but can be distinguished from three other types of political transformation that occur to some degree in revolutionary interventions: a relative negative change, a relative positive change, and an absolute negative change. I showed how all three of these types of intervention failed to sufficiently support a revolutionary political transformation and in what ways absolute positive deterritorialization might succeed in the future anterior.

Finally, I argued that the revolutionary movement of Zapatismo, to some degree, deploys all, or at least confronts the possibility of deploying all, four of these kinds of interventions. However, what distinguishes successful revolutionary interventions from other kinds is the degree to which they deploy absolutely positive deterritorializations or, what I am calling, prefigurative transformations. By showing the degree to which the Zapatista revolutionary movement has made such positive deployments, I argued that they have, to a high degree, been relatively successful in transforming their political situation through the process of political prefiguration.

But while the theory of political prefiguration and deterritorialization developed in chapter III may have provided an account of how different types of political transformation occur within several different representational processes (coding, overcoding, and axiomatization) it remained radically insufficient for understanding how revolutionary prefigurative practices, in particular, are able to cohere and distribute themselves into distinctly non-representational kinds of political bodies. How is it possible, for instance, to carry out and *sustain* the consequences of a non-representational revolution? Is there a new type of body politic that would no longer be predicated on the party-body of the nation-state, the market-body of capital, or territorial-body of the vanguard? Under what conditions would such a political body operate? How might one determine the relative benefits or detriments of the practices within its domain? And how might we understand the efficacy of different forms of agency without the reflection, contemplation, and communication of self-knowing (i.e. representational) subjects?

This chapter answers these questions.[1] Non-representational revolutions, I argue, do not simply establish new conditions for political life based on a "more just" sphere of

[1] In contrast to the political processes of coding, overcoding, and axiomatization examined in chapter II and three, the present chapter examines a fourth type of political process: consistency.

political action whose foundational principles are still held independently from the constituted sphere where such principles are deployed. Nor do such revolutions merely aim to establish counter institutions, whose sole purpose is to undermine all forms of representation and await the possibility that something new, and hopefully better, may emerge. Rather, a non-representational revolutionary body politic is built and sustained through an expressive and participatory process whose founding conditions are constantly undergoing direct and immanent transformation by the various practices and people who are effected by them to varying degrees.

This chapter thus poses three responses to the problem of creating a new revolutionary body politic. I first argue that the return to revolution located in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas is not based on creating a new process of political representation nor is it based on a mere rejection of all forms of representation as such. Secondly, I argue that, opposed to these two dangers of representation and anti-representation, the body politic of this return to revolution is defined instead by its participatory mutability: the degree to which its conditions are transformed by the participation of the elements and subjects affected by such conditions. I further argue that in order to understand the structure and function of participation in this revolutionary body politic we need to understand the unique relationship it articulates between three different dimensions of its political body: (1) the *conditions* under which it emerges and determines who counts as part of its body politic, (2) the distribution of concrete *elements* that express and constitute its body, and (3) the kinds of *subjects* who connect and transform these conditions and elements. Representational, anti-representational, and participatory political bodies each express a different type of relationship between these three dimensions. In order to develop a theory of a specifically revolutionary and participatory political body, I draw on Deleuze and Guattari's similar concept of consistency, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* and

What is Philosophy? but expand its application to the issue of revolutionary politics. Thirdly, I argue that the Zapatistas have created a similar revolutionary and participatory body politic based on, what that they call, Rule by Obeying (*Mandar Obedeciendo)*. Together, Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas form a theoretical practice of revolutionary political participation.

The Body Politic

The Representational Body Politic

If the crisis of identity and representational politics poses such an enormous problem for us today it is because identity has, for so long, provided the philosophical foundation for, and definition of, Western politics as such. With few exceptions politics has aimed at securing bodies of collective "capture" that ground and legitimate action through the presupposition of a political unity and identity of the governed: the identity of natural, ethnic, or territorial bodies; the identity of God, king, social contract, or modern state bodies; or the identity of the money-body of capital. While each of these bodies may be different in operation, each attempts to sustain a political distribution that can classify and organize various political differences as different *from* something that is certain, stable, and unified in advance of its reproduction.

Representational political bodies are thus made possible, in these cases, through the presupposition and subsequent repetition of an identity in the grounding body itself that establishes a political domain in advance of the differential expressions that come to populate and repeat it. Its multitude of political elements then differentially *re*present and *re*peat the generality of this prior domain. Each "different" political element that strengthens or weakens a given domain does so only in relation to the pre-given criteria of the general equality and exchangeability of difference. These process of representation were discussed at

length in chapter II as the body of the earth, the body of the state, the body of capital. Subjective formations are no exception. They take place only within the pre-given scope of these conditions and elements *re*presenting, *re*cognizing, *re*flecting, and *com*municating to and between themselves within the generally redundant parameters of a prior field of shared identity. This unifying process allows conflicting differences to be held together and mediated by a territorially shared "way of life," a governmentally enforced system of "rights/contracts," or a profit driven world "market." Self-consciousness, reason, and subjectivity presuppose these political models of identity when thinking represents to itself different choices, thoughts, voices, and desires on a pre-given plane of political organization.

We can see this type of representational body politic at work in the notion of vanguardism as it expresses (1) the historical unity and necessity of the relevant *conditions* of historico-political action: the factory site, the class struggle, labor power, and the overthrow of the state; (2) the practical diversity of *elements* conditioned on aiding or hindering this unified class struggle: "how does x represent the class struggle?" "how does x *re*peat the identity of its body, favorably, poorly?"; and (3) the unity of a revolutionary *subjectivity*, a proletarian-consciousness of the real historical-material conditions and the epistemological certitude of intervention: the seizer of the state apparatus and the dictatorship of the working-class. The vanguard "speaks for" its class, as a historical identity determined in advance by the science of political economy, just as democratically elected representatives "speak for" their "citizenry," determined in advance by the protection of rights, the tally of votes, etc. and money "speaks for" the world's consumer desires, determined by a prior axiomatic conjunction of labor and capital. Political differences according to the politics of representation are always differences *from* the same and within the identical.

But there are three dangers of representational political bodies: (1) Representational political bodies are necessarily exclusionary insofar as their founding principles are excluded

from modification in the political sphere they constitute. For example, the institution of state law by definition cannot be a legal act in itself since there was no system of law that proceeded its institution. The creation of a political domain based on the identity and sameness of its conditions is not only paradoxical, insofar as the creation of law is illegal, it necessarily excludes certain people from political participation to the degree the state is unable to change its founding conditions.

(2) Accordingly, if representational political bodies succeed in securing the evaluative criteria for relatively beneficial and detrimental political elements, they do so only on the precondition of a hierarchy of these elements, no matter what their egalitarian pretensions.[2] Since political differences are always different *from* the initial identity of their grounding body, elements more or less resemble its general measure of *re*cognition: the filiation of its territory, the laws of its state, the market value of its capital.

(3) Finally, representational political bodies produce subjects of deliberation only by creating an inability for the subject itself to change what it is. The subject of identity is able to reason and deliberate on political actions and decisions only insofar as it presupposes the identity of an undifferentiated body that such decisions or actions are distinguished *from*. The political subject then either asserts its positive freedom based on what it "self-transparently" desires or asserts its negative freedom from others who would curtail such reflectively known desires. In either case the subject is allowed change or difference only on the pre-condition of the initial unchanging transparency of what it *is and wants*.

The Anti-Representational Body Politic

In the wake of the above crisis of representation, and the death of the liberal subject, political counter-institutions and theoretical practices based on the rejection of all forms of representation have proliferated. Instead of positing identity as primary, and

[2] A "hierarchy based on the degree of proximity or distance from a principle" (Deleuze 1994, 37).

organizing political bodies based on their accurate representation of this identity, anti-representational political bodies presuppose difference as primary, and affirm it as a political condition radically exterior to all pre-given identities. Instead of political differences being different *from* a prior identity, they are instead conceived of as different *in-themselves*. Rather than the violent establishment of an exclusionary political domain posited in advance of the different political elements that would come to populate it, anti-representational political bodies leave the political domain radically open to potential political transformations and peoples yet "to come."

The anti-representational body politic thus understands difference in itself as the condition for all political transformation. "The political," is thus perpetually open to all those who potentially participate in its non-exclusive community. The various different political elements that would then assay the strengths and weaknesses, the health and dangers of this community, without an identity or representational condition to be defined against hierarchically, are instead understood as so many heterogenous elements. Each of these elements are equally tied to one another in nested relations that at each level signal the impossibility of political closure and open us up to the potentiality of further transformation. Instead of subjective transformations taking place solely within the pre-given identity-political domains of territorial, state, and capitalist representation, the subject itself is, according to this body politic, part of a larger "undefined work of freedom" (Foucault, 1984, 46): its own transformation beyond "self-evident" desires *for* something or *from* something. Rather than forming a unified plane on which to evaluate, deliberate, and decide different political actions, the differential subject is a fragmented, partial, and impersonal process of becoming composed of multiple drives and conflicting desires that produce the subject more as an effect or partial remainder than as a unified "self."

But how is one to put into practice a politics of "the potentiality of transformation as such?" Or is it the case, as Thomas Macarthy and others have argued (McCarthy 1991; Fraser 1989), that the politics of difference has only a critical function *contra* the politics of identity and no coherent alternative of its own? There are thus three dangers of the anti-representational body politic: (1) Since transformation as such cannot be delimited by any political domain in particular, it risks affirming an ambivalent condition for participation. Anything can happen. A political commitment to ambivalence, however, does not seem much different than the latent cynicism already pervading capitalist social life (1983, 225). If anything, such a position is indulgent and irresponsible given what's at stake in the problems at hand.

(2) Anti-representational political bodies may also be able to avoid the great hierarchical "chain of being" assumed by a politics of elements more or less identical to their original condition, but only at the cost of a latent hierarchy of "transformative potential" among the elements and the potential they express. While one may affirm their "equality" *qua* elements that may become otherwise than they are, it is also the case that in the particularity of their concrete being some elements undergo transformation more or less so than others. This is roughly the criticism that Badiou, originally in *Deleuze: the Clamor of Being*, leveled against Deleuze's pre-constructivist works, *Difference and Repetition* and *Logic of Sense*, and that Peter Hallward and Slavoj Žižek have taken up in their own monographs against Deleuze (also citing, almost exclusively, Deleuze's pre-constructivist works).[3]

(3) Similarly, the anti-representational body politic avoids the static character of the representational subject who can never change the nature of its "self," but only by diffusing the self into an endless multiplicity of impersonal drives: a self in perpetual transformation. But without a pre-given unity of subjectivity, how do agents/multiplicities deliberate

[3] See chapter I.

between and distinguish between different political decisions? The radically ambivalent and unlocalizable processes of subjective potentiality seem then to have nothing to contribute to an analysis of the basic function of participatory democracy at the core of many contemporary resistance movements (Notes from Nowhere 2003). Insofar as a theory of subjectivity is defined only by its potential for transformation, it is stuck in a kind of paralysis of endless potential change no less disempowering than the politics of identity. Or as Hallward frames this criticism against Deleuze, "he abandons the decisive subject in favor of our more immediate subjection to the imperative of creative life" (2006, 163).

The Revolutionary Body Politic

Given the challenge of these problems, I argue instead in this next section that the return to revolution influenced by Deleuze and Guattari can be defined by its creation of a participatory political body. By participatory political body I mean a set of political practices constitutive of a social order that incorporates a maximal degree of mutual and conflictual transformation. A participatory body politic is a social order that both transforms the subjects and objects that constitute it and is equally transformed by them. It is a new kind of participatory democracy or political self-management.[4]

In order to further develop this concept of a participatory body politic in this section I draw on the notion of consistency in Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy

[4] The process of participation, consistency, or ruling by obeying should not be confused with the process of liberalism or representative democracy. The process of participatory politics is a rejection of majoritarian democracy. Instead, it proposes a more direct and unmediated process of political inclusion and self transformation much more similar to the the Zapatista process of consensus decision making and rotational self management found in the political, economic, and social life of the Autonomous Municipalities. Those who are directly affected by it are not represented by it but rather participate *directly* in its management. "*quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbetur*." "that which touches all, should be decided by all."

and expand its implications for revolutionary politics.[5] I find Deleuze and Guattari's concept of consistency particularly useful because it allows us to conceive of a non-representational social organization based on more than the mere rejection of representation. Even as early as *Difference and Repetition* Deleuze had formulated a similar philosophical concept of self-management. "We remain slaves," Deleuze says, "so long as we do not control the problems themselves, so long as we do not possess a right to the problems, to a participation in and management of the problems" (Deleuze 1994, 158). It is, however, not until *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?* that the theory of consistency is fully developed and politicized. But even then, it is not developed as a theory of a revolutionary body politic. The aim of this section is thus to expand this concept in order to develop such a theory.

But consistency is not just another word for static predictability; it is precisely the opposite. A revolutionary body politic is consistent insofar as it (1) sustains a constructive rupture or break from the intersection of representational processes, (2) connects or consolidates a block of collective practices, or capacities for action that have all been similarly deterritorialized, and (3) is continually and unpredictably transformed by the various elements and agents that compose it. Thus, what makes a revolutionary body politic consistent is precisely its participatory mutability around a locally determinate event. While the first of these three characteristics was argued for at length in chapter III, the last two will be argued in the present section drawing on the work of Deleuze and Guattari. In particular, I draw on their concept of consistency and its three component concepts, the abstract machine, the concrete assemblage, and the machinic persona, to understand how a non-representational political body works.

---

[5] Not all abstract or concrete machines are revolutionary. As we saw in chapter II there are four kinds of abstract machines for Deleuze and Guattari, three of which support processes of representation (territory, state, and capital). This chapter engages only the fourth type of abstract machine: the revolutionary machine.

The problematic of defining a distinctly non-representational social order has also been posed by other scholars of radical political theory. A revolutionary politics requires, according to Bruno Bosteels, a "consistency and durability" (2005a, 594), that is, "the putting to work of an event" (2004, 104), based on a careful "study [of] the consequences of an event within the situation, not [the] elevat[ion of] the event into a wholly other dimension beyond being" (2004, 104). Or as Alberto Toscano frames it, to "articulate what the parameters and modalities for the consistency of reality may be, [and] how this consistency might find itself regulated and stabilized" (Toscano 2004), without, that is, being represented. Here, I am certainly in agreement with Bosteels and Toscano, except that I think that we can locate such a theory in Deleuze and Guattari.

But surprisingly, even Antonio Negri is unsympathetic to such a task. In an interview with Cesare Casarino, Negri claims that Deleuze's political philosophy is still unable to translate the ontological theory of the event, as the revolutionary potentiality of transformation, into "a logic of collective action" (Casarino and Negri 2004, 157), that would "adequately describe the positive recomposition of power" (2004, 152). "In Deleuze," Negri says, "—and even in his last works—there is always a sense of astonished stupor in the face of Singularity, there is always an inability to translate the ontological Event into a prefiguration or schematism of reason, into a constitution, or even into a merely virtual constitution that would nonetheless contain a constructive element. There is always surprise and chance" (2004, 155). For Negri, the question remains, "how can we translate the ontological substratum into logical dimensions?" (155), that is, into "the discovery of the logic of collective actions, the constitution of such a logic in that moment of Singularity" (157).

Whether Negri's criticisms are fair to Deleuze or not, his concerns articulate well the aim and challenge of the present work, and in particular this chapter. That is, to advance, in

spite of certain limitations in Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy and those of their critics, a "logic of collective action" or consistency drawn from their political philosophy and placed along side the revolutionary practices of Zapatismo. The aim of this is to discover an alternative political practice to the representational politics of territory, state, and capital, as well as the merely anti-representational politics of speculative or spontaneous leftism (Bosteels 2005b). In order to develop the concept of what I am calling a revolutionary body politic, I examine each of its constitutive components in turn: (1) the *conditions* under which this body politic emerges and determines who counts as part of it, (2) the distribution of concrete *elements* that express and constitute its body, and (3) the kinds of *subjects* who act and transform its body. Or as Deleuze and Guattari rename these components: the abstract machine, the concrete assemblage, and the machinic persona.

The Revolutionary Abstract Machine

What are the conditions under which a revolutionary political body can emerge and sustain itself? Is there such a thing as a body politic that would no longer be conditioned by the old models of territorial, state, and capitalist representation? We have seen already two ways that the problem of establishing a set of conditions for political emergence and inclusion can be answered. The conditions under which a being counts as a political being within an body politic can be considered fixed, unified, and representational of its members. A body politic can have as its condition a limited territorial boundary based on ethnic, social, and geographical divisions; it can have as its condition the limited law of a sovereign state based on social contract, natural law, and rights; or it can have as its condition the malleable but still limited value of what is profitable for the capitalist market. Or the conditions in which beings are considered political begins within a body politic can be considered as radically open to the contingency and possibility that all beings can become other than they are: the body politic can be unconditioned.

Given the previously argued dangers confronting both these types of body politic, I propose instead in this section an alternative kind of political condition that is neither limited, representational, nor merely open, but is flexibly open and transformable by its membership. This kind of determinate but flexible political condition for inclusion in a body politic is what Deleuze and Guattari call a revolutionary abstract machine. A revolutionary abstract machine, Deleuze and Guattari say, is characterized by four distinct features, each of which I argue can help us understand the conditions for a revolutionary body politic.

(1) A Revolutionary Abstract Machine Is both Singular and Absolute

> In historical phenomena such as the revolution of 1789, the Commune, the revolution of 1917, there is always one part of the event that is irreducible to any social determinism, or to causal chains. Historians are not very fond of this point: they restore causality after the fact. Yet the event itself is a splitting off from, a breaking with causality; it is a bifurcation, a lawless deviation, an unstable condition that opens up a new field of the possible. (Deleuze 2006, 233)

The emergence of the conditions for a revolutionary body politic, according to Deleuze and Guattari, do not resemble any recognizable, legal, or legitimate *thing* within the present state of affairs. In this sense the conditions for a revolutionary body politic mark a "singular" event. As an abstract machine this condition is "free from all normal, or normative causalities" deduced or derived from the known possibilities of what a political body is capable of doing. A revolutionary body politic does not just establish another cultural identity, subject of rights, or commodity in circulation, it creates a new condition for inclusion that is both contingent and heterogenous to the topology of representational power. But this new condition is not the mere rejection of all conditionality as such. Rather, the revolutionary abstract machine creates a unique and "unstable condition that opens up a new field of the possible" alongside the state of affairs that supports a whole "series of amplified instabilities and fluctuations" that constitute the *localized* struggle of the body politic itself. Insofar as Lenin, the Paris Commune, and May 1968 were all contingent and

heterogenous ruptures in the processes of political representation i.e. singular, Deleuze and Guattari argue that they were all revolutionary abstract machines (Deleuze 2006, 233; Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 100).

But the condition for a revolution works like an abstract machine not only in the sense that it is singular, but also in the sense that it is the self-referential basis by which the body politic legitimates its own existence. Without reference to a transcendent political power (God, Social Contract, Natural Right, Profit, etc.) to justify its emergence, the condition for a revolutionary body refers only to itself as the guarantor of its own existence and must be continually reaffirmed. "As concept and as event," Deleuze and Guattari say, "revolution, is self-referential or enjoys a self-positing that enables it to be apprehended in an immanent enthusiasm without anything in states of affairs or lived experience being able to tone it down" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 101). While representational political bodies presuppose the necessary and natural unity of their social bodies, revolutionary political conditions, as contingent and self-referential, change in nature each time a new kind of element or agency effects a "redeployment" of them, like a perpetually remade political feedback loop.[6] "The possible," contrary to the identical, Deleuze says, "does not pre-exist, it is created by the event. It is a matter of life. The event creates a new existence, it produces a new subjectivity (new relations with the body, with time, sexuality, the immediate surroundings, with culture, work)" (2006, 234). The condition of a revolutionary body politic is thus an abstract machine insofar as it is singular, self-supported, and allows for "new space-times" and new subjectivities antagonistic to representational power to emerge (1995, 172).

But the condition for a revolutionary body politic is also "a *local absolute*." That is, "an

[6] "In physics, Ilya Prigogine spoke of states in which the slightest differences persist rather than cancel themselves out, and where independent phenomena inter-resonate" (Deleuze 2006, 233).

absolute that is manifested locally, and engendered in a series of local operations of varying orientations," as Deleuze and Guattari say of revolutionary abstract machines. It is a singular-universal (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 382) or point of "absolute survey" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 100) whose origins are contingent and local but whose consequences are potentially infinite. As such, a revolutionary body politic is radically inclusive of anyone who wants to participate under its mutable and re-interpretable conditions, but only insofar as such participation changes the nature of the entire assemblage.[7] The absolute of this abstract machine then, should not be confused with the absolutes or universals of identity that remain the same (and pre-given) while only adding on an increasing number of axioms or elements to be represented as in representational democracies and market economies. Rather, when Deleuze and Guattari speak of a "*devenir tout le monde,"* "becoming-everybody/everything" of revolution (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 470), what this means is that everybody and everything may participate in an effectuation and transformation of a revolution to the degree that they are also transformed by it and as they "respond to the demands of the event." (Deleuze 2006, 234).

Thus, the condition for participation in a revolutionary body politic is an abstract machine in the sense that it is a singular, self-referential, inclusive, and absolute. Its contingent and local emergence, can, with only itself as its support, bring about inclusive and infinite consequences without representation or pre-given criteria or exclusion like a territory, state, or market, etc.. A condition for participation thus does not merely allow for the possibility that everyone may become other than they are, it names a singular and absolute condition under which everyone can participate in and shape the creation of

[7] "Contingent holism sees the social world as composed of practices that intersect with and affect one another (although not every practice intersects with every other practice), that change over time, that form the parameters within which we understand ourselves and our world, but that do not offer a foundation from which the world can be exhaustively or indubitably understood" (May 1997, 34).

another world alongside the old. It "posit[s] revolution as a plane of immanence," Deleuze and Guattari say, "infinite movement and absolute survey, but [only] to the extent that [its] features connect up with what is real here and now in the struggle against capitalism, relaunching new struggles whenever the earlier one is betrayed" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 100).

(2) A Revolutionary Abstract Machine Is the "Degree Zero" of its Body Politic

The condition of a revolutionary body politic, or what Deleuze and Guattari call its abstract machine, also marks the most minimal degree of existence within the body politic. In the sense that an emerging revolutionary condition or event is singular, it is not representable within the normal state of affairs. Because of this relative invisibility Deleuze and Guattari say that such an abstract machine marks a "degree zero" or is the "most deterritorialized element" in the political arrangement (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 157). But this condition does not indicate a mere potential for transformation as such that cannot be realized in any particular transformation or whose realizations are only betrayals or ironies. This "zero degree" bears a particular name such that a political field can begin to gain consistency around it, creating a "vortex," or site of "circulating reference" (Latour 1999), like Lenin, the Paris Commune, etc.

Political consistency, according to Deleuze and Guattari, thus requires not only a self-referential condition for its beginning but it also requires this beginning point bear some sort of marker to indicate its non-appearance from the perspective of the dominant political arrangement of laws and markets. But the abstract machine is also invisible from within its own political arrangement. No one knows entirely what it is or what it is capable of doing. This is why Deleuze and Guattari call it an "abstract" machine. A revolutionary condition is similarly "abstract" in the sense that it does not appear as a concrete "thing." May 1968 was not a thing. From the perspective of the state, May 1968 did not mark the necessity of a new

non-statist, non-capitalist politics. It was a problem to be resolved into the state. Even from the perspective of those who were committed to the event, May, 1968 was not a thing that ever appeared in full light. It was a real and contested moment whose name brought together a host of previously marginalized political desires. It is in this sense that Deleuze and Guattari say that the abstract machine is that, "which at every instant causes the given to be given, in this or that state, at this or that moment. But . . . itself is not given" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 265). Not, however, as in "a dream, something that is not realized or that is only realized by betraying itself," but rather as a "Real-Abstract . . . that is neither undifferentiated nor transcendent (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 142).

A revolutionary condition is thus an abstract machine in the sense that it is both now-here and no-where (a play on Samuel Butler's utopian neologism *Erewhon*). It is "a revolutionary machine," Deleuze and Guattari say, "all the more abstract for being real" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 512). Politically, the abstract machine is the very limit "*Chiffre,"* "cipher" that marks the border line or threshold between the dominant state of affairs and the existence of a new world (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 390). A revolutionary condition is thus a Zero, "but," Deleuze and Guattari say, "there is nothing negative about that Zero" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 153). It is "positive" insofar as it indicates the reality of the conditions for a new world.

(3) A Revolutionary Abstract Machine Supports a Conjunction of Concrete Elements

So far I have argued that the conditions of sustaining a revolutionary political body, following Deleuze and Guattari's theory of the consistent abstract machine, are (1) that its emergence be contingent and heterogenous to all forms of political representation; (2) that it legitimate its emergence with reference only to itself; and (3) that it indicate a degree of real

non-appearance within the concrete situation.[8] But the abstract machine of a consistent revolutionary body also supports a "conjunction, combination, and continuum," of all the concrete "degrees of deterritorialization"[9] that it conditions.[10] An abstract machine does not represent the concrete elements or degrees of deterritorialization that it conditions. It does not stand in or speak for them, nor does it indicate their pure becoming. Rather, the abstract machine has no existence independent of the concrete degrees of positive deterritorialization that it combines together. The abstract machine acts as an attractor or horizon around which concrete actions and agents circulate, contest, and transform it.[11] Where there is a whole swarm of heterogenous political grievances, problems, and crises in power (kinds of deterritorialized elements), a revolutionary political body, like an abstract machine, acts as a mobile and flexible point or proper name like "Zapatismo" or "Peoples Global Action" around which diverse groups and grievances can coalesce and take collective action.

As such, Deleuze and Guattari say, the abstract machine "causes the other element[s it conditions] to cross a threshold enabling a conjunction of their respective deterritorializations, a shared acceleration. This is the abstract machine's absolute, positive deterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 142). A conjunction of deterritorialization for Deleuze and Guattari simply means an intercalation or "ordering without hierarchy" of heterogeneous elements within a consistent political arrangement (Deleuze and Guattari

---

[8] The condition for a revolutionary political body is not only self-referential as witnessed in claims of political autonomy like "we are autonomous because we are autonomous" but it is also minimally marked in its real-abstract non-appearance (cipher or degree zero) as we witness in political claims like "we are nowhere, but we are everywhere."

[9] See the next section of this chapter on "the degrees of deterritorialization" within the consistency of the concrete machinic assemblage.

[10] See chapter III.

[11] As Deleuze and Guattari say, the abstract machine "crosscuts the chaotic variability and gives it consistency (reality). . . . It refers back to chaos rendered consistent" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 208).

1994, 90).[12] It is what allows radically heterogenous political elements to all be equally constitutive of an event even if that event is changed by this variable constitution. Similarly, what revolutionary practices have "in common" is only their relative differentiation from the condition they continue to transform. The conjunction of a revolutionary condition, like an abstract machine, is thus what "transforms the respective indexes into absolute values" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 71), and gives multiple concrete elements a specific field of immanent practice without external reference to territory, state, or capital. A revolutionary body politic does not represent anything, it acts as a mutable and contested marker around which various deterritorialized elements combine and take on consistency.

(4) A Revolutionary Abstract Machine has a Proper Name and Date

Finally, the condition for a revolutionary body politic has a proper name and date that acts as a shared and contested common ground for diverse struggles. We can see this in Deleuze and Guattari's description of this kind of abstract machine.

> The abstract machine is always singular, designated by the proper name of a group or individual, while the assemblage of enunciation is always collective, in the individual as in the group. The Lenin abstract machine, and the Bolshevik collective assemblage. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 100)

And further,

> Abstract, singular, and creative, here and now, real yet nonconcrete, actual yet noneffectuated—that is why abstract machines are dated and named (the Einstein abstract machine, the Webern abstract machine, but also the Galileo, the Bach, or the Beethoven, etc.). (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 511)

The abstract machine, according to Deleuze and Guattari is an "asignifying proper name" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 28) that works within a logic of collective action to "designate something that is of the order of the event, of becoming or of the haecceity" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 264), like the name of a military operation or the name of a hurricane. Proper names do not "represent" or stand-in for something else, they

[12] This was explored in depth in chapter III.

are instead the markers of a real yet nonconcrete, actual yet noneffectuated, event whose being is nothing more than all of the affects, elements, and agencies that constitute it. "Effects," Deleuze and Guattari say "that are not a mere dependence on causes, but the occupation of a domain, and the operation of a system of signs" (1983, 86).

This is why Deleuze and Guattari write *A Thousand Plateaus* as a series of abstract machines, planes, or plateaus instead of chapters; each chapter/plateau is given a name, a date, and an image or placard at the beginning to mark its distribution of "asignification." The subsequent pages of the plateau are then the concrete assemblages that effectuate this proper name. But all this only raises the question of how such a real nonconcrete revolutionary machine is concretely effectuated.

The Revolutionary Concrete Machinic Assemblage

In the previous section I showed how it is possible to conceive of a political condition for a revolutionary body politic that is based neither on representation or anti-representation, but upon what Deleuze and Guattari call consistency and what I am calling participatory politics. If we are to truly renew the concept of revolution today the conditions of a revolutionary body politic can no longer be the static and relatively immutable ones of territorial borders, contracts and rights of the sovereign state, or even the unpredictable fluctuations of the world market. Nor should we simply reject all political conditions outright. Rather, what I am proposing instead is that we conceive of an alternative social order or revolutionary body politic based on a maximum degree of feedback and mutual transformation between the conditions, elements, and agencies that constitute it.

Thus in order to understand how a revolutionary body politic works we need to understand not only how its conditions work but we need to understand how the concrete elements that articulate and realize this condition work. This is the task of the present

section. By "elements" I mean all the the actions, weapons, tools, interventions, slogans, demands, and occupations that come together to create a revolutionary sequence. A revolutionary body politic has no existence independent of these concrete deployments.

Given the previously argued dangers confronting representational and anti-representational body politics, I propose instead in this section an alternative concept of political elements that is non-hierarchal, but is still ordered and mutually transformative of the body politic. This kind of determinate but flexible political effectuation in a body politic is what Deleuze and Guattari call, a revolutionary concrete assemblage. A revolutionary concrete assemblage, Deleuze and Guattari say, is characterized by three distinct features, each of which I argue can help us understand the elements of a revolutionary body politic.

(1) A Revolutionary Concrete Assemblage Effectuates an Abstract Machine

A revolutionary body politic has a real but abstract condition that does not appear as a concrete thing within the dominant matrix of political power or even within the revolutionary body itself. Thus, what still needs to be explained is how a revolutionary body politic is effectuated in a variety of different concrete expressions (practices, slogans, actions, institutions, etc.). These are what, I am arguing, Deleuze and Guattari call concrete or collective assemblages. But these concrete effectuations are not ordered in a hierarchy with either an identity (territory, state, or market) at the top or with a radical difference at the bottom. Rather, following Deleuze and Guattari, the concrete elements that effectuate a revolutionary condition are deployed in various degrees of intensity that react back on their own conditions for effectuation. Thus, the body politic is always undergoing a continual transformation: a participatory feedback loop. But we should not let this feedback loop obscure the difference between the abstract and concrete machinic assemblage. "The *machinic assemblage*," Deleuze and Guattari say "is something entirely different from the abstract machine." But there is still a "coadaptation" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 71) or reciprocal

presupposition of the two (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 77) that allows for "an acentered, [and] nonhierarchical," participatory transformation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 21).

> In every respect, machinic assemblages *effectuate* the abstract machine insofar as it is developed on the plane of consistency or enveloped in a stratum. The most important problem of all: given a certain machinic assemblage, what is its relation of effectuation with the abstract machine? How does it effectuate it, with what adequation? Classify assemblages. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 71)

It is never possible to decide once and for all, or in advance, given a certain machinic assemblage, who is and who is not an ally or enemy of the revolution or what relation they have to the abstract machine. This is because a revolutionary political body is continually undergoing a transformation in its abstract condition and its concrete elements. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari's insistence that determining their relationship is the most important problem of all. It is a question that must be continually answered, transformed, and reanswered. What are the aims of the revolution in the short term, mid term, long term, how should we effectuate it in a certain situation, what supports the revolution, what is hindering it, and what is irrelevant to it?

Unlike "arbitrary or inconsistent [elements]," Deleuze and Guattari say, "[that] do not hold up for an instant," "concrete assemblages [are] like the configurations of a machine," that give it its degrees of consistency (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 3). "The plane [of immanence]" then "is the abstract machine of which these assemblages are the working parts" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 36). To expand this concept to revolutionary praxis, the concrete elements of a revolutionary political body like its slogans, demonstrations, demands, actions, and occupations are transformed by their condition no less than they transform that condition.[13] Thus, they cannot be understood as "normative" or "goal-

[13] This is the meaning of the body without organs. Its not that the body of the abstract machine has no concrete organs at all. Its just that these concrete organs do not come pre-organized. There is no static political image that organizes the organs of the political body in advance. The revolutionary body without organs is constantly re-orgnanizing its organs in a process of continual and participatory transformation.

driven" effectuations that merely follow out prescriptive conditions (laws, demands for profit, etc.). But neither should such mutual transformations be mistaken for a kind of pragmatic "revisionism" where a hypothesis is "tested," found to work or not work, and then rationally (or otherwise) revised accordingly, thus grounding a narrative of political "progress".[14]

Rather, the politics of consistency is revolutionary in the sense that instead of applying solutions to pre-given problems (how to make sure everyone is represented fairly in a presupposed state, for example), or simply affirming that "other problems are possible," particular problems themselves are transformed directly by those who effectuate them and who are affected by them. "When people demand to formulate their problems themselves," Deleuze and Guattari say "and to determine at least the particular conditions under which they can receive a more general solution," there is a politics of consistency: a direct participation *without* representation or mediation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 471). This kind of participation and self-management thus offers a political alternative absolutely incompatible with territorial hierarchies based ethnic lineage, state hierarchies (both liberal and socialist) based sovereign right, and capitalist hierarchies based on wealth and private property.

(2) A Revolutionary Concrete Assemblage Creates an Endoconsistency

A revolutionary body politic marks a break with representational power and creates an evental condition that combines a new set of concrete practices. These practices then turn back on and transform their condition in a social order of participatory feedback. But according to Deleuze and Guattari, these machinic assemblages or, what I am arguing are the

[14] "Belief, sheer, direct, unmitigated personal belief, reappears as the working hypothesis; action which at once develops and tests belief reappears as experimentation, deduction, demonstration; while the machinery of universals, axioms, a priori truths, etc., is the systematization of the of the way in which men have always worked out, in anticipation of overt action, the implications of their beliefs with a view to revising them in the interests of obviating the unfavorable, and of securing the welcome consequences" (Dewey 1906, 124).

concrete practices of a revolutionary body, also create an internal consistency of their own within this revolutionary body. How do we determine which concrete practices are more or less part of the same struggle, sequence, alliance, etc.? And in what sense do they function in a political "ordering without hierarchy," or an "equality without homogenization," as Deleuze and Guattari say?

The concrete machinic assemblage, according to Deleuze and Guattari, has an internal or endoconsistency that "renders components inseparable within itself." "There is," they say, "an area *ab* that belongs to both *a* and *b*, where *a* and *b* 'become' indiscernible. These zones, thresholds, or becomings, this inseparability defines the internal consistency" of the arrangement (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 20). In terms of a revolutionary political body, this simply means that its concrete practices are dependent and inseparable in varying relations and to greater or lesser degrees. Thus, no concrete practice acts independently without effecting certain others. Since, as was previously argued, there is no transcendent or external guarantee in historical necessity, God, reason, the state, etc. for the legitimacy of such a revolutionary body, and the abstract machine has no existence outside its concrete effectuations, then these concrete effectuations are bound to the body politic only by their immanent relationship: their internal consistency. "As fragmentary totalities," Deleuze and Guattari say, concrete machines "are not even the pieces of a puzzle, for their irregular contours do not correspond to each other. They do, however, "form a wall, but it is a dry-stone wall, and everything holds together only along diverging lines" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 16–17). Accordingly, Deleuze and Guattari say, the concrete machine "has no reference; it is self-referential; it posits itself and its object at the same time as it is created" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 22).

It is one thing to evade the hierarchy of representational political bodies by creating an inseparability, becoming, or generic equality of elements within a political event, but such

an affirmation, while important, is not sufficient for elucidating the ordered relationship between such elements. Similarly, within a revolutionary political body not all of its concrete practices will be equally important. Political revolution may be "a question *of consistency:* the 'holding together' of heterogeneous elements," but it is also a question of creating a variable social order (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 323).

Thus, Deleuze and Guattari say of the concrete assemblage that it is "a synthesis of disparate elements, defined only by a degree of consistency that makes it possible to distinguish the disparate elements constituting that aggregate (discernibility)" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 344). These discernible degrees, or "individuals" can then "enter into composition with other degrees, other intensities, to form another individual" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 253). All of which are arranged "according to this or that degree of deterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 100) whose "orderings without hierarchy" can be consistently discerned within the arrangement (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 90). The more positively deterritorialized or differentiated a concrete element is the less strongly it appears or consists in the political arrangement and the closer to the zero degree or abstract machine it becomes. The "less" deterritorialized it is the more strongly it appears and consists in the dominant political arrangement and the closer it comes to creating a political unity.[15] Similarly, a revolutionary body politic creates a non-hierarchal order in the sense that it is not a causal order, or an order of power over any one or thing, but in the sense that some practices in the social body are more important or are at greater risk of co-optation by power. A revolutionary body aims to increase its degrees of deterritorialization against power while also connecting, sustaining, and defending the greater degrees that have already

[15] The difference between deterritorialization as "the degrees of shared acceleration of heterogeneous components on a plane of consistency," territorialization as "the degrees of coding and primitive unity on the plane of organization" and reterritorialization as "the degrees of overcoding and axioms on the plane of organization" was developed in chapter III. "With the nomad…it is deterritorialization that constitutes the relation to the earth, to such a degree that the nomad reterritorializes on deterritorialization itself. It is the earth that deterritorializes itself, in a way that provides the nomad with a territory" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 381).

been liberated.

These degrees of deterritorialized consistency, according to Deleuze and Guattari, are then bounded by two limits: a pessimal threshold, or degree zero, after which consistency is broken down or dissipated into inconsistency, and a maximal limit, after which it is exploded or totalized under something else like a form of representation. In between inconsistency and representation there is thus the consistency of degrees of positive deterritorialization. Just as a tick's power, Deleuze and Guattari say, is "bounded by two limits: the optimal limit of the feast after which it dies, and the pessimal limit of the fast as it waits," there is a minimal threshold of revolution where popular support, enthusiasm, or commitment wane to such a degree that its consistency is lost, and there is a maximal limit after which it becomes reterritorialized into the party or state apparatus (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 257). The aim of a revolutionary consistency is accordingly to occupy and populate the middle with new elements, institutions, and agencies. There is thus a non-hierarchical equality of elements (*qua* effectuations of the event), and a non-homogenous diversity of elements (*qua* degree to which they consist in an arrangement). Elements are not ranked by how they affirm a presupposed identity or difference in-itself, but are locally and non-hierarchically ordered to the degree they create a strong or weak consistency of a specific event.

(3) A Revolutionary Concrete Assemblage Creates an Exoconsistency

A revolutionary political body not only creates an internal consistency of its concrete practices but it also creates an external consistency that connects it to other elements outside itself. Deleuze and Guattari call this the exoconsistency of the concrete assemblage.

> Its internal neighborhood or consistency is secured by the connection of its components in zones of indiscernibility; its external neighborhood or exoconsistency is secured by the bridges thrown from one [machine] to another when the components of one of them are saturated. . . [but,] we can no longer add or withdraw a component without changing the nature of the [assemblage]. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 90)

Similarly, a revolutionary body politic of concrete practices not only includes those who participate in its internal transformation, but also aims to include others not already part of the struggle. That is, revolution is both inclusive and expansive. It has the capacity for internal transformation and external growth beyond its local construction.

The Revolutionary Political Persona

So far I have argued that we use Deleuze and Guattari's concept of consistency, composed of an abstract machine and concrete assemblage, to understand the participatory process that forms the basis of a revolutionary political body distinct from both representational and anti-representational bodies politic. The condition of a revolutionary body politic is an abstract machine in the sense that it is singular, inclusive, and absolute in its consequences. The concrete elements of a revolutionary body politic compose a machinic assemblage in the sense that they effectuate and transform their conditions, create a non-hierarchical but ordered internal consistency, and expand this to include others. But we have not yet seen how Deleuze and Guattari's concept of personae can be expanded from its limited use in *What is Philosophy?* and become relevant for revolutionary praxis. This is the task of the present section.

The concept of a revolutionary subject poses two problems. On the one hand the subject can be understood as a unified and identical basis from which to exercise a freedom *of* expression or a freedom *from* domination. The problem was that such a subject *itself* cannot change what it *is*, only act for or against something *via* the pre-given self of contemplation modeled after various forms of political representation (territory, state, capital). On the other hand the subject can be understood as a capacity for the transformation of subjectivity *as such*. But this notion allows for subjectivity only by dispersing its agency into a pure

potentiality. In what follows I would like to propose instead a third theory of revolutionary subjectivity drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of conceptual personae.[16]

Against Peter Hallward's claim that Deleuze and Guattari's concept of subjectivity is "derivative" or "dissolved into the imperative of creativity as such" (2006, 163), I argue instead that by expanding their concept of the persona we can articulate a theory of revolutionary subjectivity defined by the "intervention of a local operator" who connects the conditions of a revolutionary body to its concrete consequences (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 75). Personae are not subjects of experience, rational reflection, discourse, representation, or difference/creativity in-itself. They do not transcend political bodies in any way. Rather they are subjects of and within a political body. They function as the internal process of connection between its abstract conditions and concrete effectuations. A persona, Deleuze and Guattari say, is characterized by three distinct features, each of which I argue can help us understand revolutionary subjectivity.

(1) A Revolutionary Persona Makes an Immanent Intervention in the Body Politic

A revolutionary body politic is a continually transformed condition and set of concrete practices but it is the revolutionary subject that connects the two together. The connection between a revolutionary condition and its consequences, however, is a conflictual process because, as Deleuze and Guattari say of persona,

> There are types of persona according to the possibilities of even their hostile encounters on the same plane and in a group. But it is often difficult to determine if it is the same group, the same type, or the same family. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 77)

---

[16] "It definitely makes sense to look at the various ways individuals and groups constitute themselves as subjects through processes of subjectification: what counts in such processes is the extent to which, as they take shape, they elude both established forms of knowledge and the dominant forms of power. Even if they in turn engender new forms of power or become assimilated into new forms of knowledge. For a while, though, they have a real rebellious spontaneity. This is nothing to do with going back to 'the subject,' that is, to something invested with duties, power, and knowledge. One might equally well speak of new kinds of event, rather than processes of subjectification: events that can't be explained by the situations that give rise to them, or into which they lead" (Deleuze 1995, 176).

Even within the same body politic there are different types of persona or subjects who contest the order and consequences of its territories, deterritorializations, and reterritorializations in the social field. These form, Deleuze and Guattari say,

> inextricable knots in which the three movements are mixed up so that, in order to disentangle them, we have to diagnose real types or personae. The merchant buys in a territory, deterritorializes products into commodities, and is reterritorialized on commercial circuits. In capitalism, capital or property is deterritorialized, ceases to be landed, and is reterritorialized on the means of production; whereas labor becomes "abstract" labor, reterritorialized in wages: this is why Marx not only speaks of capital and labor but feels the need to draw up some true psychosocial types, both antipathetic and sympathetic: the capitalist, the proletarian." (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 68)

According to Deleuze and Guattari, the personae that Marx draws up are not self-knowing subjects, independent from the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, who decide what is beneficial or harmful as such outside of larger social bodies. Nor are they entirely absorbed into the pure processes of transformation. Rather the "proletarian" and the "capitalist" are specific personae or "'terminals' of a whole group of social assemblages" that locate, distinguish, and connect various political practices to and through the social body (Guattari 2008, 371). That is, their subjectivity is not essentially conscious, rational, emotional, embodied, experiential, or grounded in any other transcendental monolith. Rather, persona exist immanent to their social body.

Expanding on Deleuze and Guattari's example of Marxism we can see the use of this notion for understanding a distinctly revolutionary kind of subjectivity. The political persona of the "proletarian" is Marx's subject of revolutionary praxis. Passing back and forth between the specific (maximally deterritorialized) abstract machine of "Labor" and locating the (deterritorialized degrees) of concrete "worker-assemblages" composed of various slogans, direct actions, factory reclamations, and self-management efforts, is the persona of the "proletarian." Without reflection, contemplation, or communication, a revolutionary subjectivity intervenes within a process of political representation and

connects degrees of deterritorialized labor *to each other* (self-management) while warding off the reterritorializations of private property and capital. Thus the role of political persona, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is to "make perceptible, in the most insignificant or most important circumstances, the formation of territories, the vectors of deterritorialization, and the process of reterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 68). A political persona is thus revolutionary insofar as it determines where a political body forms territories, deterritorializes those territories, connects those deterritorialized elements to each other, and avoids reterritorialization by various forms of political representation.

Like a runner, or intercessor, Deleuze and Guattari say, the "persona is needed to relate concepts on the plane**,** just as the plane itself needs to be laid out (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 64, 81). But these two operations do not merge in the persona, which itself appears as a distinct operator" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 76). Thus, far from being dissolved into an affirmation of pure transformation (or negative deterritorialization), as Peter Hallward has suggested of Deleuze's earlier theory of agency, Deleuze and Guattari's theory of political personae is based on two specific interventions: (1) the laying out of an abstract machine and (2) the connection of it to the concrete machines that populate it.

Herein lies the difficulty: one cannot have a revolutionary subjectivity without a revolution, but one cannot have a revolution without subjects that bring it about. Deleuze and Guattari's solution to this problem, however, is to suggest that *both* interventions occur simultaneously in the mutual presupposition of the other; problem and solution are co-given they say (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 78, 82). "Sometimes," Deleuze and Guattari say, "the persona seems to precede the plane, sometimes to come after it—that is, it appears twice; it intervenes twice" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 75). On the one hand the political persona extracts the determinations of the abstract machine, "as if it seizes a handful of dice from chance so as to throw them on the table," and on the other hand establishes a

correspondence between each throw of the dice and the components that occupy this or that region of the table (the concrete assemblages) (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 75). Since, for Deleuze and Guattari "there are only immanent criteria" in revolutions, the political personae of these movements are also immanent to these criteria in their expression of them (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 74).

The persona's dedication to these mutually determining criteria thus forms the structure of political "commitment" or "belief." "Persona concern those who believe in the world," Deleuze and Guattari say, not in the existence of the world as a thing but in its particular possibilities and intensities, so as once again to give birth to new modes of existence (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 74). In "Control and Becoming," an interview with Deleuze, Antonio Negri asks Deleuze what he thinks the political consequences of his conception of the subject will be for a new militant pragmatism. Deleuze responds by saying that, "What we most lack is a belief in the world, we've quite lost the world, its been taken from us. If you believe in the world you precipitate events, however inconspicuous, that elude control, you engender new space-times however small their surface or volume" (1995, 176). Political personae are exactly this immanent belief in a new world that is both "now-here," in the concrete machines used to effectuate the abstract machine, and "no-where," in the abstract machine that is continually being transformed. Personae, as revolutionary subjects, are thus committed to the creation of new modes of existence, no matter how small, that will connect up with others to construct a new revolutionary political body.

(2) A Revolutionary Persona has Different Features

Revolutionary political personae do not have psychological or personological traits based on the subjective identity of consciousness nor are they merely fractured or dissolved "egos." Rather, according to Deleuze and Guattari, they have distinct pathic, relational, dynamic, juridical, and existential features. Revolutionary personae thus create specifically

different kinds of consistencies and relations among concrete and abstract machines. Deleuze and Guattari discuss, in *What is Philosophy?,* several different features of some of these personae in the history of philosophy that I would like to expand and explicitly politicize in this section (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 71). But before developing each of these features in turn, however, it is important to note the limitations of this typology as well as clarify the lack of any pretension to an exhaustive universal list of political personae. As Deleuze and Guattari say, "no list of the features of conceptual personae can be exhaustive, since they are constantly arising and vary with planes of immanence. On a given plane, different kinds of features are mixed together to make up a persona" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 70). Personae are not unified static beings without conflict, nor do they fit any exhaustive list made of their types. Accordingly, it is not "always easy to decide which, at a given moment in a given society, are the good types" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 68). Despite the difficulty, the task of articulating them remains an important practice, more a creation or participation than a representation.

First, political personae have *pathic* features:

> The Idiot, the one who wants to think for himself and is a persona who can change and take on another meaning. But also the Madman, a cataleptic thinker or "mummy" who discovers in thought an inability to think; or a great maniac, someone frenzied, who is in search of that which precedes thought, an Already-there, but at the very heart of thought itself. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 70)

These pathic personae have certain passions, dispositions, or sufferings in a political domain that affect the kinds of connections they make in it. These can be helpful for understanding the pathic features of revolutionary political personae: the revolutionary *pessimist* who demands only the impossible in order to maintain moral superiority; the *defeatist* who, like a "mummy" discovers in the revolution the hopelessness of all collective action; or even the frenzied *activist* driven by guilt to constantly be "taking action."

Second, political personae have *relational* features:

> "The Friend," but a friend who has a relationship with his friend only through the thing loved, which brings rivalry. The "Claimant" and the "Rival" quarrel over the thing or the concept. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 71)

Personae can be defined in terms of their relationships with other personae. Consider the political persona of the "*Compa*," in Zapatismo. The *compa* has a relationship with another *compa* only insofar as both are struggling for similar conditions, principles, or specific actions. This brings conflict over the "aims of the revolution" or how best to achieve them. The "Revolutionary" and the "Reactionary" then quarrel over the ends or means of the struggle.

Third, personae have *dynamic* features insofar as they undergo transformation or movement:

> If moving forward, climbing, and descending are dynamisms of conceptual personae, then leaping like Kierkegaard, dancing like Nietzsche, and diving like Melville are others for philosophical athletes irreducible to one another. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 71)

In terms of political personae we might consider direct action, sabotage, and mass demonstration (among others) as kinds of group-subject dynamisms. Retreating, compromising, occupying, hiding, attacking, defending, and organizing can all be considered dynamisms of political personae. The *subterfuge* of Subcomandante Marcos, the *negotiations* of the San Andres Accords, the *teaching* at the Zapatista Autonomous Schools, are all dynamic features of the *compas*.

Fourth, political personae have *juridical* features insofar as collective actions "lay claim to what belongs to them by right and, from the time of the pre-Socratics, have confronted Justice" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 72). But Deleuze and Guattari do not have in mind a transcendent conception of judgment by Law or Values or even the virtue of conscience. Rather the juridical features of political personae are mergers of judge and innocent where judgment takes place within the purely immanent criteria of evental existence (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 72). Immanent justice may mean beyond Good and Evil, but it does not

mean beyond good and bad. Consider the *Caracoles* and people's courts of Zapatista territory. Rather than being informally judged by the juridical-army (EZLN), the village people of these territories have begun rotational participation in people's courts in order to respond to legal issues of drug and human trafficking, non-regional use of forest materials, and various community disputes they lay claim to by their own right: by autonomy. Community members (both men and women) take turns learning how to use these juridical features immanent to the values and laws they have established independently from the Mexican government or corporate interests over the resources of their land.

Finally, political personae have *existential* features: the small aspects of daily life compose the significance of political struggle. Deleuze and Guattari provide an example from the history of philosophy: "is not Kant's stocking-suspender a vital anecdote appropriate to the system of Reason?" they suggest. And Spinoza's liking for battles between spiders due to the relations of the modes in the *Ethics* (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 72–73)? Might we also consider the importance of Lenin's taste in music, Marcos' use of poetry and art, or Marx's health problems, or the *compas* taste for *pozol* (a fermented maize porridge), etc? How do these features contribute to the functioning of the personae and the effectuation of the event?

While there are certainly many more features to political personae, it remains an important part of a theory of revolutionary subjectivity to be able to articulate how and to what degree the different kinds of personae work and relate to each other within a particular domain, rather than simply affirming their capacity to become other.

> No rule, and above all no discussion, will say in advance whether this is the good plane, the good persona, or the good concept; for each of them determines if the other two have succeeded or not, but each must be constructed on its own account —one created, one invented, and the other laid out. Problems and solutions are constructed about which we can say, "Failure ... Success ... ," but only as we go along and on the basis of their coadaptations. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 82)

(3) A Revolutionary Persona Operates in the Third Person

A revolutionary body politic has various types of subjectivity that contest and participate in the direct transformation of its conditions and consequences. But these personae do not act or speak from the perspective of an autonomous self in the first person, they operate as agents immanent to a revolutionary body politic in the third person (He, She, They) and the indefinite (One, Everyone, Anyone, etc.). While the first person generally indicates a self-conscious subject of enunciation who makes decisions on a political arrangement independent from it, and the second person designates the projection of the first, the third person persona indicates an indefinite group-subject always in co-adaptation with the body politic. In *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari say,

> We believe… that the third person indefinite, HE, THEY, implies no indetermination from this point of view; it ties the statement to a collective *agencement*, as its necessary condition, rather than to a subject of the enunciation. Blanchot is correct in saying that ONE and HE—*one* is dying, *he* is unhappy—in no way take the place of the subject, but instead do away with any subject in favor of an *agencement* of the haecceity type that carries or brings out the event insofar as it is unformed and incapable of being effectuated by persons ("something happens to them that they can only get a grip on again by letting go of their ability to say I"). The HE does not represent a subject but rather makes a diagram of an *agencement*. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 265)

Thus, opposed to the "indetermination" of a pure potential for transformation, or the representational first person of enunciation (based on contemplation, reflection, and communication), the third person effectuates or makes a diagram of the event, immanent only to the collective assemblage. Personae are "indefinite" in the sense that they are not persons independent from the event who, look on, judge, and make decisions about how it should proceed, but they are "determinate" in the sense that they are indicated by a third person that is tied to a collective *agencement*. The persona is thus never a person or

consciousness but rather an inseparable "they," or "everyone" effecting a becoming, folding, or co-adaptation of the abstract and concrete machines.

"I won't say *I* anymore," Deleuze and Guattari say in *Anti-Oedipus*, "I'll never utter the word again; it's just too damn stupid. Every time I hear it, I'll use the third person instead" (1983, 23). The irony of this quote aside, the important point is not so much that the first person pronoun, "I" is never uttered again, but that the speech acts of personae always be considered as most primarily "speech act[s] in the third person where it is always the conceptual persona who says, 'I'" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 64). It is not the case that the first and second person pronouns, "I" or "You," have no meaning; rather, the point is that they are derived or conditioned on a more primary third persona of the event. "I" and "You" function as different features *of* political events that engage in negotiation and conflict immanent to the collective assemblage at hand, not as features of an independent consciousness, ego, radical alterity, or transcendence *outside* the assemblage.

Rather than representing or speaking *about* a political event, the persona or avatar is always the immanent agent of an operation and locally determinate in relation to the abstract and concrete machines it helps create and connect (1983, 16). For Deleuze and Guattari, the revolutionary political "subject" is not simply "de-centered;" it is a co-adaptive component of a particular collective enunciation or political consistency. Having expanded and explicitly politicized Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the persona, we can see how it accounts for a new kind of revolutionary political subject different from both representational and anti-representational types. Along with the renewal of the theory and practice of revolution found in Deleuze and Guattari is the renewal of the concept of a revolutionary subject. This subject is not structured by an identity based on static and pre-given political conditions (territory, state, and capital), or merely dispersed, but is rather a third person part of a consistent and participatory political body.

Zapatismo and the Creation of a Participatory Body Politic

In the last section I argued that opposed to the two dangers of representation and anti-representation, there exists an alternative social order currently under construction. This new body politic is defined by its participatory mutability: the degree to which its conditions are transformed by the participation of the elements and subjects affected by it. I further argued that in order to understand the structure and function of this participatory and revolutionary body politic we need to understand the unique relationship it articulates between three different dimensions: (1) the *conditions* under which it emerges and determines who counts as part of its body politic, (2) the distribution of concrete *elements* that express and constitute its body, and (3) the kinds of *subjects* who act on and transform its body. Representational, anti-representational, and participatory political bodies each express a different type of relationship between these three dimensions. In order to develop a theory of a specifically revolutionary and participatory political body, I drew on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of consistency, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?* and expanded its application to the issue of revolutionary politics. But this has only been a theoretical development.

In this next section I argue that the Zapatistas have created a revolutionary and participatory body politic in practice. The two sides of theory and practice thus constitute the theoretical practice I am calling revolutionary participation. Zapatismo presents an interesting case in political theory and practice because it cannot not be understood by the political philosophies of liberalism or Marxism. Zapatismo abandons both the notions of sovereign power based on political and juridical representation but also the the basic tenants of Marxist science, vanguardism, state capture, class struggle, and the determination of the economy "in the last instance." Marcos and the early EZLN upon arriving in Chiapas found

that their Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist preconceptions were "totally inadequate for communicating with the local population," and eventually concluded that their original plans for struggle were, "undemocratic and authoritarian" (Ross 2006, 14). But the Zapatista's are not a "postmodern" revolution in the sense that they merely reject these forms of representation in favor of a spontaneous or speculative leftism. Instead, they have constructed a new kind of body politic altogether based on participation. They call this process *mandar obedeciendo,* leading by obeying.[17] But what is leading by obeying and how does it function as a practice of political participation?

> Perhaps, the new political morality is constructed in a new space which will not be the taking or retention of power, but the counterweight and opposition which contains and obliges the power to 'rule by obeying'. . . '[R]ule by obedience' is not within the concepts of "political science" and it is devalued by the morality of "efficiency" which defines the political activity which we suffer. (Marcos 2004, 217)

The new body politic the Zapatistas invent is thus one whose conditions for social order and inclusion are defined by their obedience to those included by them, not by the taking of representative power or the rejection of all political organization. Leading by obeying thus expresses a political vertigo or participatory feedback loop between the leaders who obey the led, and the led who must lead the leaders and obey. *Mandar obedeciendo* breaks the traditional political distinction between means and ends; it "makes the road by walking." The process of leading by obeying can be understood as the mutual transformation of three different dimensions: a revolutionary condition, its concrete practices, and a form of revolutionary subjectivity.

The Revolutionary Condition: "Zapatismo, 1994"

As a body politic, Zapatismo invents a new condition for social order and inclusion. Like the phenomena of the revolution of 1789, the Paris Commune, and the revolution of

---

[17] The Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee in each region monitors the operations of the Good Government Juntas in order to prevent acts of corruption, intolerance, injustice and deviation from the Zapatista principle of "Ruling by Obeying."

1917, Zapatismo is a singular event in the sense that it is irreducible to historically necessary causal chains. In 1994, in Mexico, Zapatismo held no resemblance to any recognizable, legal, or legitimate political *thing* within the present "state of affairs," i.e., no political representation (party), no market representation, linguistic representation (their languages are not spoken or recognized by political representatives), or representation by the local indigenous leaders (*Caciques*). There was no causal necessity that Zapatismo should have existed, no way it could have been deduced from the domains of "rights," "commodities," or "class struggle" from which it emerged. Yet the Zapatistas "burst upon a world that denied their existence," as Zapatista scholar John Holloway says (Holloway 1998, 1). From the representational point of view of Mexican politics, the marginalized and un-represented Zapatistas of Chiapas have no "legitimate" existence and yet they coexist immanently and heterogeneously within the political arrangement anyway. The singular event of Zapatismo is thus not conditioned on requests for representation like "rights," the overthrow of the state, a new market economy, or a new ethnic nationalism, but instead takes on its own self-reference or autonomy from within the situation.

But the condition of the Zapatista's body politic is also universal in the sense that it is both inclusive and infinite in its consequences. "To be Zapatista" does not mean that you must be represented by the EZLN or that you must be indigenous, or even from Mexico. But Zapatismo cannot mean anything one wants. Zapatismo means participating in a very specific struggle against neoliberalism and for direct self-management where ever one is and to whatever degree one is capable of. Without a prior or immutable condition for exclusion the Zapatistas have made it clear that anyone can become a Zapatista to the degree that they share their struggle.[18] Many around the world have subsequently taken up this universal event where they are (Europe, Asia, North America, etc.). So rather than simply affirming

[18] "We are all Zapatistas!" Became a global slogan for solidarity actions with the Zapatistas.

their difference and un-representability, the Zapatistas have created a *singular-absolute* event/ intervention and given it a specific consistency of its own, heterogenous to the regimes of political representation. This singular-universality is practically constituted through the creation of *Encuentros* (international gatherings)[19] that aim to include others that will change the nature of Zapatismo as a social body each time they meet (Chatterton 2007).

But Zapatismo does not represent anyone. Rather, as a condition for a revolutionary body politic, Zapatismo mobilizes a proper name or marker that acts as an attractor or horizon for all those elements in Chiapas that did not legally "exist," who were politically "invisible," who were marginalized, disappeared or killed by the government (the underpaid, landless, non-Spanish-speaking, indigenous *campesinos*).[20] In 1994 the proper name "Zapatismo" was brought into popular existence, not to represent these people, but to mark the visibility of their invisibility within Mexican politics. The proper name "Zapatismo" provides a sign of something *through* which people can speak. Thus when Marcos speaks to the Mexican government he does not represent the Zapatistas, he is instead named, "Delegate Zero" of the "Other Campaign."[21] Where a normal delegate represents or stands-in for its people, "Delegate Zero" instead expresses a positive marker of what does not appear as legitimate political being in Mexico. This zero is a positive indication of what is being spoken *through* without referent or representation. It indicates the condition of an "Other politics."

This conditional marker "Zapatismo," does not represent Emilio Zapata, Marcos, or

---

[19] The Intercontinental Encuentros (Encounters) for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism emerged from the Zapatista movement's engagement with individuals and social movements around the world following the Zapatista uprising.

[20] "We were silenced. We were faceless. We were nameless. We had no future. We did not exist" (Marcos 2001b, 101).

[21] Subcomandante Marcos (currently a.k.a. Delegate Zero in relation to the "Other Campaign"). Unlike other Zapatista comandantes, Subcomandante Marcos is not an indigenous Mayan.

the sum total of denumerable Zapatistas, but is like a pure infinitive "to become Zapatista" in a concrete field of collective actions that circulate and transform the body politic marked by this name. Zapatismo thus has no existence outside of the concrete practices that effectuate and mutually transform it. As a condition for collective action it must be elaborated step-by-step and is always changing. The slogan, "*Todos Somos Zapatistas*!" (We are all Zapatistas!) demonstrates the universality of this process. This slogan creates an incorporeal transformation, that is, a real change in the world that is not necessarily or immediately physical or corporeal. As a speech-act tied to the conditions of a revolutionary body politic it brings together all of the solidarity actions, demonstrations, and celebrations of "inexistent" and marginalized people around the world. Each time someone or something new is included in this "we" the meaning of Zapatismo changes, like the differential repetition of a festival.[22] This is a feature of the participatory body politic I am arguing takes place both in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy and in the Zapatistas political practice. This is why the Zapatistas have so many celebrations and Intercontinental *Encuentros:* not to provide new laws or programs, but to "redeploy" and transform the nature of Zapatismo itself each year. "They do not add a second and a third time to the first, they carry the first time to the 'nth' power," as Deleuze says (Deleuze 1994, 1).

Zapatismo also creates and combines various concrete practices of different degrees of importance, proximity, and intensity. For example, environmentalists, feminists, and labor activists may all equally be considered Zapatistas if they take up and follow out its consequences. They all do so to different degrees of significance and intensity that are all ordered but not by a hierarchy of power and control.

The Revolutionary Concrete Practices: the Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities

The body politic created by the Zapatistas not only establishes a singular-universal

[22] "Behind our black mask . . . we are you" (Khasnabish 2008, 127).

condition by which to combine and include various concrete practices within its social order but it also creates a variety of concrete practices that effectuate and react back on their conditions. These concrete practices "obey" in the sense that they are politically conditioned by the singular-universal event of Zapatismo but also "lead" in the sense that they are able to transform this condition through direct participation.

For example, the Zapatistas have created 38 *Autonomous Municipalities* covering more than a third of the state of Chiapas in order to concretely realize the real but "invisible and abstract" conditions of their body politic (Ross 1995). The *Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities* are the Zapatistas' implementation of the 1996 San Andrés Accords, which the government abandoned in December 1996, after refusing to carry them out. The Accords guarantee the right of indigenous peoples to form and govern their own municipalities. In forming the municipalities, residents reject the representation of official authorities and elect their own rotating and recallable administrators. They name their "local health promoters [and] indigenous parliaments, and elaborate their own laws based on social, economic, political and gender equality among the inhabitants of diverse ethnic communities" (Mora 1998). The municipalities make their own decisions based on the participatory, direct consensus of its constituents and through the rotational governance of the *Juntas* (councils or cabinets that adjudicate disputes, distribute funds, and register workers cooperatives), and the *Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee* (CCRI). But this participation is not only political participation. The Zapatistas also effectuate their political body in the concrete practices of workers cooperatives based on collective ownership, worker control, and self-management. There are no bosses, landowners, or capitalists, but instead a participatory economics based on shared prosperity. These concrete effectuations of their condition are not perfect by any stretch of the imagination but the aim of their creation of these concrete expressions is, as Guattari would say,

> to set up structures and devices that establish a totally different kind of contact. A kind of self-management or self-organization of a set of problems which does not start from a central point that arranges elements, inserts them into a control grid, or establishes an agenda, but that, on the contrary, allows the various singular processes to attempt a rhizomatic unfolding. This is very important, even if it doesn't work. (2008, 178)

The Zapatista's concrete effectuation of their body politic is their struggle for a maximum of participation and "self-management conceived outside the criteria of a formal democracy that has proven to be sterile" (Guattari 2008, 391).

The Zapatistas have created a whole host of various concrete articulations of their event: abolishing alcohol, having a rotational form of participatory self-government in the Juntas, harvesting coffee and honey, weaving and working in cooperatives, receiving aid from international NGO's, participating in the horizontal cooperative economy that fair trades with them around the world, using the slogan "we are all Zapatistas!" As Marcos says, "The kids, the chickens, the stones, everything here is Zapatista."[23] Zapatismo, according to Marcos, is not a political ideology, it has no normative prescriptions, or necessary consequences given in advance of its expression. It is neither party nor vanguard. Rather, it creates a new type and concrete distribution of existence: kids, chickens, and stones all become the concrete body of Zapatismo.

But this does not mean that all these concrete elements are exactly the same. The *campesinos* who grow, produce, eat, sell, teach, learn, and govern as "Zapatista" as they can, should not, of course, be confused with those in Europe, America or elsewhere who are in solidarity with them, write academic articles about them, give them aid, etc. Each element of Zapatismo functions in a different way and with a different degree of risk and privilege at stake, even though each helps constitute the other. These elements, however, do not exist in

[23] "For a long time, this place has existed where men are Zapatistas, the women are Zapatistas, the kids are Zapatistas, the chickens are Zapatistas, the stones are Zapatistas, everything is Zapatista. And in order to wipe out the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, they will have to wipe this piece of territory off the face of the earth, not just destroy it but erase it completely, because there is always the danger of the dead down below…" — Subcomandante Marcos letter to *Proceso*, 1994.

a hierarchy of power and knowledge. They are ordered based on their intensity and importance but not on their hierarchy. No one person or program stands at the top to order such a hierarchy.

Even within Zapatista territory there are degrees of intensity in relation to Zapatismo. The "First of January Boot Cooperative" in the *caracol* Oventic has to import their boot soles from Asia, but the Yachil Coffee coop is entirely "Zapatista" owned and managed. Importing boot soles from Asia might be a slightly lesser degree in relation to the goals of local production, self-management, and economic justice, the latter might be a greater. Such degrees of deployment in Zapatismo are in constant mutation, growing greater when a Canadian anarchist boot co-op opens up to sell the Zapatista's boot soles, for example, or becoming weaker when cooperative cafés that sell Zapatista coffee go out of business because a *Starbucks* moves in. There are thus a variety of elements and degrees in which Zapatismo is effectuated and whose degrees of consistency do not constitute a hierarchy of power, but rather an order of relation to and within the event.

But the participatory body politic created by the Zapatistas not only creates an internal consistency of the concrete practices that constitute it to various degrees, as we have seen, it also connects these concrete practices up to those outside of this internal consistency. The Zapatistas have concretely expanded their struggle beyond their locality and to the world at large. Had the Zapatistas created an exclusively indigenous, ethnic, or nationalistic revolt it would have risked becoming a limited and locally saturated struggle within the borders of Chiapas or Mexico alone. It became clear after 1994, however, that the Zapatistas could rebel but they could not compete with the Mexican military without national and international popular support from those outside their territory. Thus, the Zapatistas asked the world to see Zapatismo as everyone's struggle. They said, "*Detras de nosotros estamos ustedes,*" "behind us we are you," and "*Todos somos Marcos,*" "we are all Marcos."

Without media attention and human rights watches that kept paramilitary forces at bay, without the monetary support, cooperative networks, first aid, and supplies of the global community, Zapatismo risked an internal saturation in several regards. It risked running out of supplies and being forced into desperate acts of violence against the Mexican army; it risked becoming a reformist movement out of desperation for any kind of political amelioration; it risked becoming a sectarian, nationalist, or indigenous movement without any global vision, and it even risked falling back on military vanguard and patriarchal hierarchies within their communities.

The concrete practices that have created this external and expansive connection include the way that Zapatistas take on refugees from all over Chiapas, hold "Intercontinental *Encuentros*" around the world, assist the struggles of many left social movements around Mexico, provide medical and legal aid to non-Zapatistas and even to anti-Zapatistas within their own communities. Despite the fact that the Zapatistas may not be in complete agreement with all the groups or individuals they share certain campaigns or resources with, the Zapatistas can at least form bridges where their interests are common. Beyond ideology, geography, identity, and certainly beyond an affirmation of difference in-itself, the Zapatistas have created a vast global network of external consistency piece by piece.

The Revolutionary Political Subject: the Compañera

Leading by obeying not only means creating a revolutionary political body and effectuating a set of concrete practices that sustain it and follow out its consequences, it also means inventing a new form of subjectivity that connects the two with each other in a mutual transformation. For this purpose the Zapatistas have invented the revolutionary subject of the *compa* (short for partner or comrade). The Zapatista *compa* has a strange double existence. For the event of Zapatismo to be brought about there must be *compas* to

do so, but for there to be Zapatista *compas,* Zapatismo must already exist. The emergence of each presupposes the other; thus both emerged at the same time: Jan 1st, 1994.[24]

The purpose of the *compas*, as the revolutionary subjects of Zapatismo, is to articulate and determine the various processes of Zapatismo: where are its dangers, where are its opportunities, where are its points of antagonism and conflict, etc. For example the *compas,* as the subjects who connect the evental condition "Zapatismo" to its concrete consequences, have to decide how many trees may be taken from the jungle to avoid deforestation, what the penalty for taking too many is (planting two more and caring for them), or whether or not a consequence of Zapatismo is intervening against 40 state troopers arresting environmental activists for protesting the destruction of a forest of 200-year-old trees from being turned into a shopping mall in Morelos.[25] Piece by piece the *compas* show Zapatismo's concrete consequences by effectuating some actions, some slogans, some demonstrations, and not others. But these effected elements, as processes of leading by obeying, in turn transform Zapatismo. It has no existence outside of its effectuations. This transformation of the condition "Zapatismo" then transforms the *compas* who must then redeploy new concrete effectuations based on this change. Zapatismo thus leads itself by obeying itself in a kind of feedback loop with no vanguard at the helm. It is in this sense a process of participation where event, consequence, and subject all enter a mutual transformation.

The Zapatista *compa* also breaks with a tradition of revolutionary subjectivity based on individualism and self-discipline. Instead, the *compa* acts in the third person and creates a new kind of discipline: the collective discipline of the event. This does not mean of course that *compas* never say "I," or "You," it simply means that these features are derivative or

---

[24] See chapter III.

[25] Apparently it does.

secondary to the more primary third person that acts as the agent of a connection between an event and its consequences. Conflicts and agreements still take place between specific "I's" and "You's" but only as conflicts and agreements *of the event they participate in*: not outside it, or upon it, but within and through it. Like the use of Delegate Zero to replace the political condition of representation and exclusion or the use of the self-managed Autonomous Municipalities to replace the concrete practices of private and public property, the Zapatistas create *compas* to replace the representational subject of liberal and capitalist individualism. The *compas* accomplish this practically through the use of black ski masks.

The *compas* use black masks and bandanas to create a collective and "indefinite" group-subject. "In order for them to see us, we covered our faces; so that they would call us by name, we gave up our names; we bet the present to have a future; and to live... we died" (2004b, 115). While Marcos has given several different reasons for the use of these masks over the years, from making sure no one tries to become the leader,[26] to portraying Mexico's covering up of its *real* Mexico,[27] the collective practice of masking has produced a very specific kind of revolutionary subjectivity immanent not to a consciousness who represents an "I" to itself, but to the event: to Zapatismo itself. The practice of collective masking in Zapatsimo is hostile to vanguardism insofar as it creates a visual equality between subjects without leaders. It de-individualizes first person subjects in favor of third person collective subjects of the event. We might imagine how confusing it would be to try and follow a single person when everyone was wearing the same black ski mask. "Are you the one leading us? No, I thought you were leading us?" Everyone takes turns leading by obeying ((Marcos 2006). The point is to create a locally generic subjectivity of Zapatismo and express

---

[26] "The main reason is that we have to be careful that nobody tries to be the main leader. The masks are meant to prevent this from happening." A quote from Marcos (Maxwell and Harvey. 1999, 6).

[27] "I will take off my ski mask when Mexican society takes off its own mask, the one it uses to cover up the real Mexico…" Quote from an interview with Marcos in (Katzenberger 1995, 70).

it collectively, that is, to lead but to lead by obeying those you are leading. "Because," as Subcomandante Marcos says, "here in the EZLN the mistakes are conjugated in the first person singular and the achievements in the third person plural" (Ramírez 2008, 307). Rather than affirm a pure alterity or potential for "transformation as such" found in "the face" (Levinas 1979) of a "Thou" (Buber 1958) against a representational "I/You" opposition, the Zapatistas propose instead an indefinite but determinate third person of the event. By covering their faces as a political action the Zapatistas are able to create a unique political anonymity (open to anyone, and yet unambiguously against neoliberalism) that rejects both liberal and critical models of subjectivity, in favor of a subject of the event itself. This practice has been taken up by others around the world to achieve a similar collective form of agency (Thompson 2010).

In this section I have argued that the Zapatistas have created a revolutionary and participatory body politic based on leading by obeying. In particular they have done this by creating the conditions of a singular-universal event with the proper name and date, "Zapatismo, 1994;" by sustaining and effectuating its concrete consequences in their Autonomous Municipalities, and by creating a new form of revolutionary subjectivity that acts in the third person: the masked *compa*. These three dimensions of their revolutionary body politic not only parallel Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy of consistency, but also express the theoretical practice of participation that I have developed throughout this chapter.

Conclusion

In the previous chapter we were left with the problem of how revolutionary interventions could be sustained through the creation of an alternative body politic without becoming either representational or anti-representational. This chapter has argued that there

is a third way to understand the concept of a body politic today: as a participatory set of conditions, elements, and agencies engaged in a maximal degree of mutual and direct transformation. This can be seen in both the political philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari and the praxis of the Zapatistas.

Against the exclusionary conditions of political representation defined by a set of pre-given normative criteria for political participation, or the ambivalent conditions of potentiality defined by the general capacity for change-as-such, I have argued for a concept of political conditions along the lines of what Deleuze and Guattari have called abstract machines. Since the abstract machine is a singular marker of an event (and not a thing) that both conditions and is transformed by the political elements it conditions, it has no pre-given exclusionary criteria, only participatory ones contingent on what/who participates. Since the abstract machine marks a *locally* waged struggle against specific forms of power, it is also an unambivalent commitment to more than just change-as-such: it is the creation of specific new elements and agencies.

Against the hierarchical ordering of elements found in the politics of representation, defined by their distance from, or reproduction of, pre-given norms or identities, as well as the hierarchical ordering of elements in the politics of potentiality, defined by their distance from the process of pure becoming or a difference-in-itself, I have argued for a concept of political elements based on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the concrete machinic assemblage. Since concrete machines effectuate their condition in a relation of reciprocal transformation (and not by a reproduction of pre-given criteria) they are participatory and non-hierarchical insofar as every element can change the conditions of the whole. Additionally, since they express "degrees of consistency" (between pure difference and pure identity) they can also be meaningfully ordered in relation to an abstract machine opposed to affirming a general degree of a "capacity to become other".

Similarly, against the paralysis of the subject, created by limiting its transformation to what it may rationally desire to be free *from* or be free *to,* found in the politics of identity, as well as the paralysis created by dispersing subjectivity into a pure form of becoming or transformation as such, I have argued for a concept of political subjectivity based on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of "personae." Since political personae are defined by the simultaneity of their immanent intervention as well their connection between the abstract and concrete machines, they are able to change not only their desires within the political domain of a given event, but also their very nature insofar as their actions transform the initial conditions of their existence. In addition to their localized interventions, personae have specific features that distinguish them from a purely dispersed form of transformational becoming: they combine and conflict, juridically, existentially, relationally, etc. The three concepts of the abstract machine, the concrete assemblage, and the political persona thus provide real conceptual alternatives to the representational and anti-representational political bodies, just as Zapatismo provides a practical alternative to them in the practice of leading by obeying.

But while this chapter has been able to show the structure and function of how revolutionary interventions are sustained in a participatory body politic, it has failed to offer much more than a gesture of how such political bodies can connect up with others. It is one thing for a revolutionary event to create an internal consistency between its abstract condition, concrete consequences, and subject, or even to connect a few of its consequences outside its local struggle, as we have seen in the case of Zapatismo, but how do radically heterogenous revolutionary political bodies connect to one another, if they can at all? On what new condition? How would we reconcile their potentially mutually exclusive concrete commitments? This is a question of political affinity and universal solidarity and will be addressed in the next and final chapter of this dissertation.

CHAPTER V

POLITICAL AFFINITY AND SINGULAR-UNIVERSAL SOLIDARITY

> Clearly, a revolutionary machine cannot remain satisfied with local and occasional struggles: it has to be at the same time super-centralized and super-desiring. The problem, therefore, concerns the nature of unification, which must function in a transversal way, through multiplicity, and not in a vertical way, so apt to crush the multiplicity proper to desire. (Deleuze 2004, 199)

Introduction

How is it possible to sustain and carry out the consequences of a non-representational revolutionary transformation? In chapter IV I proposed three responses to this question. First, I argued that non-representational revolutions do not simply establish new conditions for political life based on a "more just" sphere of political action whose foundational principles are still held independently from the constituted sphere where such principles are deployed. Nor do such revolutions merely aim to establish counter institutions, whose sole purpose is to undermine all forms of representation and await the possibility that something new, and hopefully better, may emerge.

Second, I argued that a non-representational revolutionary body politic is built and sustained through an expressive and participatory process whose founding conditions are constantly undergoing direct and immanent transformation by the various practices and people who are effected by them to varying degrees. I further argued that in order to understand the structure and function of participation in this revolutionary body politic we need to understand the unique relationship it articulates between three different dimensions of its political body: (1) the *conditions* under which it emerges and determines who counts as part of its body politic, (2) the distribution of concrete *elements* that express and constitute its body, and (3) the kinds of *subjects* who connect and transform these conditions and elements. Representational, anti-representational, and participatory political bodies each express a

different type of relationship between these three dimensions. In order to develop a theory of a specifically revolutionary and participatory political body, I draw on Deleuze and Guattari's similar concept of consistency, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?* but expand its application to the issue of revolutionary politics.

Third, I argued that the Zapatistas have created a similar revolutionary and participatory body politic based on what that they call Ruling by Obeying (*Mandar Obedeciendo)*. Together, Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas form a theoretical practice of revolutionary political participation.

But while the theory of a participatory body politic developed in chapter IV may have been able to account for the practical and theoretical reality of a third type of political body, it failed to understand on what basis such revolutionary bodies would be able to connect to one another and assemble a larger global alternative to neoliberalism and political representation. If the conditions of revolutionary political bodies are singular and non-representational, on what basis can such heterogenous political conditions share a common affinity or belonging? To what degree can this inclusive model of political participation, argued for in chapter IV, be practically extended into a world-wide revolutionary movement? Does one condition or body politic simply swallow another in larger and larger spheres of participation or do they exist in parallel?

Defined as the connection between two or more heterogeneous political conditions, what I am calling revolutionary political affinity confronts two dangers. On the one hand, it risks being synthesized into a single global condition under which heterogeneous conditions can communicate, but only as particular elements under a larger representational condition (the affinity of citizenship within territorial nation-states, the unequal/vertical affinity between allied and axis nations, etc.). On the other hand, the affinity between revolutionary political bodies risks becoming dispersed into a multiplicity of unconnected singularities

whose only belonging is the universal non-belonging of their radical difference. However, the political solidarity found in the contemporary return to revolution I argue, is not simply a matter of integrating marginalized demands back into the dominant nation-state apparatus by simply tweaking the criteria for citizenship to include those who are currently excluded. Nor is it a matter of recognizing the universal singularity of all beings to become other than they are. Rather, this revolutionary solidarity occurs when the participatory political bodies, defined in chapter IV, adopt each other's struggles as their own. This solidarity is not a matter of recognition, charity, or even radical difference, but rather a federated and transversal connection between multiple singular-universal political bodies.

This chapter thus poses three responses to the problem of creating solidarity between multiple non-representational political bodies. First, I argue against the concepts of citizenship and difference as desirable models of political belonging insofar as the former is structurally exclusionary and the later is unable to theorize any concrete relations between multiple coexistent conditions. Second, I argue that, opposed to these two dangers of citizenship and difference, the solidarity that defines the contemporary return to revolution is defined instead by the federated connection between multiple singular-universal conditions without totality. In order to develop this third concept of political solidarity I draw on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of nomadism and expand its implications to revolutionary praxis. Third, I argue that this recent return to revolution is expressed in the Zapatista's political practice of global networking and the assembly of International Gatherings Against Neoliberalism (*Encuentros Intercontinentales)*. Together, the theory of nomadism and the practice of mutual global solidarity in Zapatismo define the theoretical practice of what I am calling singular-universal solidarity.

Universal Political Affinity

Citizenship and the Territorial Nation-State

The concept of political affinity in the twentieth century has been dominated by the figure of the citizen. Though far from articulating a homogenous figure of political affinity, the concept of citizenship has been a rich and pivotal site for increasingly divergent contestations over political agency, inclusion, and exclusion. Today, however, a century of contestation has escalated into full-on destabilization, as citizenship has come under siege by three increasingly irreconcilable phenomena.

(1) The increasing frequency of political and economic intervention by trans- and non-national organizations into states by providing many of the affinities, protections, services, and goods typically provided by state citizenship. Such organizations include *transnational entities* like the European Union or the Bolivarian Alliance in South America; *international entities* like the United Nations; *global entities* like Non-Governmental Organizations and the growing network of doctors, teachers, journalists, farmers, lawyers, and groups "without borders;" *economic entities* like private Corporations and the World Trade Organization; and *activist entities* like the Alter-Globalization Movement and the World (and Regional) Social Forums.

(2) The growing global movement of economically, politically, and environmentally forced migrants (disproportionately from the global south) who are often denied full political status (citizenship) and access to services in their new country. The last decade alone has marked the highest number of migrations world-wide in recorded history. But what is unsettling about this phenomena is that each year a higher and higher percentage of migrants around the world are becoming irregular or non-status. If citizenship and legal status are the conditions under which nation-states understand the political agency and rights of a people, what does it mean for over 100 million people to be living without status

around the world? (United Nations 2008; IOM 2008).[1] Increasing numbers of precarious, criminalized, and exploited persons pose a serious challenge to the desirability of citizenship-based political affinity.

(3) The massive internal destabilization of citizenship brought on by the nation-state itself: the denationalizations during World War I and World War II; the creation of interment, work, refugee, and extermination camps throughout the twentieth century; the torture and abuse of prisoners at *Abiu Graib*; the suspension of *Habeas corpus* at Guatanamo and in the Patriot Act, and so on. These demonstrate the increasingly permanent state of juridico-political exception and executive control into which citizenship has fallen. If states cannot be trusted to guarantee the sole concept of political affinity that only they have given themselves the power to protect, then the legitimacy of such a concept remains permanently in question.

Citizenship, as a form of political affinity or belonging, aims to resolve the relationship between multiple political conditions (territorial, economic, cultural, and so on) by capturing them all under a single condition, what Hannah Arendt calls, "the old trinity of state-people-territory" that formed the basis of European civilization (Arendt 1951: 282). Insofar as multiple political conditions and their agents accept the enforcement of specific criteria for belonging (birth, rights, etc.), the state can mediate and identify legitimate forms of political agency (voting, property, family, etc.) and illegitimate forms of political agency (revolution, theft, perversion, etc). But it does so only insofar as multiple conditions are sacrificed to become elements of a single state condition: citizenship.

The problem with the theoretical entrenchment of the territorial nation-state matrix, however, is not that we have yet to find the right balance between them, but rather that all

[1] "The IOM estimates that irregular immigrants account for one-third to one-half of new entrants into developed countries, marking an increase of 20 per cent over the past ten years" (IOM 2008).

three terms of this trinity are themselves fundamentally exclusionary political concepts. In fact the very philosophical labor of trying to theorize a radically inclusive politics within such a matrix should rightly be considered an "oxymoron" (Levinson and Tamir 1995). A theory of political affinity delimited by a territorial space necessarily excludes those outside its borders and restricts the free movement of peoples to a logic of political inclusion and exclusion along arbitrary geo-political lines (Balibar 2006, 2). The territory is the *a priori* condition for migration and its control. Thus, a theory of political affinity based on the particularity of national identity, no matter how "differentiated" it is, likewise marginalizes extra-territorial, extra-national affinities and solidarities that cannot be restricted to the nation.

A theory of political affinity legitimated by the sovereign state also excludes its own power of legitimation from its juridical legislation. Logically, that is, the state cannot include its own condition (the exceptional and executive violence of its foundation) within its own laws. This is why almost all modern state constitutions (democratic, socialist, or totalitarian) have paradoxical laws that allow for the suspension of the constitution itself in times of emergency or national security (Agamben 2005, 11–19). Finally, restricting political analysis to the confines of the territorial nation-state conceals the unquestioned presupposition of liberal multiculturalism: its complicity with multinational capitalism (Žižek 1997). The argument that modern nation-states should be neutral sites or "empty universalities" of multicultural representation often simply means that minorities are tolerated as consumer markets or sources of equally exploited wage labor (as an economic exclusion) in a state-protected capitalist economy (Žižek 1997, 44). Despite its pretensions to universality and inclusion the territorial nation-state is essentially exclusionary, whether it is liberal or socialist.

Biopolitics and Universal Singularity

The inherently exclusionary dilemma of the territorial nation-state that underpins the concept of citizenship-based political affinity is, however, not a new problem, and uncovering its paradox or *aporia* has not done it any harm. Even so, the contemporary phenomena of extra-national affinity, migration, and political states of emergency have certainly exacerbated it. Rather than weakening exclusionary models of power, the logical structure of exceptionalism has only taken on an increasingly multiple, decentralized, and permanent formulation under modern capitalism—all the more powerful for its suppleness and contradiction. The power of political exclusion today "not only takes place at the territorial borders of the nation-state" but has become diffused into much more flexible border structures that have made *life itself* (not merely the citizen) the site of multiple intersecting forms of power (Balibar 2002, 75–86). Today invoking juridico-political suspensions of laws and rights toward the ends of increased security against an unidentified enemy (terror), and allowing multinational corporations to pass freely across national territorial borders while the poor and undesirable are "refused," states and corporations have mobilized an advanced structural invisibility.[2]

Borders are thus a modern political expression of this mobilized exception. A border excludes and includes less like a *barricade or wall* than like a passage-way or *sieve* for capital to pass through a very particular distribution of borders (for profit, control, security, etc.) while fortifying others against migrants or terrorists. In the present political climate of terror and securitization, it has become increasingly apparent that borders no longer exist solely in the geographical space between two sovereign territories, but as local police enforcement, fire

[2] While there may be a structural exclusion and multiplicity necessary to law itself, there are certainly degrees of mobilizing this combination. Modern nation-states, as Hannah Arendt feared, have succumbed to the temptation to increasingly deploy this exceptionalism. "The clearer the proof of their inability to treat stateless people as legal persons and the greater the extension of arbitrary rule by police decree, the more difficult it is for states to resist the temptation to deprive all citizens of legal status and rule them with an omnipotent police" (Arendt, 1951, 290).

fighters, hospitals, schools, private companies, airports, banks, and individuals begin to independently monitor and strategically report non-status and "suspicious" persons, "the border" today is becoming something much more "self-regulating" and "self-transmuting": what Deleuze calls *les sociétés de contrôle,* "control societies" (Deleuze 1995: 179). Borders have become multiple modulating constraints not just to block external movement but to regulate and stabilize internal populations to a certain degree or probability within a largely unpredictable *milieu* or environment (Balibar 2006, 5).

But if the exclusionary liberalism of the territorial nation-state has been increasingly transformed into the more multiple and heterogeneous exceptionalism of biopolitics and control, what, if any, opportunities does this open up for a new non-exclusionary theory of political affinity? Giorgio Agamben argues that the decline of nation-state-based citizenship has revealed the figure of the refugee as the starting point for a new theory of political affinity. It is worth quoting him here at length,

> Given the by now unstoppable decline of the Nation-State and the general corrosion of traditional political-juridical categories, the refugee is perhaps the only thinkable figure for the people of our time and the only category in which one may see today —at least until the process of dissolution of the Nation-State and its sovereignty has achieved full completion—the forms and limits of a coming political community. It is even possible that, if we want to be equal to the absolutely new tasks ahead, we will have to abandon decidedly, without reserve, the fundamental concepts through which we have so far represented the subjects of the political (Man, the Citizen and its rights, but also the sovereign people, the worker, and so forth) and build our political philosophy anew starting from the one and only figure of the refugee. (Agamben 1996, 158–59)

While the "unstoppable decline of the Nation-State" is far from certain at this point, Agamben's insight here is to highlight the site of such a potential unhinging: the refugee. Insofar as the figure of the refugee "unhinges the old trinity of State-nation-territory" and expresses the disjunction between the human and the citizen, between nativity and the nation, Agamben argues, "it brings the originary fiction of sovereignty to crisis" and allows "the citizen [to] be able to recognize the refugee that he or she is" (Agamben 1996, 164).

If biopolitics has truly created a permanent state of exception and modulated control, everyone has become, at least potentially, a form of *bare life*, stripped of all particularity. Citizens are no longer the central subjects of political management. It is now environments and populations that are increasingly becoming the focus of a governmental rationality of modulated and flexible control. This *form of life* or *singularity,* discernible in the figure of the refugee or the non-status migrant and virtually present in everyone, is internally excluded from the dominant politics of citizenship and the nation-state. Thus, Agamben argues that such singularization opens up the opportunity for a new radically inclusive form of political affinity based on "the paradoxical condition of reciprocal extraterritoriality (or, better yet, aterritoriality) that . . . could be generalized as a model of new international relations" (Agamben 1996, 164). Eugene Holland has expressed similar hopes for the concept of the nomad ("the deterritorialized *par excellence*") found in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy (2006, 203).

While grounding political affinity in the universal singularity of reciprocal aterritoriality or deterritorialization may avoid the problem of representation and exclusion inherent in the relation between the universal and the particular found in the nation-state, it remains, however, insufficient for understanding how such singularities organize and connect up with one another or become, in themselves, concretely universal. Singularity, in this theory, seems to remain radically finite, or rather indefinite. While we may agree that universal singularity or absolute deterritorialization is the condition for "those who have no 'qualification'" to form new networks of non-totalizing relations, it does, for all this, fail to theorize how such singularities form immanent relations of greater or lesser consistency (Rancière 2004, 305). For example, if we agreed that citizenship were inherently exclusionary and that we were all mutually aterritorial refugees, what new practices of political affinity would be desirable to facilitate more or less connection between such singularities? What are

the different types of relation between singularities, and what are their dangers? What would such a new model of international relations actually look like? The theory of universal singularity or deterritorialization fails to provide a theory of political relation and thus to understand political affinity as more than just a finite and ambivalent opening of "new horizons of possibility previously undreamt of by international state law" (Derrida 2001, 7).

Solidarity and the Singular-Universal

In the wake of these problems I argue in this section that the contemporary return to revolution, of which Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas are a part, is defined instead by a singular-universal solidarity. By this I mean the degree to which two or more heterogeneous political bodies are united through one or more specific concrete practices. This solidarity, however, is never a complete unity; it is only a *degree of identity* based on the specific number of mutually shared practices. The question of solidarity can thus be formulated in the following way according to Deleuze: "How can one uphold the rights of a micro-analysis (diffusion, heterogeneity, fragmentation) and still allow for some kind of principle of unification that will not turn out to be like the State or the Party, a totalization or a representation" (2006, 132–33)?

The answer to this question requires all of the previous chapters of this dissertation. In chapter II, I defined and distinguished between the different dangers of representation facing this kind of unity; in chapter III, I defined four types or degrees of change that escape these representational unities; and in chapter IV, I argued that these degrees of change could be connected together in a participatory body politic defined by its singular-universal conditions, concrete effectuations, and immanent subjectivities or persona. But we have yet to see how singular-universal conditions themselves can be connected together to

form larger, world-wide revolutionary networks. We have not yet understood the theory and practice of solidarity: the creation of "a world where many worlds fit," as Marcos says.

We have so far distinguished between two kinds of universality: (1) the universality of representation (found in the territorial nation-state), and (2) the universality of singularity (found in the potentiality of the deterritorialized refugee or nomad). But the concept of belonging or solidarity I develop in this chapter should also be distanced from four common theories of solidarity: (1) Solidarity is not a matter of charity. Charity presumes an unequal distribution of power and wealth, such that those who have them may temporally alleviate the suffering of those who do not without radically changing the conditions under which such inequality existed in the first place. (2) Solidarity is not altruism. Altruism is based on an identification with the needs, interests, and character of a particular group or person. As such, altruism also fails to understand or change the conditions under which a particular group or person has suffered injustice. (3) Solidarity is also not a universal principle of duty. Such a principle would undermine the singularity and contingency of multiple conditions and subordinate them to a single abstract condition (duty) without the possibility of participatory transformation of that condition (as discussed in chapter IV). (4) Finally, solidarity is not a matter of allies fighting toward the same teleological objective (class struggle, socialism, etc.). As we saw in chapter IV, this is in part because contemporary revolutionary conditions undergo participatory transformations of their objectives as they proceed. Additionally, each singular-universal condition has its own objectives that would be undermined by submission to a single objective.

Negative definitions out of the way, the remainder of this chapter offers a positive account of solidarity in two stages: the first section develops a theory of how multiple singular-universal conditions can be connected together, without presupposing the representational unities discussed in chapter II, by drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's

concept of nomadism found in *A Thousand Plateaus*. The second section then argues that the Zapatistas express this new type of political solidarity by mobilizing global connections between multiple singular-universal political conditions through their *Encuentros Intercontinentales.*

Singular, Universal, Inclusive

Before addressing the question of how multiple singular-universal conditions are able to connect to each other, I want to remind the reader what a singular-universal revolutionary political condition is, as it was defined in chapter IV. The contemporary revolutionary political body, I argued, is able to unify an assemblage of heterogeneous practices of resistance without subordinating them to a form of political representation (state, party, or vanguard) insofar as it makes use of a participatory politics theorized by Deleuze and Guattari as the reciprocal determination (consistency) of an abstract machine, a concrete assemblage, and machinic personae. In particular, the abstract machine acts as a mutable revolutionary political condition and exemplifies the local yet absolute dimensions of the revolutionary body politic.

A revolutionary condition, or abstract machine in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, is singular insofar as it presupposes no prior identity, causality, or place in the dominant matrix of political representation (territorial-state-capitalism), but it is absolute insofar as nothing is essentially excluded from participation in its infinite consequences: it is a maximum degree of inclusion with a minimal degree of identification. It is local insofar as it has a specific proper name, site, or date (Zapatista 1994, The Paris Commune, May 68', etc.), but is absolute insofar as this proper name is open to universal participation and reinterpretation. The absolute of the abstract machine, then, should not be confused with the absolutes or universals of identity that remain the same (and pre-given) while adding on an increasing number of axioms or elements of representation (as in representational democracies, nation-

states, and market economies). Rather, when Deleuze and Guattari speak of a "becoming-everybody/everything (*devenir tout le monde*)" of revolution, this means that everybody and everything may participate in an effectuation and transformation that "respond[s] to the demands of the event" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 470; Deleuze 2006, 234). In sum a singular-universal event accomplishes three basic operations: (1) it clarifies the distance or irreconcilability of a singularity within the dominant matrix of political representation; (2) it calls for a revolutionary decision on a specific "undecidable" and unrepresented singularity (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 473); (3) and it then follows out the "non-denumerably infinite" consequences of this event by constructing new concrete assemblages and machinic personae that effectuate it (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 470).

But in what sense, then, is such a condition necessarily inclusive? In *What is Philosophy?*, Deleuze and Guattari describe this immanent condition[3] as a plane whose only regions are the elements that develop it through local operations, point by point, and within a generic relation of becoming with one another. The plane of immanence, according to Deleuze and Guattari, thus has an "infinite" or "absolute" movement, or "a nonlimited locality" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 382), "defined by a coming and going, because it does not advance toward a destination without already turning back on itself, the needle also being the pole" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 38) like a "vortex" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 509). Thus, if a revolutionary condition is defined only by those who construct it through participation in it, then it cannot be essentially exclusive (it has no essential criteria for participation, only mutable ones).[4] The type of revolutionary political body exemplified in the contemporary return to revolution is thus singular, universal, and inclusive. But this recapitulation has only heightened the problem we are trying to resolve in this chapter: if

[3] I.e. plane of immanence; abstract machine.

[4] Although this is not to say that debate and conflicts never arise regarding the status and content of an event.

revolutionary events each have their own singular and specific conditions, elements, and agencies for action, how can they possibly be said to be in solidarity with other heterogenous conditions, elements, and agencies without creating a new unity (territory, state, or market)?

Deleuze, Guattari, and Nomadic Solidarity

In the preceding chapters I have argued for three interpretive theses about Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy: (1) that we should use their concept of *Historical Topology* as a theory of revolutionary political diagnosis, (2) that we should use their concept of *Deterritorialization* as a theory to bring about prefigurative political transformations, and (3) that we should expand their concept of *Consistency* to be used as a theory of political participation. In this chapter I propose my final interpretive thesis, namely, that their concept of *Nomadism* should be used as a theory of political solidarity. Defined in its most basic terms, Nomadism, for Deleuze and Guattari, is a "mode of unlimited distribution without division." Nomadism is fundamentally a theory of political relation. It describes how singular-universal events like revolutionary political bodies relate to each other and can be distributed in a mutually inclusive way without totalization or representation.

But why do Deleuze and Guattari call this nomadic? What is it precisely about nomadism that allows us to theorize the inclusive and mobile connection between heterogeneous political conditions? Deleuze and Guattari define the origins of the word *nomad* following the work of French historian Emmanuel Laroche in *Histoire de la racine "Nem" en grec ancien* (1949). There Laroche argues that the Greek origins of the root "νεμ" signified a "mode of distribution" (*moyen de distribution*), not an allocation of parceled out or delimited land (*partage*). "The idea [that nomos meant] law is a product of fifth and sixth-century Greek thought," that breaks from the "original Homeric root νεμω meaning, 'I distribute' or 'I arrange'" (1949, 255, my translation). Even "the [retroactively] proposed translations 'cut-up earth, plot of land, piece' are not suitable in all cases to the Homeric

poems and assume an ancient νεμω 'I divide' that we should reject. The pasture in archaic times is generally an unlimited space (*espace illimité*); this can be a forest, meadow, rivers, a mountain side" (1949, 116, my translation).

"The *nomos*," Deleuze and Guattari say, thus "designated first of all an occupied space, but one without precise limits (for example, the expanse around a town)" (Deleuze 1994, 309n6). Rather than parceling out a closed space delimited by roads, borders, and walls, assigning to each person a share of property *(partage*), and regulating the communication between shares through a juridical apparatus, the original meaning of nomadism, according to Laroche and Deleuze and Guattari, does the opposite. Nomadism "distributes people in an open space that is indefinite (*indéfini*) and noncommunicating" without division, borders, or *polis* (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 380). It is marked instead by "traits" that are effaced and displaced within a trajectory: points of relay, water, food, shelter, etc. But just because nomadic distributions have no division or border does not mean that nomad space is not distributed or consistent. Rather, it is precisely because of the fact that the nomos defines a concretely occupied but non-limited, indefinite space that it offers us a way to think of heterogeneous political conditions as mutual and connectable without opposition. If there are no distinct divisions or delimited "pieces" (*des morceaux*), then there can be no mutual exclusion.

If each group solidarity has its own "specific infinity" or *distribution illimité* (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 21), and there are an unlimited number of such unlimited distributions, then there is by necessity no deducible continuum between such "non-denumerable infinite sets." The relationship between infinite events is thus "undecidable: the germ and locus *par excellence* of revolutionary decisions," as Deleuze and Guattari say (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 473). It is precisely this undecidability between infinite events that makes solidarity possible. If there were a deducible continuum between all events, then we would simply

reproduce the first figure of representational (and exclusionary) universality—making solidarity both unnecessary and impossible. On the other hand, if any kind of unified continuum were absolutely impossible then solidarity would only be paradoxical and ineffective. Solidarity must lie somewhere between these two positions.

But how is solidarity actually constructed between co-existent and unlimited distributions? While it must be admitted that Deleuze and Guattari rarely mention the word solidarity, I want to highlight a particularly illuminating passage and a footnote from the "Treatise on Nomadology" chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus* where they do (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 366). Here, they directly connect the concept of solidarity to its nomadic origins and its role in the creation of a "collective body" (*le corps collectif*) opposed to the State, Family, or Party body.

The nomadic origins of the concept of solidarity, according to Deleuze and Guattari, are found in Ibn Khaldun's concept of *asabiyah*.[5] In his book, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History,* Khaldun defines the Bedouin nomads not primarily by their ethnic, geographical, State, or familial genealogy, but by their mode of life and *group solidarity* that brings various heterogeneous persons and families together. What is interesting is that, for Khaldun, solidarity is not defined by any pre-given, genealogical, or even static criteria for inclusion/exclusion, but rather by contingent relationships "between persons who . . . share a feeling of solidarity without any outside prodding" (1958, Section 8). "By taking their special place within the group [solidarity], they participate to some extent in the common descent to which that particular group [solidarity] belongs" (1958, section 13). Not only is the only condition for group solidarity, according to Khaldun, "a commitment" to a particular group solidarity, but this mutual solidarity then creates a new common line of descent (similarly open to solidarity with other groups). Thus Khaldun can claim that "genealogy is something

[5] The Arabic word for socialism is derived from *asabiyah*.

that is of no use to know and that it does no harm not to know . . . [because] when common descent is no longer clear and has become a matter of scientific knowledge, it can no longer move the imagination and is denied the affection caused by [solidarity]. It has become useless" (1958, section 8). Even State political power is useless without solidarity behind it (1958, section 12). The most primary form of social belonging is thus, according to Khaldun, neither sedentary (State) nor genealogical (Family), but rather contingent and mobile (Nomadic).

What Deleuze and Guattari find so compelling in the nomadic origins of Khaldun's theory of solidarity is that each nomadic Bedouin family acts not as a hierarchical or unidirectional condition of genealogical descent, an arranged matrimonial alliance between families, or even a State-bureaucratic descent, but rather as a contingent "band vector or point of relay expressing the power (*puissance*) or strength (*vertu*) of the solidarity" that holds them together (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 366). Families are thus assembled primarily through relations of mutual, horizontal solidarity and have nothing to do "with the monopoly of an organic power (*pouvoir*) nor with local representation, but [with] the potential (*puissance*) of a vortical body in a nomad space" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 366). It would thus be a mistake to understand nomadic solidarity as simply a matter of pure deterritorialization or unlimited space: a line of flight from or internal transformation of State power. Rather, I am arguing, following Khaldun, that Deleuze and Guattari's concept of nomadism is a matter of belonging and unity among heterogeneous relays. "Revolutionary movement," Deleuze and Guattari say, is "the connection of flows, the composition of non-denumerable aggregates, the becoming-minoritarian of everybody/everything. . . . This is not a dispersion or a fragmentation" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 473). Accordingly, Khaldun defines nomadic (*badiya*) solidarity (*asabiyah)* according to two

axes of belonging: *the group/family* (the condition of a common descent) and *relations of solidarity* (the concrete practices of mutual support and relay between groups).

So just as a revolutionary condition immanently holds together the becoming of its heterogeneous conditioned concrete elements, so is it immanently related to other conditions like a Bedouin solidarity: without the outside prodding of territory, family, or state. And since this evental condition is always a singular-universal or local-absolute, made only through local operations, there can be no event of all events. Such an event would be transcendent and outside of or excluded from events as such, as discussed in chapter III. But if there is an infinity of infinite events[6] whose relations are undecidable, but whose conditions are *decidable* as universally open and egalitarian, then it is at least possible that, even though such events are non-denumerable and heterogeneous (*illimité,* for Laroche), there could be, according to Deleuze and Guattari, "larger or smaller [infinities] according to the . . . components, thresholds, and bridges" they connect (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 21). If every event is open to universal participation and transformation, then events, by definition, are not mutually exclusive. They can, however, be added, combined, or mutually reinforced to certain degrees, while never becoming entirely identical. That said, since the relation between political conditions is still a fundamentally "undecidable" one, the actual labor of following out the local consequences of the relations of solidarity requires more than just a revolutionary "decision" that two or more revolutionary political bodies are "in solidarity."

---

[6] This is different than saying "an infinity of events." In chapter IV I argued that each participatory political body was both singular insofar as it was a locally waged struggle but infinite or absolute in the sense that its consequences could be carried out anywhere by anyone and infinitely so. This is the definition of an infinite event. An infinity of infinite events is different and poses a real problem similar to one posed in set theory: "the continuum hypothesis." If there are multiple infinities, that is, an infinity of infinities without totality what how can we know which are larger or smaller and what their relations are? This is also the problem of solidarity between non-representational body politics.

Transversal Relays

Thus, if solidarity is possible how does it work? By solidarity I mean, the immanent, point-by-point connection between at least two heterogeneous evental sequences (an immanent condition, its concrete elements, and its forms of agency). By "connection," I mean the degree to which a concrete element or singularity is affirmed as a consequence or singularity of both evental conditions. Since merely "deciding on the undecidable," as I argued in chapter IV, is insufficient for sustaining the participatory consequences and agents of such a decision, so is merely "deciding on the undecidable" relation between two heterogeneous political conditions. Accordingly, it is necessary, for evental solidarity, to connect at least one consequence or element from one event to at least one consequence or element of another. The more concrete elements of an event that are connected to the elements of another event, the greater the degree of infinity in each event as well as the degree of solidarity between them. In *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari call this the "external neighborhood or exoconsistency" of the event. Its trans-universal or "transversal" relations are "secured by the bridges thrown from one [machine] to another" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 90). This is the piece-by-piece labor of solidarity.

But since each revolutionary condition is singular, a "connection" or "transversality" between connections cannot mean total identification. Rather, this kind of revolution is "constructed piece by piece, and the places, conditions, and techniques are irreducible to one another" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 157). Thus two heterogenous conditions become *more or less connected/identified* through an unlimited series of concrete political practices that act as non-communicating relays. This is because "for the nomad," according to Deleuze and Guattari, "locality is not delimited; the absolute, then, does not appear at a particular place but becomes a non-limited locality; the coupling of the place and the absolute is achieved not in a centered, oriented globalization or universalization but in an infinite succession of

local operations" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 383). But this infinite succession is not an indefinite delay of solidarity; it is the positive concrete articulation of increasingly greater degrees without a totality of absolute unification. Just as two different nomadic Bedouin families share more or less solidarity over some specific practices and thus "participate to *some extent* in the common descent" (my italics) of each others' families, so it is possible to say that two or more heterogeneous political conditions participate to a greater or lesser extent in each others' conditions to the degree that they share a number of the same concrete consequences or relays. With this definition we are closer to the earlier political meaning of the word *nomos* as a mode of non-limited distribution than we are with the derivative fifth or sixth-century Greek definition of *nomos* as law (*loi*), judgement (*juger*), or government (*gouverner*) (Laroche, 1949, 256). With this definition it is also possible for one to occupy multiple heterogeneous conditions at once to the degree that a given distribution of bridges of shared commitment crosses transversally multiple political conditions. This is what Deleuze and Guattari call

> a constructivism, [or] 'diagrammatism,' operating by the determination of the conditions of the problem and by transversal links between problems: it opposes both the automation of the capitalist axioms and bureaucratic programming. From this standpoint, when we talk about 'undecidable propositions,' we are not referring to the uncertainty of the results, which is necessarily a part of every system. We are referring, on the contrary, to the coexistence and inseparability of that which the system conjugates, and that which never ceases to escape it following lines of flight that are themselves connectable. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 473)

We have now been able to finally answer the question, "how can one uphold the rights of a micro-analysis (diffusion, heterogeneity, fragmentation) and still allow for some kind of principle of unification that will not turn out to be like the State or the Party, a totalization or a representation" (Deleuze 2006, 132–33)? The answer requires a revolutionary body politic to have at least four specific characteristics: singularity, universality, inclusivity, and a participatory structure (defined in chapter IV and rephrased

above). It must be local and determinate with a proper name, absolute and infinite in its consequences, and open to modification by anyone without pre-defined criteria. Given these four characteristics, I have shown how Deleuze and Guattari define a "collective political body" by its nomadic solidarity following Laroche and Khaldun. Laroche defines *nomos* by its earlier Homeric roots as the open distribution or arrangement of a collective body in an unlimited and inclusive space. The forest, pasture, mountain steppe, and their inhabitants all express this undivided but clearly heterogeneous kind of distributive unity. Khaldun, then, defines the connections between heterogeneous Bedouin families neither by Family, State, or Territory, but by two different axes: Common descent and relations of relayed group solidarity. While groups of common descent never merge entirely, they merge to a greater or lesser degree depending on the concrete relations of group solidarity at a given time. Finally, we reached the definition of nomadic solidarity as the piece-by-piece infinite connection (bridging) of shared concrete actions by two or more heterogeneous political conditions (never merging but becoming more or less transversally identical).

Zapatismo and *Los Encuentros Intercontinentales:* **"A World in which Many Worlds Fit"**

The concept of nomadism as a theory of political solidarity does not apply only to the historical phenomena of nomadic peoples. As a "mode of distribution" it can be used elsewhere and for other purposes. Thus, in this next section, I argue that the Zapatistas do precisely this with their own concept of mutual global solidarity. This kind of solidarity is irreducible, not only to the practices of citizenship and difference, but to other existing models of political solidarity as well. I begin by distinguishing between four types of solidarity—internationalism, third-world solidarity, rights solidarity, and material solidarity—and address Thomas Olesen's (2005) argument that they all share a one-way model of unequal solidarity. I then argue that, rather than break with these models altogether, the

Zapatistas rely on and offer all these types of solidarity to some degree but ultimately rely most on a practice of global solidarity defined not by unequal relations between first and third world, nor by north and south, but by mutual relations between singular universals. Beyond this, I argue that their practice of creating *Encuentros Intercontinentales* (Intercontinental Gatherings) and *Puentes de solidaridad* (Bridges of Solidarity) do more than just define a "mutual" relation of global solidarity; they define a singular-universal theory of inclusive solidarity held together by coordinated concrete actions.

Neither Citizenship nor Difference

The singular-universal solidarity of the Zapatistas, however, does not emerge from nowhere. It emerges, along with modern citizenship and other theories of solidarity, from the development of the modernist concept of universalism: the idea of a global consciousness, a shared humanity, and an aspiration to see the world as a single place. Regardless of how successful modern democracies have been at achieving this universality, the Zapatistas express a new development in its theory and practice. In contrast to the modern theory of citizenship based on the territorial nation-state that was criticized earlier in this chapter for its exclusionary character, for the Zapatistas there is no *essential* criteria for political inclusion/exclusion, like what territory one was born in, what nation one is a part of, or what state grants one rights, etc.). "Dignity is that nation without nationality," they say "that rainbow that is also a bridge . . . that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs, and wars" (Marcos 2004b, 642).

Additionally, in contrast to the theory of political affinity as difference proposed by Simon Tormey (2006, 146), the Zapatistas, I argue, do not insist on the political solidarity of universal singularity or difference alone, but on a type of organized global solidarity found in the unique structure of the *Encuentros* that must be constructed through a *particular* network of concrete bridges against neoliberalism. Merely affirming global autonomy and difference

means nothing without the discipline of building revolutionary political bodies and bridges based on participatory conditions and concrete actions. "Shared difference" tells us nothing about the type of organization required to assemble singularities without falling into the trap of representation. "A world in which many worlds fit" as the Zapatistas say, thus cannot be realized by merely affirming that "there are a multiplicity of worlds" (universal singularity) but must be constructed in such a way that many worlds fit together (through concrete bridges and encounters) without creating a representational hierarchy like a territory, nation, state, or market. That way is not universal difference for the Zapatistas; that way is participatory democracy and global solidarity through networked horizontalism.

Four Types of Solidarity

Finally, the singular universal solidarity used by the Zapatistas is different from four other kinds of solidarity: internationalism, third-world solidarity, rights solidarity, and material solidarity. Left-wing internationalism, especially active in the early twentieth century, proposed socialist cosmopolitanism as an alternative to global capitalism. It was defined by two features: First, it assumed a certain homogeneity of industrial working conditions and thus a high degree of global class consciousness that was ready for revolution, as can be seen in the slogan "workers of the world unite." Second, it was vertically structured around national parties and states with socialist governments, and not by the voluntary organization of individuals and civil society. Since the end of the cold war, however, this type of international solidarity has virtually disappeared (Waterman 1998, 236). Third World solidarity, on the other hand, grew out of the student movement and anti-war movements of the 1960s (especially in Europe and the USA) and was particularly important in supporting the national liberation movements of the 1970s. It was also defined by two features: First, it was concerned with economic and structural inequalities between rich and poor; and,

second, although it divided the world into first, second, and third (or North and South), it still reflected a growing global consciousness.

Rights solidarity is concerned mainly with human rights abuses and other forms of repression by states or extra-legal forces. "Rights solidarity work generally aims at putting pressure on human rights abusers. This may be done directly by lobbying the governments of the countries in which the violations take place, but often pressure is exerted through other governments or intergovernmental organizations expected to have a certain influence on the state in which the violations occur" (Olesen 2005, 256). Rights solidarity is based on a strong conception of universal human rights but is often less politicized because it focuses on the violations of individual persons instead of more structural causes. Material solidarity is directed mainly towards victims of natural disasters (droughts, earthquakes, etc.) or human-caused disasters (wars, refugees, etc.) and to different forms of underdevelopment. "Material solidarity reflects a global consciousness in that it constructs a world in which the fate of distant people can no longer be ignored. Like rights solidarity, material solidarity is often carried out by organizations that take a neutral position in specific conflicts" (Olesen 2005, 256).

All four of these types of solidarity, according to Olsen, display elements of inequality. These forms are all based on a predominantly one-way relationship between those who offer solidarity and those who benefit from it. The ones who offer solidarity are generally richer and have more resources to offer those who do not have them. Solidarity based on charity and altruism may have beneficial consequences but insofar as they are not aimed at changing the structural conditions under which they currently exist, then they risk perpetuating the inequality that allows them to exist. While Third World solidarity and international solidarity may be more politicized in the sense that they demand structural changes to the current global inequalities, they also rely on some of the binary historical

perspectives that characterized the Cold War, where the providers of solidarity are mostly from Europe and the USA and those elsewhere receive aid on the condition they affirm the strategies of the provider.

Global solidarity, in contrast, is defined by a high degree of mutual aid between activists that blurs the distinction between the provider and receiver of solidarity and has a larger emphasis on non-material solidarity (inspiration, education, affection, etc.). All solidarity activists are understood to be affected, to varying degrees, by the same neoliberal system. Global solidarity thus emphasizes similarities between socially distant people while simultaneously respecting local differences. In this way global solidarity aims to move between the singular and the universal without subordinating one to the other. This is the kind of solidarity practiced by the Zapatistas.

The Encuentros

But it would be inaccurate to argue that the Zapatistas have always given or received solidarity in a purely mutual way. The Zapatistas still receive material aid from Europe and the United States to a significant degree, and human rights groups continue to be a presence in Chiapas. While the global inequality of wealth and power does pose a challenge to the aim of mutual global solidarity, this does not mean that global solidarity should not be the larger aim and practice of revolutionary movements.[7] The Zapatistas and their supporters thus aim to create the first global solidarity network based on this model of mutual aid. The network they invented to do this was called the *Encuentro Intercontintal.*

[7] Although those who currently practice rights and material solidarity would also agree that the current system of inequality is a barrier to global solidarity, the difference is that material aid solidarity does not change the conditions for the production of the material donated. The Zapatistas on the other hand aim to transform the conditions for material production and distribution not just in theory but also in practice. Their political philosophy is explicitly anti-capitalist and their practical creation of workers cooperatives and use of democratic fair trade practices concretely express their rejection of private property, profit, and charity. Despite their relative poverty they have done their best to provide aid to others like Cuba and Palestine.

On July 27th, 1996, three thousand activists from more than forty countries converged in Zapatista territory in Chiapas, Mexico, for the *First Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism*. The aim of the first *Encuentro* was to gather the "minorities of the world: the indigenous, youth, women, homosexuals, lesbians, people of color, immigrants, workers, peasants, etc" (Marcos 2004b, 642), and create a space where they could share their struggles and create bridges of mutual global solidarity. Here, the *Committees in Solidarity with the Zapatista Rebellion* were created and charged with the further organization of more *Encuentros* on the five continents—Europe, Asia, America, Africa, and Oceania—in the coming years. And the closing remarks of this first *Encuentro* (*2nd Declaration of La Realidad*) defined two central aims of this new network: First, to make a collective network of all singular struggles and resistances.

> This intercontinental network of resistance, recognizing differences and acknowledging similarities, will search to find itself with other resistances around the world. This intercontinental network of resistance will be the medium in which distinct resistances may support one another. This intercontinental network of resistance is not an organizing structure; it doesn't have a central head or decision maker; it has no central command or hierarchies. We are the network, all of us who resist. (Marcos 2004b, 645)

Second, to create an intercontinental network of alternative communication among all struggles and resistances that

> will search to weave the channels (*tejer los canales*) so that words may travel all the roads (*camine todos los caminos)* that resist . . . [and] will be the medium by which distinct resistances communicate with one another. (Marcos 2004b, 645)

In 1997 the *Second Encuentro* was held in southern Spain, drawing over three thousand activists from over fifty countries. It was here that the plans for the creation of an offshoot group called *Peoples Global Action* (PGA) originated in order to "move beyond debate and exchange and propose action campaigns against neoliberalism, worldwide" (De Marcellus 2001). Beginning in 1998, PGA organized a series of direct actions and interventions on various global elite summits (G7, WTO, etc.) that are now identified as the Anti-

Globalization Movement. Over the years the multiplication of similar forums on global resistance (World Social Forum [2001–present], Regional Social Forums, etc.) have all emphasized the core proposals made at the *First Encuentro* (Horizontal [non-hierarchical] organization and global alternative communications without centralization) *(*Khasnabish 2008, 238).

The fact that Zapatismo has profoundly influenced the last fifteen years of the largest actions and gatherings in the world against neoliberalism is by now well-known and recounted in several important books on the history of the anti-globalization movement Notes from Nowhere 2003; Khasnabish 2008; Curran 2006; Engler 2007). But it is precisely because its historical influence is so well-known that its conceptual determination remains so obscure. Thus, beyond empirical descriptions of this history, I propose to isolate and extract two practical concepts that emerge from the Zapatista experiment that allow us both to understand the larger theory of political affinity in the present revolutionary sequence as well as to develop and further its practices elsewhere. These two practices are the *Encuentro* (Encounter) and the *Puente* (Bridge).

The *Encuentro* is not just a historical phenomena or empirical gathering of various marginalized peoples against neoliberalism that takes place around the world; it is a political strategy of heterogeneous common decent and transversality. It was created as an alternative to the exclusionary affinity of citizenship based on the false universality of nations and borders, and to the pure affirmation of universal singularity based on shared difference alone. It also invented a new kind of revolutionary solidarity historical different from others based on unequal power relations. An *Encuentro*, according to the *2nd Declaration*, is a non-hierarchical and non-centralized space where different groups share their conflicts and

agreements without the *a priori* conditions of territorial, state, or economic belonging.[8] It is a space where multiple singular-universal conditions (see section II) co-exist as irreducible struggles in their own right and autonomy. The *Encuentro* itself is thus not a decision-making body, it is not like the revolutionary body politic discussed in chapter IV (based on participatory and rotational democracy, etc.). According to the *2nd Declaration*, the *Encuentro* is a medium (*el medio*) in which distinct resistances are in the middle of something undivided, together.

But without any decision-making or criteria for inclusion/exclusion, what is the meaning of the *Encuentro*? What are they in the middle of together? According to the *2nd Declaration*, the *Encuentro* is not an entirely neutral medium, but neither is it a new political condition to which all attending political conditions must now give themselves over. The *Encuentro* "is not a new organization, theorization of Utopia, global program for world revolution, scheme, or enumeration of international orders . . . that assures all of us a position, a task, and a title" (2004b, 645), as the Zapatistas say. Rather, the *Encuentro* is "for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism."

We should take care to distinguish the name of the *Encuentro*, as the transversal operation holding together many singular universal political conditions, from both political ideology (representational or programmatic content) and from a new revolutionary body politic of all revolutionary body politics (composed of a new and larger condition, set of elements, and agencies). Rather the name, "For Humanity and Against Neoliberalism," is a generic name or mutable referent for the descent common to two or more heterogeneous political conditions like a particular group solidarity between Bedouin families. By formulating Humanity and Neoliberalism in the most generic way possible, the *Encuentro* is

---

[8] The non-exclusionary and egalitarian presupposition of the *Encuentro* immediately distinguishes it from racist, or discriminatory organizations with perhaps similar structures but who discriminate *a priori* based on territorial race, nation, gender, sex, etc.

able to achieve a maximum of inclusion and mutual support with a minimum of representation and reference.

Just as Deleuze and Guattari argue, following Laroche, that the Greek root *nem*, from which the word nomadism is derived, originally implied a mode of distribution or *agencement* in an unlimited or non-divided space, so the Zapatistas have created the practice of the *Encuentro* that equally distributes heterogeneous political events (women, indigenous, teachers, environmental activists, people of all races, etc.) without dividing them hierarchically or based on the exclusionary criteria invented by the State, the Party, or the Vanguard. Perhaps another way of describing the unlimited nomadic space of the mountains, planes, or forest that are without border or division is "a world in which many worlds fit": a locality that has become unlimited alongside others. Similarly, in Kahldun's theory of solidarity, Bedouin nomad "families" express a common descent undivided by Genealogy or the State and distributed in a shared medium (*l'esprit de corps*) where several heterogeneous groups share the group solidarity of a "collective body" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 366). In sum, the *Encuentro* is the name for the generic transversal relationship between multiple singular universal political conditions without division, hierarchy, or decision-making capacity. It is an open and non-divided nomadic space, but one that is clearly and unambiguousy "Against Neoliberalism and for Humanity."

However, just as it was impossible to understand the concept of solidarity in Deleuze and Guattari without the concept of "exoconsistency" (that bridged the concrete machines between different abstract machines), so it is impossible to understand the concept of solidarity in Zapatismo without also understanding the concept of the *Puentes* or Bridges that connect the concrete actions and consequences of different political events.

Accordingly, the *2nd Declaration* proposes a second dimension of solidarity to the first non-hierarchical, non-decision making, collective space of the *Encuentro*: "a network of

woven channels [or bridges] so that words [and actions] may travel all the roads that resist." Firstly, the concept of the network (*red*) discussed in the *2nd Declaration* should be distinguished topologically as an "all channel network" (where everyone can connect horizontally with everyone else in a non-linear series: like a rhizome) in contrast to "a chain network" (where top-to-bottom communication is mediated hierarchically: like a tree) as well as a "star or hub network" (where actors are tied to a single central, but non-hierarchical, actor and must go through that node to communicate with others: like a tuber) (Ronfeldt 1998, 7). Secondly, while the *Encuentro* proposes a inclusive network or mutual encounter between "particular struggles and resistances" (singular-universal conditions), this does not guarantee that such an encounter will produce any concrete connections or coordinated actions between them. Thus, the second dimension of the *Encuentro* proposed by the Zapatistas is the creation of an alternative media network for the coordination (weaving) of concrete words and actions around the world. As Ronfeldt et al. highlight:

> More than ever before, conflicts are about "knowledge" — about who knows (or can be kept from knowing) what, when, where, and why. Conflicts will revolve less around the use of raw power than of "soft power," as applied through "information operations" and "perception management" that is, media-oriented measures that aim to attract rather than coerce and that affect how secure a society, a military, or other actor feels about its knowledge of itself and its adversaries. Psychosocial disruption may become more important than physical destruction. . . Mexico's Zapatista movement exemplifies [this] new approach to social conflict that we call *social netwar*. (Ronfeldt 1998, 7)

Accordingly, Marcos says, this media network is "not about communication, but of building something" (Marcos 2001a). Media not only produce knowledge but also produce effects that transform reality. Thus, it may be "the word which is the bridge to cross to the other" (Marcos 1998, 8), but in "extend[ing] the bridges that joined those who were the same, [it makes] them different" (Marcos 2004b, 437). The concept of the bridge, deployed often in Zapatista writings, is accordingly not a common link between two different things that brings them into a unity; it is a differentiator between two common things that keeps

them apart *and* holds them together *as differentiated*. It is in this sense that the Zapatistas say that their "goal [has been] to be a bridge on which the many rebellions in the world can walk back and forth" (Marcos and the EZLN. 2008): a bridge that has connected and differentiated the mutual transformation of everyone by everyone else, communiqué by communiqué and direct action by direct action. The "coming and going" of world rebellions across this bridge is what gives Zapatista solidarity its nomadic, ambulant, and mutualistic features. But at the global level solidarity cannot be realized as a generic encounter against neoliberalism; it has to take on specific coordinated words, slogans, and actions, i.e., one or more bridges that connect two or more singular struggles together. The more concrete bridges or connections made through this alternative media network the stronger and larger the network. Because the network is nothing more than the connections or bridges that effectuate it, there is no Party, State, or Bureaucracy at the head; it is acephalic. Accordingly, it lays the largest possible conditions for a federated world-wide decision-making process.[9]

Just as different lines of descent for Khaldun's Bedoudin nomads are modified and more or less merged through concrete "points of relay" or group solidarity (without essential determination by Family or State), so the Zapatistas have inspired a global solidarity of *Encuentros* that modify and more or less merge heterogeneous struggles against neoliberalism through a concrete media and action network (without hierarchy, centralization, Territory, State, or Party). And just as Deleuze and Guattari say that a plane of consistency has an endoconsistency that holds its concrete machines together internally and an exoconsistency that connects it to other "nomadic traits" or "points of relay" on other planes of consistency outside itself, so the Zapatistas define their political plane of consistency by its participatory internal institutions (the *JBG*) as well as by its external bridges to other concrete struggles elsewhere: *Puentes de Solidaridad*. Thus revolutionary

[9] The problem of a world-wide decision making process will be expanded upon in chapter VI.

events "are defined only by their mutual solidarity" and not independently of it (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 45). Opposed to static and one-way models of solidarity based on State and Party bodies, the Zapatistas propose a mutual collective-body defined by nomadic solidarity: walking, encountering, and bridging.[10]

Conclusion

> From the global gatherings to the summit protests, the polymorphous spirit of Zapatismo was in the air.
> (Maccani 2006, 109)

At the end of the previous chapter we were confronted with the problem of how revolutionary transformations, having become consistently established in participatory body politics, could connect with other such institutions to form a global alternative to state-capitalism. If there is no longer a central axis of struggle, but a multiplicity of struggles each with its own conditions, elements, and agencies, how can they be unified or organized into a global struggle without deploying the traditional forms of State, Party, and Representation? This chapter's response to this problem was threefold.

Firstly, I argued that the present model of liberal citizenship based on territorial nation-states is unable to provide a theory of universal emancipation/solidarity because of (1) the increasing proliferation of non- and extra-national organizations that now replace many of the benefits offered by citizenship; (2) the increasing amount of criminalized migrants that are denied citizenship; and (3) the increasing frequency (since WWI) in which nation-states have suspended the constitutional rights of citizens in modern democracies. Additionally, territorial nation-states are necessarily exclusionary insofar as they are limited by a particular geography, identity, and sovereign law. Conversely, I argued that the theory of universal singularity (that what everyone has universally in common is difference/singularity

[10] "*Preguntando caminamos*," "Asking, we walk."

in-itself) is only able to provide an aporetic definition of political affinity without a theory of how such singularities would be able to assemble into specific political distributions.

Secondly, I argued that Deleuze and Guattari (following Laroche and Khaldun) provide a conceptual alternative to these models in their theory of nomadic solidarity based on (1) non-divided distribution and (2) the federated relay between points. Given the four characteristics of a revolutionary body politic as defined in chapter IV (local and determinate with a proper name, absolute and infinite in its consequences, and open to modification by anyone without pre-defined criteria), Deleuze and Guattari define a "collective political body" of solidarity as the piece-by-piece infinite connection (bridging) of one or more shared concrete actions between two or more heterogeneous political conditions, never merging but becoming more or less transversally identical.

Finally, I argued that the Zapatista *Encuentros* (in combination with the *JBGs*) offer an alternative to both citizenship and difference-based affinities as well as unequal forms of solidarity. I argued that just as Deleuze and Guattari's concept of nomadic solidarity was based on non-divided distribution and federated relay, so the Zapatistas' practice of mutual global solidarity (*Encuentro)* is based on inclusive horizontalism and networked bridges of coordinated action. While the first provides the conditions for a generic network of mutually supported resistance against Neoliberalism ("One no, many yeses") the second weaves together (federates) these multiple relays and channels into concrete action-decisions. The Zapatista conceptual practice of the *Encuentro* aims to create a nation without nationality, a people without territory: "a world in which many worlds fit."

But while this chapter has been able to conceptualize the revolutionary political solidarity that characterizes the present revolutionary sequence by drawing on the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas, it also confronts a final tension between the two dimensions internal to the functioning of mutual global solidarity: the need for an open

(non-decision-making) horizontalism and the need for a coordinated network of decision-oriented action. While it may be possible for heterogenous participatory political bodies to govern themselves, to share their methods and struggles at global *Encuentros*, and even to coordinate global actions through alternative media, this does not entirely resolve the problem of *how* decisions are to be made, implemented, and modified at the global level without creating a global State, Party, or Representation. How is it that the largest organized gathering of anti-neoliberal forces in the world, like the World Social Forum, can begin to make and enforce a meaningful transition away from global capitalism? Although the question of global transition and decision-making is not answered in this chapter (or in practice by the Zapatistas or the World Social Forum), the theory of solidarity developed here does lay a fecund groundwork for answering it. In the next and concluding chapter I end with a reconstruction and reflection upon the relative accomplishments of each chapter, the success of the argument of the dissertation as a whole, and outline areas for further investigation.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Introduction

We are witnessing today, the return of a new theory and practice of revolution. In its early stages of development and far from homogenous in character, we are witnessing not only the growing belief that "another world is possible" beyond capitalism, but that it "must be made" in such a way that the mistakes of previous revolutionary efforts are not repeated: the capture of the state, the representation of the party, or the privileged knowledge of the vanguard. Philosophically, I have argued we can see this new shift in Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of historical topology, constructive deterritorialization, political consistency, and nomadic solidarity. Politically, I have argued we can see this alternative at work in the Zapatista's use of a multi-centered diagnostic of suffering; in their creation of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno*; in their leading by obeying, and their practice of mutual global solidarity.

But Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas are neither models for how revolutions should proceed nor representations of how they are actually proceeding. Rather, what I have argued in this dissertation is that Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas have created several concepts and practices that are both indicative of, and useful for, the further creation of a new theory and practice of revolution that is no longer be subordinated to the processes of political representation or their mere critique by a speculative Leftism based on difference and potentiality. I have followed a conditional imperative. If one wants to struggle, here are some tactics to do so. Accordingly, I have proposed and defended the use of four theoretical practices extracted and reassembled from the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas: (1) a diagnostic theory of history, (2) a prefigurative theory of political transformation, (3) a participatory theory of revolutionary institutions, and (4) a theory of political affinity based on mutual global solidarity. Insofar as these theoretical practices have clarified and further

developed the actual, and not merely possible, existence of a non-representational revolutionary process, this dissertation has succeeded in its aims.

Method and Interpretation

These four theoretical practices were created through a methodology of extraction and re-assembly. Organized around the revolutionary problematics of history, transformation, the body politic, and affinity, each of the four central chapters of this dissertation developed selected concepts and practices from Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas and composed them into a new practical-theoretical assemblage that responded to the problematic at hand. In chapter II, I took Deleuze and Guattari's historical topology based on the immanent processes of coding, overcoding, and axiomatization and the Zapatistas intersectional diagnostic deployed during *La Otra Campagna* and argued that we can extract and reassemble from these what I call a multi-centered political diagnostic useful for determining the dangers and potentials for historical and revolutionary action. In chapter III, I showed how a prefigurative theory of political transformation, taking place in the future anterior, could be extracted from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of deterritorialization and the Zapatista's *Juntas de Buen Gobierno*. In chapter IV, I showed how a participatory theory of revolutionary institutions could be extracted from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of consistency and the Zapatista's practice of direct democracy used in the Juntas. Finally, in chapter V I showed how a political theory of belonging based on mutual global solidarity could be extracted from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of nomadism and the Zapatista's creation of Intercontinental *Encuentros*. The aim of this extraction and reassembly was not to show how theory is derived from practice or practice from theory, but to put the two into a mutually illuminating relationship that

highlights their heterogeneity and puts them both to use in responding to the problems of revolutionary praxis. Where one may have been a bit clumsy, hit a wall, or left one with questions, the other breaks though and pushes forward. In this dissertation I have tried to use theory and praxis as system of relays around the four tactical problems of revolutionary praxis.

The creation of these theoretical practices was also accomplished through an interpretive intervention in the context of the scholarly literature on Deleuze and Guattari and the Zapatistas. In both cases I have made a similar intervention: to reject interpreting their work as either trying to merely tweak or fortify processes of political representation (state, party, etc.) or as merely expressing the potentiality of another a post-representational politics. Rather, I have read Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas as political constructivists, that is, I have read them as making real contributions to the creation of a new collective political body. In the case of Deleuze and Guattari, I locate this constructivst turn in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?* and argue that we can extract from these works a positive and contemporary vision of revolutionary theory. In particular, the concept of political consistency I take from *What is Philosophy?* in chapter IV relies on an extension of the definition they give to philosophy (as a constructivism) to the field of politics. This is an extension left undeveloped in *What is Philosophy?* and only mentioned once in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Thematically and conceptually I have shown that such an extension is not textually unsupported and can in fact be mutually illuminating. The real motivation for this intervention, however, is that without this constructive focus Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy risks a variety of dangers articulated well by their critics: political ambivalence, virtual hierarchy, subjective paralysis, etc.

I chose to read the Zapatistas in a similar way that focused on their later (2003–present) writings and activities in order to highlight a similarly constructive turn. In 1994, the

Zapatistas declared war against the Mexican government. This failed. In 1996–98, the Zapatistas then attempted to gain formal recognition of their indigenous autonomy from the Mexican government. This also failed. In 2003 the Zapatistas took a step back to listen carefully to the Mexican people, to critique and improve Zapatista political processes (the place of women and the EZLN "military"), and to began a long term project of sustaining the autonomous Zapatista territories and their relations with other organizations around the world. This was their constructive turn. Beyond the "failure" or "success" of the Zapatista Uprising to capture the state or win rights from it, it is important to analyze what new revolutionary tactics developed after the traditional ones had failed: the rejection of the vanguard, the prefigurative creation of the autonomous communes, the global network of mutual aid, etc. It is from these practices that I extract the four conceptual indicators of a new revolutionary sequence.

Difficulties and Implications

One of the difficulties of this methodology of extraction and reassembly was to articulate the heterogeneity between Deleuze and Guattari's concepts and the Zapatista's practices without granting a privilege or explanatory power of one over the other. Instead of extracting a set of concepts and showing their implications for the history of political philosophy or extracting a set of practices and showing their implications for the history of social movements, I have extracted four theoretical practices and shown their implication for four important problematics in revolutionary praxis. My hope is that these assemblages will form further relays in the future development of these problematics. Accordingly, the theoretical practices I developed in each of the chapters acts more like a circulating reference point or strange attractor for heterogenous concepts and practices than it does like a representation of theory exemplified by practice. Each chapter has tried to maintain a real

difference between theory and practice without synthesizing the two. And it is precisely this difference that leaves open further mutations in the theoretical practices I have put forward. If the reader picks up on this relay style of assembly, it is entirely intentional.

The task of this dissertation was to elaborate responses to four questions confronting the current, albeit young, revolutionary sequence: (1) What tools does it offer us to understand the current historical conjuncture of power such that political change is desirable? (2) How can this current conjuncture of power be transformed? (3) What kinds of new social bodies will be put in the place of or along side the old ones? (4) Who can belong to or participate in this transformative social body? What I have shown by drawing on Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas is that we can locate a novel and consistent set of answers to these questions in the present sequence. The conclusion I have aimed to draw from this effort is that we should reject the prevailing notion that "there is no alternative to global capitalism and representational politics," and that "another world is merely possible." My conclusion is that another world is already underway (theoretically and practically) within and alongside the old. The task now is to develop and defend it.

The larger implication of this conclusion is that contemporary political philosophy interested in understanding the current conjuncture should offer us more than the mere conceptual conclusion that another politics is possible. Additionally, it should offer us a philosophical interrogation of actually existing theoretical practices currently underway: what dangers they face, what kinds of changes they have made, what kinds of alternatives they propose, and what the larger connections they have created. The aim of these efforts, what Foucault called "a history of the present," is to critically develop the theories and practices that are already in action here and now and force philosophy to become adequate with contemporary political struggle. This dissertation has shown that such an interrogation is not only possible but productive in resolving some of the basic questions often posed to post-

structuralist political philosophers and contemporary revolutionaries. If not capitalism, then what else is there? This question deserves more than the affirmation that "another world is possible." We must be able to say that "another world is actually underway" beneath and along side the old.

The future of such a research agenda will require not only an effort on the part of philosophers to create concepts that mobilize the insights of political struggle but also an effort by militants themselves to deploy the insights of political philosophy. If the success of this dissertation and research program is based on its usefulness for those engaged in struggle on both fronts, then the above effort is absolutely necessary.

In the course of this dissertation it may have appeared that there was an order or sequence to the concepts presented: first the diagnostic of power, then the intervention and transformation of this power, afterward its establishment in a body politic, and finally its global or universal connection. But this is only the logical order presented in this dissertation, not the existential coexistence in which these activities occur. Diagnosis, prefiguration, participation, and solidarity often occur at the same time and to different degrees in a revolutionary praxis. Even if they are not directly active in a political situation they must be actively warded off or avoided as such.

But due to the focus of this dissertation on the problematics of revolution the reader may be wondering if there is any room for state politics at all in new theory and practice of revolution. Has this dissertation rejected wholesale the strengths and place of state politics within revolutionary struggles themselves? Absolutely not. Although I deal with this problem most directly in chapter II, as the second kind of political transformation, what Deleuze and Guattari call, "relative positive deterritorialization," it is true that many questions remain. Should revolutionary politics always and in all cases reject relative, partial, or reformist transformations internal to the processes of representation (territory, state, and

capital)? Might even the smallest reforms, protests, and desires play the role of catalysts in a larger process? Deterritorializations are not necessarily good or bad; the question of revolution, however, is to what degree these crises, lines of light, etc., begin to take on an alternative and prefigurative consistency beyond the state. Territory, state, and capitalist processes can and do unleash potentials that should not be dismissed, but they also need to take on a new consistency. Hugo Chavez is currently trying to create a revolution in Venezuela by deterritorializing the state from the top down, while simultaneously creating a consistency of its fragments from the bottom up. In Argentina unemployed workers have appropriated abandoned factories and created worker self-management. These are not revolutions, but they are important processes of deterritorialization that may contribute to one. As was also argued in chapter II, there is no essentially privileged site of power or single place to begin a revolution. Thus what is required is a diversity of tactics on a diversity of fronts as the same time.

Directions for Future Research

Among the four theoretical practices proposed in this dissertation, two are particularly fecund and require further development. The first is the practical concept of a participatory body politic proposed in chapter IV. A participatory body politic is composed of three basic components: (1) the *conditions* under which it emerges and determines who counts as part of its body politic, (2) the distribution of concrete *elements* that express and constitute its body, and (3) the kinds of *subjects* who connect and transform these conditions and elements. What kind of social body are Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas proposing to put in place of representational political processes? They propose the creation of a new revolutionary body politic based on the mutual transformation of these three components.

What needs to be developed further in this theoretical practice are the different dimensions under which this kind of reciprocal determination takes place. There are, for example, participatory relations, gender relations, economic relations, ecological relations, etc. that need further elaboration appropriate to each domain. Chapter IV, however, was only able to develop this practical concept in relation to the creation of specifically political body. Further research into the concept of participation as an alternative to political representation and mere potentiality would thus require an analysis into the conditions, elements, and agencies specific to these domains. For instance, the existence of a third person form of political agency, according to Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas is not merely a human feature. This raises the question of what role ecological entities play in a directly democratic revolutionary institution? For instance, how can ecological entities be included in political decision-making?

The second major theoretical practice that requires further development in this dissertation is the concept of solidarity. Chapter IV argued that a post-representational revolutionary body politic is not only possible but theoretically and practically already underway. Chapter V argued that revolutionary body politics can share each others struggles as their own and coordinate anti-capitalist actions on the global scale. However, this does not entirely answer the question of how decisions are to be made, implemented, and modified at the global level among heterogeneous groups without creating a global State, Party, or process of representation. How is it that the largest organized gathering of anti-neoliberal forces in the world, like the World Social Forum, can begin to make and enforce a meaningful transition away from global capitalism? Chapter V has laid the philosophical and political foundations for something like this to emerge, but it has not entirely been able to anticipate the next step. Further research into the contemporary problematics of a post-representational and anti-capitalist global alternative needs to clarify and interrogate this

problematic as it is currently happening at the World Social Forum. What are the theories, practices, and risks that are being proposed to turn this horizontal network into a federated decision making body?

IV. Concluding Overview

Guided by the methodology of relayed assemblage and the interpretive intervention of constructivism, this dissertation has drawn on the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas in order to extract four theoretical practices helpful for aiding and understanding the present, albeit young, revolutionary sequence. In particular, it proposed four specific practical-theoretical concepts or "tactical pointers for the conditional imperative of political struggle," as Foucault would say. Accordingly, the chapters of this dissertation proposed and defended each of these theoretical practices in turn. Each chapter was composed of three major subsections. The first section critically distinguished the proposed theoretical practice from two others: political representation and political potentiality without construction. The second section then drew on at least one major concept from Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy to build this theoretical practice. Finally, the third section drew on at least one major political practice in Zapatismo to assemble this theoretical practice.

Chapter II argued that the return to revolution located in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas can be characterized by a diagnostic theory of history motivated by the relative rejection of all previous forms of historical representation (Patriarchy, Racism, Statism, Capitalism, Vanguardism, etc.) and a concern for their immanent diagnosis. Although this claim clearly rejects the representational readings of Deleuze, Guattari, and Zapatismo, it is obviously quite similar to the philosophy of difference described in chapter I. As such, it may seem relatively uncontroversial. But, my argument included three crucial and under-emphasized dimensions of this rejection. Firstly, that it is a *relative* rejection, meaning that

political representation always plays a more or less active role in political life even if only in the mode of "being warded off" by more participatory practices. That is, even in its relative absence, it still exerts force as an immanent historical potential of any political practice. Secondly, I argued that political representation is not an homogenous philosophical category, since there are several distinctly different types of representation. These differences are found not only in terms of content, such as race, class, gender, economics, and so on, but also in formal structure, such as coding, overcoding, and axiomatization. Thirdly, I argued that these types of relative representation always intersect and coexist with each other to different degrees in every political situation. Against the *necessary* historical emergence of these different types of political representation, but also against their *merely contingent and coexistent* emergence, I argued instead, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's Historical Topology and what the Zapatistas call their Diagnostic of Suffering, that their return to revolution is characterized by a mobilization of these types of representation as an immanent political diagnostic of the situation to be transformed. But how then can one escape this matrix of political power and representation?

In chapter III I argued that this return to revolution found in the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas is also characterized by a prefigurative theory of political transformation: the aim of constructing a new present within and alongside the old. Opposed to achieving revolutionary transformation by an evolutionary process of transition, progress, and reform in representation, or achieving it simply through a spontaneous rupture with the present, I argued that prefigurative political transformations take place in the future anterior. I was not arguing that this kind of revolutionary struggle theorized only takes place in the future anterior. I argued instead, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's theory of deterritorialization and the Zapatista's theory of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno,* that the future anterior is only one of four types of political transformation (Relative Negative, Relative

Positive, Absolute Negative, and Absolute Positive). Prefigurative revolutions are thus those types of transformation that, realizing each type of political transformation to some degree, are able to sustain the maximal creation of a new present as the expression of the past and future of their situation and connect it up to other struggles happening elsewhere. This type of political revolution is thus neither tied entirely to the determinations of its past (with its pre-given possibilities) nor to the potentialities of its future always yet-to-come. Rather, it is constructive of a new present that transforms both the past and the future. But how then are these revolutionary transformations sustained beyond their relative autonomy and prefiguration?

In chapter IV I thus argued that we can locate in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas a participatory theory of a revolutionary body politic that does not simply establish new conditions for political life based on a "more just" sphere of political action whose foundational principles are still held independently from the constituted sphere where such principles are deployed. Nor does a participatory body politic merely aim to establish anti-institutions, whose sole purpose is to undermine all forms of representation and await the possibility that something new, and hopefully better, may emerge. Rather, a participatory and revolutionary body politic is built and sustained through an expressive process whose founding conditions are constantly undergoing a high degree of direct and immanent transformation by the various practices and people who are effected, to varying degrees, by its deployment. In particular, I argued in this chapter that this participatory "feedback loop" can be located in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Consistency, found in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *What is Philosophy?* and in the Zapatista's political practice of Rule by Obeying (*Mandar Obedeciendo*). I argued that, in order to understand the structure and function of this consistency and of ruling by obeying in revolutionary body politics, we need to understand how their conditions, elements, and agencies work differently than in representational and

anti-representational political bodies. I argued this by drawing on three concepts in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy that correspond to the conditions, elements, and agencies of consistent revolutionary institutions: the abstract machine, the concrete assemblage, and the machinic persona. Just as these three concepts immanently transform one another in a relationship of "order without hierarchy," according to Deleuze and Guattari, so does ruling by obeying provide the egalitarian frame-work for the revolutionary institutions of the Zapatistas (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 90). But as of yet the problem of how these kinds of revolutionary institutions can connect up with each other remains unaddressed by this theory of participation.

Thus, chapter V drew on all the previous chapters in order to argue that we can locate in Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas a theory of revolutionary political affinity based on mutual global solidarity. Revolutionary political affinity, I argued, is not simply a matter of integrating marginalized demands back into the dominant territorial-nation-state apparatus based on modifying specific criteria for citizenship or aiding those who need help. Nor is it a matter of recognizing the universal singularity of all beings to become other than they are. Rather, revolutionary political affinity is a matter of solidarity: when revolutionary institutions, namely, those who remain un-represented or excluded from dominant forms of political affinity, find in each other, one by one, the universal transmitability and mutual aid of each other's singular struggles. Singular-universal solidarity is thus not a matter of recognition, charity, or even radical difference, but rather a mutually federated difference or "contingent holism" of heterogenous singular-universal events in world-wide struggle. The task of this chapter was thus to avoid both of these dangers and propose a theory of political solidarity instead, drawn from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Nomadism and the Zapatistas' global practice of *Encuentros Intercontinentales*. In particular, I argued first against the concepts of citizenship and difference as desirable models of political belonging

insofar as the former is structurally exclusionary and the later is unable to theorize any concrete relations between multiple coexistent conditions. Secondly, I argued that, opposed to these two dangers, revolutionary solidarity should be defined instead by the federated connection between multiple singular-universal conditions without totality.

Finally, in this chapter I have concluded with a reconstruction and reflection upon the relative accomplishments of each chapter and the argument of the dissertation as a whole. In particular, I addressed the problem left remaining at the end of the dissertation: how can mutual global solidarity take on a decision-making power such that the world's organized struggles against neoliberalism can form an acting counter-power without private property, necessary political exclusion, economic exploitation, or a centralization of this counter-power itself? While Deleuze, Guattari, and the Zapatistas provide excellent resources for constructing a new political philosophy of revolution, they are only able to lay the ground work to deal with this problem that has also yet to be resolved in the present revolutionary sequence at the level of the World Social Forum. This is a significant barrier to a real transition away from global capitalism and requires a further philosophical investigation into the currently emerging forms of political and philosophical experimentation that contribute to this problem's resolution.

REFERENCES CITED

Agamben, Giorgio. 1993. *The coming community*. Translated by Michael Hardt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1996. "Unrepresentable Citizenship." *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*. Edited by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2005. *State of Exception*. Translated by Kevin Atell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ali, Tariq, Claudia Jardim, and Jonah Gindin. 2004. "Naeem—Tariq Ali on anti-neoliberalism in Latin America". *Green Left Weekly*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.16beavergroup.org/mtarchive/archives/001208print.html

Alliez, Eric. 2004. *The signature of the world, or, What is Deleuze and Guattari philosophy?* Translated by Eliot Ross Albert and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum.

———. 2006. "Anti-Oedipus—Thirty Years On (Between Art and Politics)." Translated by Alberto Toscano. In *Deleuze and the social,* edited by Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen, 151–68. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Althusser, Louis. 1994. *Sur la philosophie*. Paris: Gallimard.

Arendt, Hannah. 1966, 1951. *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Badiou, Alain and François Balmès. 1976. *De l'idéologie*. Paris: F. Maspero.

———. 1985. *Peut-on penser la politique?* Paris: Seuil.

———. 2000. *Deleuze: the clamor of being*. Translated by Louise Burchill. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2004. *Theoretical writings*. Edited and translated by Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum.

———. 2005a. *Metapolitics*. London: Verso.

———. 2005b. *Being and event*. Translated by Oliver Feltham. London: Continuum.

———. 2008a. "'We Need a Popular Discipline': Contemporary Politics and the Crisis of the Negative." Interview by Filippo Del Lucchese and Jason Smith. *Critical Inquiry* 34.

———. 2008b. *The meaning of Sarkozy*. Translated by David Fernbach. London: Verso.

———. 2009. *Logics of worlds: being and event, 2*. Translated by Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum.

———. 2010a. *The communist hypothesis*. Translated by David Macey and Steve Corcoran. London: Verso.

———. 2010b. *La relation énigmatique entre philosophie et politique*. Meaux: Germina.

Balibar, Etienne. 2006. *Strangers as enemies: further reflections on the aporias of transnational citizenship*. [s.l.]: MCRI Globalization and Autonomy.

Bell, Jeffrey A. and Claire Colebrook, eds. 2009. *Deleuze and history*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bensaïd, Daniel. 2004. "Alain Badiou and the Miracle of the Event", In *Think Again: Alain Badiou and the Future of Philosophy*, edited by Peter Hallward. London: Continuum.

Bonta, Mark, and John Protevi, ed. 2004. *Deleuze and geophilosophy: a guide and glossary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Boron, Atilio. 1995. *State, capitalism, and democracy in Latin America*. Boulder: Rienner.

———. 2003. "Poder, contra-poder y antipoder. Notas sobre un extravío teórico político en el pensamiento crítico contemporáneo". *Revista Chiapas* (15): 143–82.

Bosteels, Bruno. 1998. "From Text to Territory: Félix Guattari's Cartographies of the Unconscious". In *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, edited by Eleanor Kaufman and Jon Heller Kevin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 150.

———. 2004. "Logics of Antagonism: In the Margins of Alain Badiou's 'The Flux and the Party.'" *Polygraph: An International Journal of Culture & Politics*. 15/16: 95.

———. 2005a. "Post-Maoism: Badiou and Politics". *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*. 13 (3): 575–634.

———. 2005b. "The Speculative Left". *South Atlantic Quarterly*. 104 (4): 751–67.

Boundas, Constantin V., ed. 2009. *Gilles Deleuze: the intensive reduction*. London: Continuum.

Bryant, Levi R. 2008. *Difference and givenness: Deleuze's transcendental empiricism and the ontology of immanence*. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Buber, Martin. 1958. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Scribner.

Buchanan, Ian and Nicholas Thoburn, ed. 2008. *Deleuze and politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Burbach, Roger. 1994. "Roots of the Postmodern Rebellion in Chiapas." *New Left Review* 205 May/ June: 113–24.

———. 1996. "For a Zapatista Style Postmodernist Perspective." *Monthly Review* 47 Mar: 34–41.

Burchill, Louise. 2007. "The Topology of Deleuze's Spatium". *Philosophy Today.* 51 (5): 154–60.

Carrigan, Ana. 1995. "Chiapas: The First Post-Modern Revolution". *The Fletcher Forum* 19 (1): 87.

Casarino, Cesare and Antonio Negri. 2004. "It's a Powerful Life: A Conversation on Contemporary Philosophy". *Cultural Critique.* (57): 151–83.

Chatterton, Paul. 2007. "The Zapatista Caracoles and Good Governments: The Long Walk to Autonomy". *State of Nature* (Spring). Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.stateofnature.org/theZapatistaCaracoles.html.

Curran, Giorel. 2006. *21st century dissent: anarchism, anti-globalization and environmentalism.* Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Landa, Manuel. 2009. *A new philosophy of society: assemblage theory and social complexity.* London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1972. *Seminar Cours Vincennes 07/03/1972.* Accessed March 3. http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=160&groupe=Anti%20Oedipe%20et%20Mille%20Plateaux&langue=1.

———. 1989. *Cinema 2: the time image.* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1990. *The logic of sense.* Edited by Constantin V. Boundas. Translated by Mark Lester and Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1994. *Difference and repetition.* Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1995. *Negotiations, 1972–1990.* Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 2004. *Desert islands and other texts, 1953–1974.* Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

———. 2006. *Two regimes of madness: texts and interviews 1975–1995.* Edited by and David Lapoujade. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia.* Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1987. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia.* Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1994. *What is philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. 1987. *Dialogues*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 2001. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Translated Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. New York: Routledge.

Dewey, John. 1906. "Beliefs and Realities". *The Philosophical Review*. 15 (2): 113–29.

Egyed, Bela. 2006. "Counter-actualisation and the method of intuition". In *Deleuze and philosophy* edited by Boundas, Constantin V., 74–84. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Engler, Mark. 2007. "The Anti-Globalization Movement Defined". *The Encyclopedia of Activism and Social Justice.* Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.stwr.org/the-un-people-politics/the-anti-globalization-movement- defined.html

Esteva, Gustavo. 2001. "The traditions of people of reason and the reasons of people of tradition: A report on the Second Intercontinental Encuentro". In *Auroras of the Zapatistas: Local and global struggles of the Fourth World War*, edited by Midnight Notes, 55–63. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

EZLN. 1994. "Women's Revolutionary Law". In *Zapatistas!: documents of the new Mexican revolution (December 31, 1993–June 12, 1994)*. New York: Autonomedia.

———. 2005. *Sixth Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle*. Translated by irlandes. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/auto/selva6.html

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Language, counter-memory, practice: selected essays and interviews*. Edited by Donald F. Bouchard. Translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon Ithaca. N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

———. 1980. *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.

———. 1984. "What is Enlightenment?" In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 32–50. New York: Pantheon Books.

———. 2007. *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*. Edited by Michel Senellart, François Ewald, and Alessandro Fontana. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2008. *The birth of biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*. Translated by Michel Senellart. Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser, Nancy. 1989. *Unruly practices: power, discourse, and gender in contemporary social theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fuentes, Federico. 2007. "Subcomandante Marcos: Capitalism's 'new war of conquest'". *Green Left* 705. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/37314.

Golden, Tim. 1994. "Rebels Determined 'to Build Socialism' in Mexico". *New York Times* 4 Jan. late ed.: A3.

Golden, Tim. 2001. "Revolution Rocks: Thoughts of Mexico's first postmodern guerrilla commander." *New York Times Review of Books*. April 8. Last Accessed March 3, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/books/01/04/08/reviews/010408.08goldent.html

Goodchild, Philip. 1996. *Deleuze and Guattari: an introduction to the politics of desire*. London: SAGE.

David Graeber, 2002. "New Anarchists," *New left Review* 13, January/February.

Grubacic, Andrej and David Graeber. 2004. "Anarchism, or The Revolutionary Movement of the 21th Century." *Z-Magazine*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.zcommunications.org.

Guattari, Félix. 1984. *Molecular revolution: psychiatry and politics*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.

———. 1996. *Chaosophy: soft subversions*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer. New York, N.Y.: Semiotext(e).

———. 2008. *Molecular revolution in Brazil*. Edited by and Suely Rolnik. Translated by Karel Clapshow and Brian Holmes. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Hallward, Peter. 2003. *Badiou: A Subject to Truth*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2006. *Out of this world: Deleuze and the philosophy of creation*. London: Verso.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

———. 2005. *Multitude: war and democracy in the age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Books.

———. 2009. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David. 2010. "Organizing for the Anti-Capitalist Transition." Talk given at the *World Social Forum 2010 Porto Alegre*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://davidharvey.org/2009/12/organizing-for-the-anti-capitalist-transition/.

Holland, Eugene. 1991. "Deterritorializing 'Deterritorialization': From the 'Anti-Oedipus' to 'A Thousand Plateaus'" *SubStance*. Vol. 20, No. 3, Issue 66: 58–59.

———. 1998. "From Schizophrenia to Social Control." *In Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, edited by Eleanor Kaufman and Jon Heller Kevin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 69.

———. 1999. *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: introduction to schizoanalysis*. London: Routledge.

———. 2006. "Nomad Citizenship and Global Democracy." In *Deleuze and the social,* edited by Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen, 191–206. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Holloway, John and Eloína Peláez, eds. 1998. *Zapatista!: reinventing revolution in Mexico*. London: Pluto Press.

Holloway, John. 2002. *Change the world without taking power*. London: Pluto Press.

International Organization for Migration. 2008. Accessed March 5, 2011. http://www.iom.int

Johnston, Adrian. 2007. "The Quick and the Dead: Alain Badiou and the Split Speeds of Transformation". *International Journal of Zizek Studies*. 1 (2): 56–84.

Katzenberger, Elaine, ed. 1995. *First World, ha ha ha!: the Zapatista challenge*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Kersten, Axel. 1997. "Tourism and regional development in Mexico and Chiapas after NAFTA." *Planeta*. Accessed March 5, 2011. http://www.planeta.com/planeta/97/0597lacandon2.html

Khaldun, Ibn. 1958. *The Muqaddimah; an introduction to history*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal. New York: Pantheon Books.

Khasnabish, Alex. 2008. *Zapatismo beyond borders: new imaginations of political possibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kingsnorth, Paul. 2004. *One no, many yeses: a journey to the heart of the global resistance movement*. London: Free Press.

Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe and Jean-Luc Nancy. 1997. *Retreating the political*. Edited by Simon Sparks. London: Routledge.

Lampert, Jay. 2006. *Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of history*. London: Continuum.

Land, Nick. 1993. "Making it with Death: Remarks on Thanatos and Desiring-Production." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*. 24 (1): 66–76.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1949. *Histoire de la racine nem- en grec ancien (nem, nemesis, nomos, nomiz)*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Latour, Bruno. 1999. *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Lazarus, Sylvain. 1996. *Anthropologie du nom*. Paris: Seuil.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1979. *Totality and infinity: an essay on exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. The Hague: M. Nijhoff Publishers.

Levinson, Sanford, and Yael Tamir. 1995. "Is Liberal Nationalism an Oxymoron? An Essay for Judith Shklar". *Ethics*. 105 (3): 626–45.

Maccani, RJ. 2006. "The Zapatistas: Enter the Intergalactic". *Upping the Anti: A Journal of Theory and Practice*. 3: 105–22.

Mackenzie, Iain M. 2008. "What is a Political Event?" *Theory & Event*. (11): 3.

Marcellus, Oliver de. 2001. "Peoples' Global Action: Dreaming up an old ghost". In *Auroras of the Zapatistas: local and global struggles of the Fourth World War,* edited by Midnight Notes Collective, 105–17. 2003. New York: Autonomedia.

———. 2003. "Peoples' Global Action: The grassroots go global". In *We are everywhere: The irresistible rise of global anti-capitalism*, edited by Notes From Nowhere, 96–101. New York: Verso.

Marchart, Oliver. 2005. "Nothing but a Truth: Alain Badiou's 'Philosophy of Politics' and the Left Heideggerians." *Polygraph* (17): 119–20.

Marcos. 1995. "Durito: Neoliberalism the chaotic theory of economic chaos". Translated by Peter Haney. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ marcos_durito_neolib_jul95.html.

———. 2001a. "Entrevista a Sub-Comandante Marcos". *El Historiador*. Accessed on March 4, 2011. http://www.elhistoriador.com.ar/entrevistas/m/marcos.php.

———. 2001b. *Our word is our weapon: selected writings*. Edited by Juana Ponce de Leon. New York: Seven Stories Press.

———. 2001c. "Punch Card and Hourglass". *New Left Review*. 9: 69–80.

———. 2004a. "Reading a Video Part Two: Two Flaws". Translated by irlandesa. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/2004/marcos/ flawsAUG.html

———. 2004b. *Ya basta!: ten years of the Zapatista uprising*. Edited by Žiga Vodovnik. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

———. 2006. *The other campaign = La otra campaña*. San Francisco: City Lights.

———. 2009. Quoted in "The Dream of a Better World Is Back" by Alain Gresh. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, May 8.

Marcos and El Kilombo Intergalactico. 2010. *Beyond Resistance: Everything An Interview With Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos*. South End Press.

Marcos and Encuentro Intercontinental por la Humanidad y contra el Neoliberalismo. 1998. *Zapatista Encuentro: documents from the 1996 Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos and EZLN. 2008. "Communiqué from the of the Indigenous Revolutionary Clandestine Committee—General Command, of the Zapatista Army for National Liberation".

Maxwell, Kenneth and Neil Harvey. 1999. "Review of The Chiapas Rebellion: The Struggle for Land and Democracy". *Foreign Affairs*. 78 (2): 151–51.

May, Todd. 1997. *Reconsidering difference: Nancy, Derrida, Levinas, and Deleuze*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

McCarthy, Thomas A. 1991. *Ideals and illusions: on reconstruction and deconstruction in contemporary critical theory*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

McNaughton, Colm. 2008. "A critique of John Holloway's Change The World Without Taking Power". *Capital & Class*. 95 (3).

Mengue, Philippe. 2003. *Deleuze et la question de la démocratie*. Paris: L'Harmattan

———. 2009. "From First Sparks to Local Clashes: Which Politics Today? In *Gilles Deleuze: the intensive reduction*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas, 161–86. London: Continuum.

Mentinis, Mihalis. 2006. *Zapatistas: the Chiapas revolt and what it means for radical politics*. London: Pluto Press.

Miller, Christopher L. 1993. "The Postidentitarian Predicament in the Footnotes of A Thousand Plateaus: Nomadology, Anthropology, and Authority". *Diacritics*. 23 (3): 6–35.

Mora, Mariana. 1998. "The EZLN and Indigenous Autonomous Municipalities." Accessed March 4, 2011. http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/comment/auto_munc.html.

Muñoz Ramírez, Gloria. 2008. *The fire and the word: a history of the Zapatista movement*. Translated by Laura Carlsen and Alejandro Reyes Arias. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Neill, Monty. 2001. "Encounters in Chiapas." In *Auroras of the Zapatistas: Local and global struggles of the Fourth World War*, edited by Midnight Notes, 45–53. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Notes from Nowhere (Organization), ed. 2003. *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. London: Verso.

O'Brien ,Karen. 2000. *Sacrificing the Forest: Environmental And Social Struggle In Chiapas*. New York: Westview Press.

Olesen, Thomas. 2005. *International Zapatismo: the construction of solidarity in the age of globalization*. London: Zed.

Patton, Paul. 2000. *Deleuze and the political*. London: Routledge.

———. 2006. "Order, Exteriorities and Flat Multiplicities in the Social." In *Deleuze and the social*, edited by Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen, 21–38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

———. 2008. "Becoming-Democratic." In *Deleuze and politics*, edited by Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn, 178–95. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

———. 2009. "Events, Becoming and History". In *Deleuze and History*, edited by Jeffrey A. Bell and Claire Colebrook, 33–53. Edinburgh University Press.

Prigogine, Ilya., and Isabelle Stengers. 1997. *The end of certainty: time, chaos, and the new laws of nature*. New York: Free Press.

Protevi, John. 2006. Review of *Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*, by Peter Hallward. *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*. http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=10564.

Proyect, Louis. 2003. "Fetishizing the Zapatistas: A Critique of Change the World without taking Power." *Herramienta: debate y crítica marxista*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.herramienta.com.ar/debate-sobre-cambiar-el-mundo.

Rancière, Jacques. 2004. "Who is the Subject of the Rights of Man?" in *South Atlantic Quarterly* 103 (2/3): 297–310.

Read, Jason. 2006. "The Age of Cynicism: Deleuze and Guattari on the Production of Subjectivity in Capitalism." In *Deleuze and the social,* edited by Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen, 139–59. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ronfeldt, David F. 1998. *The zapatista "social netwar" in Mexico*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Ross, John. 1995. *Rebellion from the roots: Indian uprising in Chiapas*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.

———. 2006. *¡Zapatistas!: making another world possible : chronicles of resistance, 2000–2006*. New York: Nation Books.

Sellars, John. 2007. "Deleuze and Cosmopolitanism". *Radical Philosophy*. 142: 30.
Sixth Commission—Intergalactic Commission of the EZLN, Mexico. Accessed on March 4, 2011. http://www.elkilombo.org/communique-indigenous-revolutionary-clandestine-committee/

Smith, Dan. 1998. "The Place of Ethics in Deleuze's Philosophy: Three Questions of Immanence." In *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, edited by Eleanor Kaufman and Jon Heller Kevin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 69.

———. 2008. "Deleuze and the Production of the New". In *Deleuze, Guattari and the Production of the New*, edited by Simon O'Sullivan and Stephen Zepke, 151–61. London: Continuum Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, and Rosalind C. Morris. 2010. *Can the subaltern speak?: reflections on the history of an idea*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Srnicek, Nick. 2008. "What is to be Done? Alain Badiou and the Pre-Eventa l". Symposium. (12): 2.

Starr, A., M.E. Martinez-Torres, and P. Rosset. 2011. "Participatory Democracy in Action: Practices of the Zapatistas and the Movimento Sem Terra". *Latin American Perspectives*. 38 (1): 102–19.

Stivale, Charles J. 1998. *The two-fold thought of Deleuze and Guattari: intersections and animations*. New York: Guilford Press.

———, trans. 2004. "'D' is for Desire". In *L'Abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze, avec Claire Parnet*. Directed by Pierre-André Boutang in 1996. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.langlab.wayne.edu/Cstivale/D-G/ABC1.html

Thoburn, Nick. 2009. "Weatherman, the Militant Diagram, and the Problem of Political Passion". *New Formations*. 68: 125–42.

Thompson, A. K. 2010. *Black bloc, white riot: anti-globalization and the genealogy of dissent*. Edinburgh: AK Press.

Tormey, Simon. 2006. "'Not in my Name': Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation". *Parliamentary Affairs* 59 (1): 138–54.

Toscano, Alberto. 2004. "From the state to the world? Badiou and anti-capitalism". *Communication & Cognition*. 37 (3): 199.

———. 2006. *The theatre of production: philosophy and individuation between Kant and Deleuze*. Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2008. "United Nations' Trends in Total Migrant Stock." Accessed March 4, 2011. http://esa.un.org/migration.

Virilio, Paul. 1993. *L'insécurité du territoire: essai*. Paris: Galilée.

Virno, Paolo. 2003. *A grammar of the multitude: for an analysis of contemporary forms of life*. Cambridge, Mass: Semiotext(e).

Walker, Simon. 2005. "Oventic Boot Cooperative Exports Boots to Canada." *Casa Collectiva*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.casacollective.org/story/news/oventic-boot-cooperative-exports-boots-canada

Waterman, Peter. 1998. *Globalization, social movements, and the new internationalisms*. Washington, DC: Mansell.

World Social Forum. 2001. *Charter of Principles*. Accessed March 4, 2011. http://www.wsfindia.org/?q=node/3

Yakubu, Owusu. 2000. "A Commune In Chiapas? Mexico And The Zapatista Rebellion". *Aufheben* 9.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1997. "Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism". *New Left Review*. 225: 28.

———. 2004. *Organs without bodies: Deleuze and consequences*. New York: Routledge.

Žižek, Slavoj and Costas Douzinas, eds. 2010. *The idea of communism*. London: Verso.

Zourabichvili, François. 1996. *Deleuze, une philosophie de l'événement*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.