

Gilles Deleuze

On *Anti-Oedipus*

Lecture 04, 28 May 1973

Marx – Desire/Need – Faye – Money – On Baudrillard

Transcription: WebDeleuze and Le Terrier; modified transcription, Charles J. Stivale

Translated by Christian Kerslake

Last time we were seeking, at very insignificant levels, how types of body without organs could be constituted and what might happen on a body without organs, once it is said that the body without organs is something which is to be made.¹ We saw that what happened on a body without organs was all sorts of things: multiplicities, flows, figures of content, figures of expression, and all that entered into relationships that formed machinic assemblages. Now all of this was directly our problem, namely: what produces statements? And in the insignificant examples we found last time, the statements in question could be, for example, the statements of alcoholics, or statements of perversion, or schizo statements; and I was quite clear that at this stage of research, there was no reason to make a difference in nature between a great statement of the schizo type, or a military statement for example, an imperial statement, or an alcoholic statement. This was the problem of statements, which implied that statements must be considered in the mechanism of their production, independently of their content and of the importance of this content.

There has been a presupposition which has been there the whole of this year, namely: what produces statements is never a subject; they are collective agents of enunciation, they are machinic assemblages – again, not at all calling on ‘social factors’, but calling on collective agents or collective assemblages [*agencements*] of multiplicities which pass through us, which are neither interior nor exterior to us, but which are indeed productive of the statements that we form.

I would like to begin with a first remark. Our attempt here is neither attached to Marxism nor to Freudo-Marxism. With regard to Marxism, I’m not even looking for the details, I would say that there are three big differences. The first difference is that Marxism poses problems in terms of need. On the contrary, our problem was posed in terms of desires. There is a great practical difference: from the moment that problems are posed in terms of need, what is invoked is ultimately an authority [*instance*] supposed to be judge, both of the nature of these needs and of their distribution, and of the measure of their satisfaction. To pose problems in terms of needs is already to make appeal, I think, to what will reveal itself to be a party organization. On the contrary, to speak in terms of desires is to say that, not the subject, because there is perhaps no subject of desire, but that the instance of desire is the sole judge of the desires of which it is the bearer, whether it is an individual or a group; and in this sense the whole problem is displaced: not that there is no place for thinking about a centralization or about a connection between apparatuses of desire, but what is certain is that the connection between apparatuses of desire cannot be made under the form of a party apparatus which would play a decisive role. I believe that the position of a problem in terms of needs and in terms of desire is absolutely different.

The second difference is that Marxism supports a certain opposition between the economic infrastructure and the ideological, between the infrastructure as instance of production and ideology. For us, at no time did the problem of ideology arise, because we have a simple idea: it is not so much that ideology is in itself a deformation of something or transformation of something; it is not at all that ideology is, for example, a false consciousness; but that, literally, there is no ideology. It does not exist.

There is no ideology. There are only organizations of power; and what one calls ideologies are the statements of organizations of power. For example, there is no Christian ideology; there is on the other hand ... fundamentally, Christianity, throughout its entire history, is not an organization of power of one particular type, but its history has been traversed by the invention of a multiplicity, of a variety of organizations of power, right up to the formation of the primary one, the idea of an international power; and what one calls Christian ideology, or the history of Christian ideology, is only the succession of statements corresponding to the organization of ecclesiastical power.

In the same way, I think there is no ideology of education, and to carry out a critique of the ideology of education is to fall into a false problem. Education must be thought starting from a type of organization of power exerted on children, and ideology, there too, is only the statement corresponding to the organization of power [*indistinct word*]. And perhaps if Marxism, under its traditional form, insists so much on a kind of duality between infrastructure and ideology, it was all the better to hide something which organized itself in it, namely the organization of power around a centralizing party, and the whole dualism and the whole Marxist reflection on the economy ... Ideology has this role of mask in relation to the organization of power; already at the time of Marx and the International, then with Lenin, then in Stalin's time, etc.

The third difference is, I believe, that Marxism carries out its work in a kind of movement which is at the same time that of recapitulation, or of a kind of recollection of memory, or of a kind of development: development of the productive forces. Our point of view is completely different: we conceive the production of statements, not at all under the species of a development, of a recollection of memory, but on the contrary, starting from a power which is that of forgetting, starting from a force which is that of experimentation, and starting from this experimentation insofar as it operates in non-development.

I think it's these three practical differences which mean that our problem has never been that of a return to Marx. Much more, our problem is much more forgetting, including the forgetting of Marx. But in the forgetting, little fragments float. I would also say why such an attempt can in no way participate in any tendency that could be qualified as Freudo-Marxism; and in this respect, it seems to me that there are two essential reasons why, speaking for myself, I would feel absolutely alien to every venture of Freudo-Marxism ...

The first is that the Freudo-Marxist attempts are also made from a kind of appeal to memory, and to *returning*, whatever the complexity of the return: it's about *going back* to Freud (the *École freudienne*²), it's about a *return* to Marx (Althusser); even if the Marx that emerges is singularly original, even if the Freud that emerges is original, that does not prevent such attempts, which start through a return, seeming to be easy to define to me: it's about, at that moment, saving the machine.

It seems obvious that the return to Freud, such as it has been carried out at the *École freudienne*, has allowed for the plugging of breaches in the psychoanalytic apparatus. The ‘epistemological’ return³ has played out in order to save, in a certain way, the bureaucratic apparatus of psychoanalysis. The return to Marx, that was the same thing: saving the bureaucratic apparatus of the party, giving to this apparatus the guarantee of a return to [missing text]. The task for us would be to consider these bureaucratic apparatuses, both psychoanalytic and communist, to consider them in their current situation where, after a long period of misunderstanding, they are once more forging an alliance; to carry as far as possible the critique of these apparatuses such as they are – which excludes any return to Marx, any return to Freud.

The second reason is that all the Freudo-Marxist attempts consist in seeking the reconciliations between two lines of economy: a well-known economy that goes under the name of political, and an economy that would be libidinal, desiring, pulsional.⁴ From the moment that one seeks such a reconciliation, the only thing one can expect of such an attempt is some kind of symbolization or some species of parallelism. A parallelism between the two economies, or a point on which one of these economies would be plugged onto the other, or a point on which one of these economies would detach itself from the other, etc. In other words, every Freudo-Marxist attempt is marked as a function of its starting-point by a dualism in which one will end up invoking parallelist themes as feeble, as lamentable, as symbolic equivalents, as parallelisms like *money = shit*, etc. It seems to me that everything that comes from Freudo-Marxism, as much on the side of [Wilhelm] Reich as with [Herbert] Marcuse, verifies this weakness.

We, on the contrary, our starting point is very simple: there is and there has only ever been a single economy, and it is the same economy which is fundamentally, from the beginning, at once desiring or libidinal and political. We consider the three following terms as close synonyms: position of desire, production of the unconscious, production of statements. This obviously implies, as much vis-à-vis Marxism as with psychoanalysis, a certain point of view which is foreign to both. Whatever one does, psychoanalysis always considers the unconscious as already produced, and as something to be reduced by a machine of experimentation, and an experimentation that is not only individual, but an experimentation which surely can be collective, in the sense that revolutions are discharges of the unconscious, are productions of the unconscious – and in this sense, they are perhaps the key to the domain of what we have been calling experimentation.

Any system made to prevent the production of the unconscious is at the same time a system made to prevent the production of new statements, or a system made to prevent the positing of desire, in a place and in a time, as it produces itself. The production of statements must no longer fundamentally belong to a split which would put production on the side of an economic infrastructure, and frame statements from the point of view of a science or an ideology; rather the production of statements must truly constitute a part of the very sphere of production. What makes a posing of desire possible, or what makes the production of new statements possible? I could just as well ask, for it is the same problem: how does one prevent a statement from spreading, how does one avoid getting stuck in a rut with a statement, it comes down to the same thing as saying: how to produce new statements? How to ensure that a statement does not crystallize, so that a statement does not enter into the imperialist system that is the imperialist system of the sign under the signifier? That is a whole bloc of problems. It amounts just as well to saying: how to pose a desire in a group or in an individual, how to produce the unconscious?

We have seen in what sense the body without organs was the object of a production and how, starting from it, all sorts of things were produced. The underlying idea we had was that what was produced on the body without organs was the assemblage, a kind of assemblage proper to the posing of desire, to releasing the charges of unconscious, to producing an unconscious which is never already there, or to producing new statements. And after all, a historical break is defined by all sorts of things, but among others, by a production of statements.

Are there any questions or comments before continuing?

Henri Gobard: I would like to know if you have considered the problem of the transition from oral to writing, and ask you if, in fact, the condition of imperialism was not linked to transcription, to writing itself, because in an oral world, it would be much more difficult.

Deleuze: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yes. yes. In a way, I want to answer yes and no. We looked at the role of writing in an imperial system last year; what interests me more is an idea that appears in [Louis] Hjelmslev: there is a point of view where that no longer matters, that is to say where there is an indifference of the substance.⁵ Ultimately, he says, the substance is phonic, whether it is oral, whether it is written, or something else, whether it is coded in the form, for example, of semaphore language, morse language, it doesn't matter that much. There is a point where you are completely right, and that's in the history of social formations; and then, there is a point where ultimately almost the same machinic assemblage can bear on completely indifferent substances. The difference would intervene at the level of qualified flows: it is obvious that the oral flow and the flow of writing are not the same thing. But at the level of the machinic assemblage which, in a certain manner – but obviously it's not the same level – if one assumes a machinic assemblage at a given period, bearing on any flows whatever, it will be the same one (with differences of intensities) that will seize hold of the oral phonic substance, written substance, and every other kind of substance. We can come back to that.

Ideology is, literally, the system of statements which correspond to – not at all which hide – some organization of power. Ideology absolutely does not consist in deceiving people; ideology is just the system of statements that flow from an organization of power such as it is: for example, between the Reformation and Catholicism, the problem is one of organizations of power, and we must not only take into account the struggle Reformation/Catholicism, we also have to take into account the settling of accounts at work within the Reformation, between statements of the popular type and the liquidation of the Reformist left, the conciliation with the princes of other reformed [countries], that is to say, what produced a type of organization of new power; and on the side of Catholicism, equally, we must take account of the whole system of heresies evidently implied by the discussions on the Trinity, putting into play very directly and very profoundly problems of organization of power concerning the Church. And it doesn't even mask anything: it could only be stated like that.

Ideology absolutely does not seem to me something deceptive at all: the most beautiful discussions in the Middle Ages on Scholasticism, on the Trinity – all that articulates very clearly and very clearly puts into play what the organization of the church is going to be, what the role of priest is going to be, it does not hide anything.

Gobard: I am very happy that you say it does not hide anything, because that corroborates my own research, namely that what is true is not the depth, it is the surface; you have to trust appearances.

Deleuze: A statement is *what is said*. At our level, there is never anything to interpret.

A student: [*Question on need*]

Deleuze: You are asking me to theoretically justify how need and authority [*instance*], judge of needs, are connected; I can do that. I think that in the idea of need, there is fundamentally the idea of a lack of something, and that, from the moment something is lacking, there is necessarily a judge who will evaluate both the lack and the relation of what is lacking with the lack itself, that is to say, with the need; from that moment there is a whole system of organization of power; so the subject of need will be divested, and this is why socialist systems have the most often spoken in terms of need and not in terms of desire. Need is something in which lack is inscribed. And if desire is a process, then it is obvious that only the group as bearer of desire, or only the individual as bearer of desire, is judge of its own desire.

When society brings about the repression of desire, it is always in the name of: people have needs, and we are charged with satisfying them. The repression of desire is never done in the name of: there are desires, you have to take them into account, but be reasonable; it's always done in the name of need. When there is a conception of desire according to which desire would be a lack of something, it's all well and good establishing the most severe distinction of nature between need and desire, these distinctions of nature are only words. We will see a certain theoretical shoring up where desire begins because it is lack of a lack, because it is lack to the second degree, as opposed to need. In any case, it will already have been pushed back into the domain of need, and at that moment there will be a judge of desire, even if it is only the psychoanalyst.

Today, we're going to forget about everything we did before, but everything we did previously on the body without organs will be essential to us. Simply, bizarrely, a shift will take place, because, with the preceding planes, we had no reason to place a perverse statement, an alcoholic statement, a schizo statement, a social statement, a political statement on different planes; it was necessary, on the contrary, to treat them all like equivalents, that is to say, all producing themselves on bodies without organs of a different type. From now on, there will be a whole system involving the different types of BwO, the different types of statements, and the relationships between these statements. Here, it is going to be necessary to establish a whole differential system.

What is this question of the production of statements? It is a relatively recent problem: three books in France pose, or else do not pose but revolve around, this question: how statements are produced, or what comes down to the same thing more concretely: how does one have done with old statements? How does one produce new statements? The three books are those of [Jean] Baudrillard, [Jean-Pierre] Faye and [Michel] Foucault. For Baudrillard, the examples of the production of statements are borrowed from aesthetics and in particular from a very concrete aesthetic involving the auction, the sale of paintings at an auction.⁶ In the case of Foucault, the great examples he gives of the production of statements concern above all madness, in the 19th century, the production of new statements concerning madness, such as it happens in the 19th century, and on the other hand, the constitutive statements of the medical

clinic in the 19th century as well.⁷ In Faye, the core matter of his reflection on the production of new statements is Nazism: in what sense was Nazism the producer of statements with a new sense?⁸ We must also look at Guattari's book and notably the passage concerning the Leninist break which explicitly asks how to give an account of the production of new statements at the moment of the Bolshevik revolution.⁹

It seems to me that these theories have a common background which consists of several points: first, they are distinguished from the linguistic studies with which we have been submerged. Why? Because the linguistic studies have consisted above all in analyzing language in its formal elements of various tenors; while here, it concerns something absolutely different: a kind of discovery and insistence that linguistics had forgotten about the creative power of language; and here we can locate where that comes from. It obviously refers back to Chomsky. That's the first common aspect to all the studies. There is a second aspect, which is that the problem of the production of statements, as a function therefore of a creative power of language, forces us to leave behind an overly simple conception of production, for the reason that statements themselves are part of the domain of production. From that moment, what is broken is the production/ideology duality. That implies therefore a transformation of the concept of production, namely a transformation which no longer goes in the traditional Marxist direction, where production is above all envisaged as material production. So we have the overhauling of the concept of production, and the suppression of the production/ideology duality, for the benefit of what? Here too, this is one of the common points among the three authors: to the benefit of the problem of power and of the organization of this power, precisely because blowing up the ordinary production/ideology duality will no doubt introduce the problem of the organization of power, as already forming part of an indissolubly economico-political structure.

The third common point is the attempt, sometimes successful, sometimes not successful, to break precisely with the linguistic category of signifier and signified. Fourth common point: it is to renew the problem of the unconscious by posing it at the level of statements. No longer to refer the unconscious to a machine of interpretation. Perhaps what I am saying does not hold equally for the three authors, but it is eminently valid for Foucault. It amounts to an attempt to discover the way in which desire invests economic forms themselves. These, it seems to me, are all the points in common between these three authors.

We will begin with the book by Baudrillard and see in what sense it fits, and in what sense it does not fit into the attempt. I ask those who know this book to give their opinion. The first thesis, in the *Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*¹⁰ ... Just a parenthesis: as today it will really be about the study of texts, it probably goes without saying that it will be quite boring, and if those who aren't interested want to leave, that's fine by me; nevertheless [if you're not familiar with the texts in question], that shouldn't stop you from understanding anything either ...

Baudrillard's first proposition is a veritable elimination and subordination of the category of production, and in any case, the category of production as material production. And there, that's a real rupture with Marxism. And why is the category of material production like the statement?¹¹ Here, Baudrillard's arguments are very clear: because material production refers to use-value, and because use-value itself presupposes completely artificial notions, like those of need and ideology. In other words, we must not start from use-value; from that moment, we must not start from material production, because material production is already wholly criss-crossed by a system of another nature: it is not use-value which is primary, and in

Baudrillard there is a whole critique of use-value at work right from the beginning of his book. Which comes down to saying, second proposition, that what is primary is exchange. In a certain way, that comes down to saying something Marx also said, namely, that production in capitalism is the reproduction of capital; but at the beginning of *Capital*, one can indeed also find the path exchange-value, use-value. Baudrillard proposes a kind of reversal of the relation: exchange-value is primary, exchange is primary. Why? Because production itself, as material production, presupposes a “differential” matter of exchange: the big mistake is to make of differentiation “a superadded variable, [...] a variable given by the situation”, whereas it is “a relational variable of the structure.”¹² As Veblen had seen – he is a great disciple of Veblen –, “the whole of society is regulated by the production of distinctive material.”¹³ Now, precisely according to him, production is already differential production, production of distinctive materials, and this is insofar as it presupposes a whole system of exchange; in other words, exchange-value is primary, it is what is going to criss-cross production, and from that moment, it is this that is going to be primary in relation to use-value.

From there, things get complicated, because Baudrillard’s third proposition is this: starting from exchange-value, a transmutation is produced. So here we are in a simple situation; someone is telling you that exchange-value is primary in relation to use-value, which can also mean: the exigencies of consumption are primary in relation to production, and in effect, at the level of the exigencies of consumption, there is already a handling of a distinctive material, of a differential material. Good. That implies an idea that it is necessary to retain for later, namely that the basis (I am not saying the form), the basis of capitalism is exchange-value. [*Interruption of the recording*]

... Baudrillard’s third thesis concerns, in a certain way, a veritable transmutation of exchange-value, and for him, as for us, that will be the essential, namely the way in which exchange-value will transform itself into what he will call *sign exchange-value*, or what he calls sign-value, or what he calls sign-form.¹⁴ That is going to be the crux of his problem, and I say to myself that it is also going to be ours, because how exchange-value ... [*Unfinished sentence*] I’m not sure if it’s well posed, starting from exchange-value, because again: how does exchange-value transmute itself into sign-value, or sign-form – that’s another way of saying: how are statements produced in a system of exchange? How does the production of statements come about?

The answer consists in saying, if I understand correctly, that there is a destruction of exchange-value: in the circuit of exchange, there is a destruction of exchange-value, and the destruction of exchange-value occurs in expenditure – I won’t insist on it, but one feels [Georges] Bataille looming here –, and that it is in expenditure that the purchased object takes on sign-value, and that it is there that there is a production of signs. It is therefore in the act of expenditure that exchange-value becomes sign-value, and it is there that a production of signs comes about which does not belong to the superstructure, and which does not belong to ideology, but which does truly belong to the economic system.

That that truly belongs to the economic system, that’s also part of our concern – otherwise we would not have spoken about Baudrillard – namely: to introduce statements and to introduce desire into the economic infrastructure. What is the difference with exchange-value?

It is that, at that moment, the differential material which was already included in exchange-value ceases to be a pure matter and becomes form, sign-form. And it is there, in this

transformation of exchange-value which itself was the bearer of material surplus value, in the transformation of exchange-value into sign-value, that a specific surplus-value of domination appears. And this is where the organization of power happens. This is page 115 and what follows.¹⁵ On page 206, we find the formula: “Exchange-value is realized ...” – is realized at the very moment it is annihilated as exchange-value – “is realized in sign-value.”¹⁶ Once again, this production of sign-value is itself accomplished in expenditure. Hence the idea that a true psychoanalysis, that is to say a true desiring economy, must be brought about at the level of consumption and expenditure.

Fourth thesis: with the apparition of sign-value or of sign-form, there arises – this seems bizarre to me – the *signifier-signified* couple, because the sign is the set of the two. And there is produced a term-by-term assignation, signifier-signified, of which he gives at least one example in the case of the work of art, the signifier being the form, the signified being the function, and the set of the two constituting the sign or sign-value. Now, this constitutive signifier-signified, or the very elements of the sign, is as if traversed by something famous, namely the bar.¹⁷ The bar is very important: it is what assigns a system of relations between the signifier and the signified; it is the bar that separates the signifier and the signified. If I understand right, the sign is therefore this bar itself which distributes signifier and signified, term by term, and he devotes a long footnote to Lacan saying: yes, Lacan does not make the signifier-signified term by term, but it comes down to the same thing, there is a domain of the signifier, a domain of the signified, and there is the bar.¹⁸

And, last proposition: this bar of the signifier and signified, this constitutive bar of the sign and the sign-form, well, far from revealing something, it hides and occults. What it hides and occults, we don't know yet. What is important at this level is that this is where I also see, whether fulfilled or non-fulfilled it does not matter, a part of the program of the theory of production of statements, namely to attempt to situate the problem of the unconscious and to renew the problem of the unconscious as a function of this question of the production of statements.

So, finally, the last thesis: what does it hide, this bar of the signifier and the signified, constitutive of the sign? We learn that it hides castration. According to him, the whole of modern capitalism is a way of concealing a sublime truth which is that of castration. It occludes castration because ... I'm presenting it very badly: it's because, as you can sense, I don't understand anything here ... It occludes castration because, he literally says in the article on 'The Body'¹⁹: castration is only *signified*, and that, it is not good.²⁰ When castration is only signified, it is occluded because it is only signified, and that doesn't bode well. Why? Castration is simultaneously signified and occluded as signified. That doesn't go well because it seems, according to the article, that it is misrecognized; in what sense? Because what is misrecognized is the essence of desire, it is its proper [*indistinct word*], namely, it is lack. Look at [*For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*] page 259 – ah, my reference is wrong.

Richard [Pinhas]: I think I've got your reference.

Deleuze: [*Indistinct sentence*]

Richard: “Lack is always that in terms of which we miss others, and through which others miss us”, page 208.

Deleuze: That's quite a statement. I've found the page 69: "[...] the entirely latent discourse, in the object, of the symbolic absence [*manque*] of the subject from himself and the other"²¹ – yes yes yes yes – desire is “the desire for something lost, where it is lack, an absence on which the objects that signify it have come to be inscribed; what can it mean to take such objects literally, as if they were merely what they are?”²²

So, this misrecognition of castration because castration is only signified, that corresponds to what stage? He says: it's like this – it is very forced – and he chooses striptease as an example. He talks of the bar of the stockings on the thigh, which refers to the bar *signifier-signified*.²³ Castration is only signified, if I understand correctly. And the bar can be anything: “the clothes that come off, signalling the emergence of the body as phallus.”²⁴ All that is a “denial of castration.”²⁵ The ideal is the idea of a “naked body”, “full”, where castration is therefore occluded.

This is interesting to us because it makes the body without organs play a very specific role. The body without organs is precisely a body which operates the denial of castration. The difference of the sexes is ignored.²⁶ “More nude than nude”²⁷, “the woman painted in gold” ... and he says, I can't quite remember, but the spirit of it is: full body, non-porous, without exudation nor expression, without grain or roughness, vitrified.²⁸

The difference with Lacan is that the bar *signifier-signified*, far from indicating castration, is, on the contrary, the sign that it is occluded, the mark of an occultation, the mark of a misrecognition of castration.

Baudrillard's last thesis: so, from that moment, since you see that this misrecognition of castration is not good, you see that basically there is a whole thesis here referring back to castration as belonging fundamentally to the essence of desire. The last thesis appears as: what is the true order of desire, including in an economy, an order of desire which would invest the economy as a function of a non-misrecognized castration, as a function of a recognized castration? His answer is this: it must be something other than sign-value.

For the moment, we have been playing on *exchange-value*, *sign-value*; and exchange-value became sign-value in a kind of transmutation; sign-value gave us the bar signifier-signified; that is to say, occulted castration. How to get oneself out of such a catastrophic situation, where desire misrecognizes castration, that is to say, misrecognizes its own being? Baudrillard says that there was a time when things were better. The time when things were better must be defined through a third term: this is *symbolic value*.²⁹ Symbolic value is beyond the signifier and the signified. It implies a kind of non-appearance; it is therefore opposed to sign-value. It is distinguished from sign-value, and Baudrillard's whole book will play on the three terms exchange-value, sign-value and symbolic value, and symbolic value is beyond or below the signifier and the signified, why? Because it is lived under the reign of ambivalence.³⁰

It is through ambivalence that one disburdens oneself of the signifier and signified, because, in Baudrillard, if I understand well, ambivalence is not simply the ambivalence of feelings in the sense of love/hate; it is the ambivalence of the signifiers and signifieds themselves. One no longer knows what is signifier and what is signified, and it is in this ambivalence that the value-sign is surpassed towards symbolic value; and we have seen that sign-value is referred to consumption and to the forgetting and denial of castration, while this value thing, symbolic value, refers to the recognition of castration and no longer to consumption [*consommation*],

but to consummation [*consummation*]. We find ourselves right in the middle of the economy of gift/counter-gift.

Let me quickly take up these propositions again: use-value is not primary, it is exchange-value that is primary. Exchange-value produces a distinctive or differential material. It must be transmuted into sign-value which, for its part, raises the differential or distinctive material to the level of form. Sign-value operates in expenditure and in consumption. The sign is constituted by the bar of signifier and the signified and it occludes the truth of desire which is castration, to the profit of a full body which is the body of the woman painted in gold. Finally, beyond all that, there is something which is symbolic value, made up of gift and counter-gift, of ambivalence, of recognition of castration, and which implies the very dissolution of the signifier and signified.

I'd like it if those who know Baudrillard a bit could say if my summary is correct. Who has read Baudrillard well?

Richard Pinhas: There is something thing that strikes me as odd in Baudrillard's procedure, and it's the only thing I can't manage to explain to myself in relation to his methodology itself: he starts from something very Marxist, very traditional, which is the problem of difference and of indifference, the relationship of the producer to the objects he produces, and to his means of production. And Marx's classical thesis is that with capitalism, we have to do with a social formation which functions with the producers separated from the means of production, in a relation of indifference to the objects they produce, something absolutely different from all other social formations, and the example he gives is of the artisan who makes his own object, that is to say, an unmediated relation with the object. And, starting from this indifference, Baudrillard will seek in the Freudian terms of the difference of the sexes and the denial of this difference – he will say that, with capitalism, since there is indifference to the objects produced, to objects sold, and since finally the only universal there is the abstract universal of value, he will say that the indifference vis-à-vis objects is covered over once again by [another] indifference: a denial of the split between the sexes. And I think that makes sense: at last, one sees how the mapping [*recouvrement*] of the Freudian field on a Marxist field works.

Deleuze: If you want to say that it's typically Freudo-Marxist, I am entirely in agreement.

Richard Pinhas: And this approach will yield a reconciliation in symbolic exchange as a result. I absolutely do not understand how he brings about this symbolic exchange.

Deleuze: Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. Basically, you understand even less than me. I was looking for someone who understands better ... [*Silence of students*] Since you don't want to speak, I'll tell you what seems bizarre to me. To the question: what produces statements? ... What produces statements in a capitalist formation or in another [social formation], since, after all, what choice is left to us? In any case, desire is lack, lack of itself, loss of itself, it is castration; indeed it's through castration that one accedes to desire. What produces statements in the capitalist regime is what occludes castration, namely the bar ... But I don't understand why the bar occludes castration.

Gobard: It's because he must be using 'castration' with two different meanings; the first, the old infantile and Freudian idea that the woman is a man deprived of sex, and the second where castration is the terminology used to speak of the difference of the sexes.

Deleuze: Yes. He even says that symbolic castration is beyond the difference of the sexes. [Pause] In any case, what produces statements is castration. So that interests us and it does not interest us. It interests us since castration being, according to Baudrillard, at the very heart of desire, it is indeed a way of linking the problem of the production of statements to the problem of the posing of desire, and the formula ‘what produces statements is castration’ ... – so in effect, a striptease dancer has a system of non-verbal statements that is linked to a code, the code of strip-tease; an African dance is another code; there are non-verbal statements – castration would therefore be what produces all statements, in two possible modes: either an occluded castration, or as an exhibited castration; which amounts to saying that what produces statements, in any case, is the splitting of the subject. Either the subject can be split by the bar of the signifier and signified, or it can be split in some other way – why it should be split, I don’t know – I’m keeping in mind the article on ‘The Body’ with regard to symbolic value. What is the difference between what exhibits and what hides castration, asks Baudrillard?

The difference is that in the case of what exhibits castration, one sees the radical difference – I am quoting exactly³¹ – that traverses the subject in its irreducible ambivalence. But that’s a bit odd, because ambivalence was what came out of castration, but it turns out that the regime of ambivalence is another irreducible difference. In any case, it is a splitting of the subject that produces the statement. It is once again the old thesis we saw a long time ago: namely, the production of statements by a subject brings with it, through the effect of the statement itself, the splitting of the subject into the subject of enunciation and the subject of the statement.

If, to the question: what produces statements? we are told that it is the splitting of the subject, our preceding analyses were tending towards a contrary result, namely that the splitting of the subject was a very precise effect obtained in order to prevent all production of statements. It is easy to show that, from the moment that a subject is split into subject of the statement and subject of enunciation, far from that engendering the least statement, it is the condition under which no statement can be produced. It is the same condition, and not by chance, that is at work with the psychoanalytic machine, when I was asking why and how it is that the psychoanalytic machine is set up to prevent any production of statements, at the very moment that it pretends to say to the poor patient: go right ahead, you can produce your statements here. All that was needed was the machine of interpretation. The whole of psychoanalysis lies in this: in your relations with your friends, with your work, with your children, etc., you are subject of the statement; in your relations with me, the psychoanalyst, and through the relation to me, the psychoanalyst, you are subject of enunciation.

Hence Lacan’s formidable stroke of calling the analysed person *analysand*. That consists in saying to someone: come and sit yourself on the couch, you will be the producer of statements, you will be the subject of enunciation. Before, psychoanalysts were much more modest because they said something like: if you are on the couch, and if you speak, you will, through the intermediary of my interpretation, accede to the status of subject of enunciation. This is why with the Lacanian recalibration, the psychoanalyst has less and less need to speak, he is more and more silent. The splitting is always assured in the same manner: throughout all your real life, you will be the subject of the statement; you accede to subject of enunciation in relation to the analyst who interprets what you are doing in your real life, so that you are only subject of enunciation in the cabinet of the analyst.

Now, it is precisely this machine that suppresses all the conditions of enunciation. So that if Baudrillard's thesis consists in saying to us: what produces statements is a split subject. Whether it is split according to the system of sign-value, or split in the system of symbolic value, it amounts to the same: it confuses the production of statements with its very opposite, namely what prevents and what suppresses all the conditions for the production of statements. That's the first point.

The second point is that it is all very well to put use-value into question; he is surely right. But to put use-value into question in order to rely on exchange-value does not seem to me sufficient because, while you're at it, if you keep exchange value, you reintroduce use-value. Baudrillard has alighted on an interesting problem, but which seems to me lost in advance: how to engender sign-value, that is to say, the sign-form, as he himself often says, that is to say, how to produce statements, how to engender them starting from exchange-value? Now, it seems that his answer either invokes a miracle or a parallelism. The miracle would be the act of expenditure which would transform, within exchange, exchange value into sign-value. In this case, I don't see any very precise analysis, except strangely enough, in the case of the sale of paintings at an auction³² – and all the same it's a bit weird to conceive the capitalist system in the mode of the sale of paintings at auction. Because of his elimination of the category of production, the subordination of production to consumption, what he retains as the model of the capitalist object is not the machine, it is the gadget; this was already visible in his first book *The System of Objects*, where what he had in mind was a psychoanalysis of the object, and he was obliged therefore to conceive of machines as super-gadgets, instead of conceiving gadgets as residues of machines or as miniaturized machines.³³ The model of the gadget: he is indeed obliged to take such a model, that is to say, to ignore the whole machinic power [*puissance*] of both desire and of capitalism; he is indeed forced to completely occlude the power of the machine and the nature of the machine, in order to engender, starting from exchange-value ... in order to crapulously engender sign-value, or the sign-form, from exchange-value, through a simple operation of expenditure.

When use-value has been suppressed, while conserving exchange-value, one does not give oneself any condition to account for any transmutation at all, except in one case: the system of parallelism. As far as the book on the *Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* goes, it seems to me that what's involved is an operation that remains completely miraculous – this transformation of exchange-value into sign-value. With regard to the article on 'The Body', a parallelist point of view clearly appears between money [*argent*] and phallus.

This money-phallus parallelism, which will guarantee the passage from exchange-value, which is made with material money, to sign-value which is made with the formal phallus – a passage from material money, from material exchange, to formal phallic sign – this is what allows him, simply in the name of a metaphor or of a parallelism, to nimbly get away with saying: it is not embarrassing to establish a metaphor between money and the phallus because the phallus itself is a metaphor ...

We fall back into a parallelist system; it was a question of knowing how desire invested the economy, and we fall back onto a simple parallelism between two economies; namely the transformation exchange-value/sign-value can only be done through a parallelism between money grasped as distinctive materiality and the phallus grasped as differential formality, this is where a system of parallelism between the two comes into play, and from that moment, it no longer at all keeps its implicit promise, namely: to show how desire invests the economy;

it makes a junction through symbolization, through metaphor or through parallelism between two economies, a political economy and an economy of desire.

Finally, third point, because it's time for a rest: why is it that exchange-value is no more serious a notion than use-value. Why doesn't it work?

It seems to me that it is for the following reason: first point: first of all, it seems to me that exchange, in Marxism, is an extraordinarily ambiguous and confused notion because the term 'exchange' brings along with it, as a concept, the theme of a certain equality between the things exchanged or exchangeable things. Marx says it very well, in principle; and, in fact, the problem of exchange is that what is exchanged are *not* equal things: namely, economically there is a fundamentally unequal character to economic exchange. On the conditions of the inequality of exchange, I cite for you two important and contemporary texts: *Unequal Exchange* [by Arghiri Emmanuel] published by Maspéro³⁴ and the book *Accumulation on a World Scale* by Samir Amin at Éditions de Minuit³⁵, where he takes up and corrects the theory of unequal exchange; and the book by Samir Amin is very good. He takes up the theory of unequal exchange, but he doesn't at all take it up as belonging fundamentally to exchange, but he takes it up at the level of the Third World, that is to say: under what conditions, on the periphery of capitalism, under what conditions and why, is the exchange *Third-World-developed countries* fundamentally an unequal exchange?

This notion of exchange brings with it by right a principle of equality and in fact mobilises an essential inequality; and the whole Marxist problem of surplus value comes from that: how to account for the inequality of exchange? And Marx's answer is precisely an arithmetical answer; and you understand why it can only be an arithmetical answer that accounts for the inequality and for the exchange, when the problem has been posed only in terms of exchange.

When the problem has been posed only in terms of exchange, there can be no answer to the question: why the inequality of exchange? There can only be an arithmetical answer, precisely because exchange has absorbed by right this sort of postulate of equality, and it's a matter of accounting, starting from an equality presupposed by right, for an inequality affirmed in fact. From that moment, this can only be done under the form of a plus and a minus, and one aspect of the Marxist theory of surplus value is precisely to explain how the inequality of exchange is situated at the level of the sale and purchase of labor power, that is to say, how a surplus value is created linked to the wage-earners or to the purchase of labor power, a surplus value translatable in terms of plus and minus, which will account for the inequality of exchange.

Now, what doesn't work in that? Once again, it's that, in a certain way, it can't keep the promises given. The promise given was to show how, in a social formation, social production was coded by something more profound, that is to say, how ultimately production was not primary. Now, in order to show how production is not primary at the level of the economy, we opt for the exchange mechanism.

A sort of circuit of exchange would first of all be abstract, and there is a place for that, and in relation to which it would be necessary to engender the immediacy of fact, which could only be done, once again, through an arithmetical process. When Marx talks of exchange, he indeed talks of it as an abstract form; there is no society which functions like that. Also, I said last year that it was necessary to substitute a completely different mechanism for it.

What traverses a society is not a circuit of exchange; it is a completely different circuit which does not refer us to arithmetic, but which refers us to a differential apparatus. And it is very curious that Baudrillard himself feels the need to invoke a differential matter, a distinctive matter and a differential form, but starting from an exchangeist structure which, it seems to me, does not support it. What defines, on the contrary, a social field, whether it is capitalist or something else, is not at all the unequal or equal quantities which would enter into a relation of exchange, it is the quantities of different powers, quantities of powers in the mathematical sense of the word power [*puissance*]; these are different potentialities. The question is not: equal quantities or unequal quantities, because that's the problem of exchange, but that has never worked with this thing.

What functions in an economic formation is the different powers of quantities, that is to say the flows that traverse the social field. These are not quantities of the same power, and therefore the (pseudo-)mathematical apparatus which can account for that is obviously not arithmetic, it is necessarily differential calculus, since differential calculus, I remind you, is made to treat quantities which are not of the same power.³⁶ The differential relation is precisely a relation which makes it possible to confront and compare quantities which are not of the same power. Differential calculus would be stripped of meaning if your idea was just to apply it to quantities of equal power. Therefore, it does not seem to me at all that one should start from a circuit of exchange, where one would play with a presupposed equality and an inequality to be engendered, which is closer to the relation *exchange-value–sign-form* in the false genesis proposed by Baudrillard. Rather one must start from what is immediately given in a political economic field, namely quantities which are different.

Money [*argent*] in the capitalist system appeared to us last year as a system of these quantities of different powers. Where money [*argent*] intervenes as structure of financing, I would say the quantity is of power X, and where it concerns money taken as means of payment, let's put money taken as quantity of power I. It is not the same money that is endowed with a purchasing power and that constitutes the capital of a society. It is not the same 'money' [*argent*] which is money [*monnaie*] and which is capital.³⁷ All the economists know this since the question of the economy since the crisis is: how to create capital with only a little money [*monnaie*], or even, at the limit, without money [*monnaie*] [*missing word*]. The problem of Nazism – see Faye's book – the economic problem of Doctor Schacht was: how is it possible to make capital without money?³⁸ Now, money [*argent*] as purchasing power at your disposal, which is a medium of exchange, – if it is true that use-value³⁹ is second in relation to exchange-value, exchange-value itself is second in relation to something else, namely the differential relations between quantities of different powers, between irreducible quantities of powers.

These two irreducible forms of money [*argent*], I said last year that they have a fictive homogeneity which is guaranteed by the banking system, which is guaranteed by the central bank. And what we will see in the case of Nazism is how, at the moment they wanted to de-index capital from gold, they precisely had to bring about a whole system of discounting and re-discounting, operations of discounting and multiple discounting, precisely in order to guarantee this play of quantities of power that are absolutely different, money [*monnaie*] as structure of financing and money [*monnaie*] as means of payment: And that is what I want to say: money as means of payment is thus money as exchange-value and through which exchange occurs; money as structure of financing is absolutely not that; money as structure of financing is, since Keynes, the object of creation and destruction. It is creation and destruction. And even when, for example, you have a monetary mass which remains constant,

for example of 1000 over two years, that does not mean at all that, as the classical economists said, the monetary mass has stayed constant, it means that there have been creations of money and destructions of money which would be equivalent to each other, which is absolutely different; but money as structure of financing never ceases to be traversed by movements of creation and destruction. It is money as means of payment that is determined by its status as a means of exchange.

Here I am sticking to – and this is why I’m making progress in my analysis – it may seem slight, but I’m just sticking to our thing about there being two flows. I was saying that two flows [*flux*] are needed when something flows [*coule*]. The other day, for the alcoholic, it was his flow of masturbation and his flow of writing. Here, at the level of the body of capital, there are indeed two flows; it’s two flows, in some relation, it’s the flow of money as structure of financing and the flow of money as exchange-value or means of payment. This thing interests me a lot, because, if you recall the analysis of the drunken crisis last time⁴⁰, – and I don’t care whether it’s money [*argent*] or it’s rot or it’s sperm; but if I don’t care whether it’s one or the other, it is not at all at the level of a dumb metaphorical system of equivalences of the psychoanalytic genre, it’s at the level of this: in any case, it’s the abstract machine which is at play in both cases, independently of the quality of the flows. In any case, you will have a minimum of two flows which stream on a body without organs; you have a system of completely fictive equivalences guaranteed by the play of the banks, the play of discounting and re-discounting; what matters is that two flows being given, one is necessarily more deterritorialized than the other; and there, it is obvious that in this case with my two flows of money, money as means of payment, means of exchange, purchasing power, it’s the same thing: you receive at the end of the month a wage, this wage corresponds to a purchasing power, to a means of exchange ... [*Interruption of the recording*]

... it can only be understood in its relationship with a flow of a radically different power [*puissance*] and which it is not a power [*puissance*] of purchasing power [*pouvoir d’achat*], is not a power of exchange, but is a power which surpasses us because of the very instruments of the capitalist machine, because of capitalism itself – namely a power of a completely different nature, of creation-destruction, the structure of financing.

Therefore, that exchange is by nature unequal, there is no need to explain it within the circuit of exchange. You only have to see that the flow of exchange which presupposes money as purchasing power, derives from a differential relation with a flow of a completely different power, from which it receives, by nature, a fundamentally unequal character. In this case, there is always one of the two flows which plays the deterritorialized-deterritorializing role, which comes to the same, and which, as a result, is like the dominant one, or the one that envelopes the other. In this case, there is no need to continue, as Gobard says, that goes without saying.

What does that mean, *wages–purchasing power*? It is precisely exchange. In capitalism, it is the means by which one reterritorializes wages, the fixed wage, demands for an increase in wages ... You see, all the processes of reterritorialization in the capitalist system – namely with your wages, you will go and buy yourself your little house, you will buy your fridge ... I’m not being ironic here: I am defining processes of territoriality and reterritorialization that we know well. And the demand for wages is reterritorialization within the framework of the trade union; there is a whole chain of territorialities: the family, purchasing power, the party, the union, which play on this flow of money to the power I, namely what goes in and what comes out of the wallet of a worker or of a non-worker, which is defined as wealth or as

poverty, and which is therefore a flow of a certain nature – this is what is assumed by exchange and which already includes inequality. The other, the flow of structure of financing, object of creation and destruction which is capital, in opposition, if you like, to money [*monnaie*] as purchasing power – because ultimately, a capital is not realizable. It is only realizable in one case, that of bankruptcy, when it ceases to be capital. An enterprise does not realize its capital. I am not saying that capital exhausts the structure of financing, I'm saying that capital forms part of money [*argent*] as structure of financing. There are other things which form part of it: for example: State subsidies, for example: investments, but these things are never realizable here and now, and it is at their level that the creations-destructions of money [*monnaie*] take place, which involves, through concrete mechanisms: banks, emissions of money [*monnaie*].

Although a monetary mass can remain constant, that does not prevent it from being constantly and several times renewed, several times created and several times destroyed. Now, it is obvious that this is deterritorialized money [*argent*] because it fundamentally rests on a play of multiple inscriptions, on a play of discount and re-discount, and it is even because it is so deterritorialized that it can intervene several times. We would have to get in a specialist to explain to us the relationship between the contemporary economy, the American economy, and the Nazi economy, because there is at least something in common; it is that in a given time, the same sum is used several times; that is how one can make capital with very little money [*monnaie*]. The same sum serves several times through the play of discounts and re-discounts over a period of time where the same sum intervenes at several levels. Now, in the mechanism of the contemporary economy, in the case of a rather mysterious entity like Euro-dollars, this is also very clear: it is precisely a system where a single sum will intervene several times by way of a play of writings, effecting an auto-accumulation. Here, you have the example of a form of money [*argent*], at the limit deterritorialized – it's called Euro-dollars, which implies all the same that there is, within the very movement of deterritorialization, something like territorial anchoring points, like points of reterritorialization which will prepare other flows: the territorial flow of money as purchasing power. Now, I say that it is the deterritorialized flow, creation-destruction, of power X and the other flow, the territorial flow of purchasing power, which constitutes the whole basic economic system, and not at all exchange.

A student: [*Indistinct words*]

Deleuze: What do you do with coins [*sous*]? You exchange them; it is not the money [*argent*] which itself is more territorialized, it is that in its very use, it is a means of exchange, and that what you exchange it for is by nature territorializing. Either you hoard your money, and you make a territorial usage of it, or you exchange it for objects, and these objects form your environment, your territory. While capital as structure of financing is if need be territorialized to the extent that it is attached to such and such an enterprise, the day that no longer works – it no longer works in the East, so let's head off to the South. The mobility of capital is the measure of its deterritorialization; although one should not exaggerate, there are indices of territoriality in structures of financing: for example, a given territory will make a call. And they make territorial appeals to capital under what form? They will say for example: look how cheap our labour is. So it's through that, the territorial characteristics of money as means of payment, that the indices of territoriality are established in capital as structure of financing, which by itself is deterritorialized; and if that does not work at some location, a well-known phenomenon takes place: capital flight. One must not be surprised that there are movements of capital flight, it is in the very nature of capital. What is surprising is that capital stays still,

but it only rests in appearance since, once again, when a monetary mass remains constant, it is only in appearance that there is constancy of mass; in fact, there is a series of creations and destructions at the end of which you find the same abstract quantity. But in fact, it has not ceased moving.

I just want to conclude on this: there is no question of making the genesis of anything whatsoever by starting with statements that start from the circuit of exchange. Moreover, starting from the circuit of exchange, it is not surprising that Baudrillard discovers castration: starting from the circuit of exchange you will never engender anything but statements of the Poujadist type. You will never engender the least master statement, the least dominant statement of a social formation, you will only engender platitudinous statements of everyday life. What is generative of statements is the differential relation between the flows of quantities of irreducible powers, and it is in the separation and interplay of these flows that statements will be produced. And I am announcing, for what follows, that this seems to me a key to the question that Faye sets himself, namely how were Nazi statements produced at a certain time? We will see that it is not according to this general formula, but that it is according to a variant of this general formula that these were produced.

I summarise. The genesis of statements that Baudrillard proposes comes down to this: what would be productive of statements is a subject, it is the subject. Now from the moment one says that, the trick is already played, there is nothing to claw back: as soon as one says that, it means a subject split into subject of the statement and subject of enunciation; now this splitting, otherwise named castration, is not what produces statements, but what prevents the production of statements.

Secondly, he promised to show us how desire invested the social economic field, and he promised this to us by announcing to us a genesis of sign-value starting from exchange value. Now this attempt leads to the restoration of a simple money-phallus parallelism, and which, on the other hand, is in principle impossible, because exchange-value is absolutely no more primary than use-value. And, finally, it is not by chance that, within the framework of his system, the true model of the capitalist object for him is the gadget; this is linked to the two things just mentioned. The only positive thing we have retained is the idea that statements always presuppose a field of flows, on condition that these flows do not presuppose once more an exchangeist circuit but presuppose flows on condition that these flows are considered as quantities affected with different powers, in such a manner that one of the flows can always be assigned as deterritorializing, and the other as territorial.

It is perhaps in this way that we will see more concretely how the production of statements is made ... [*End of recording*]

Notes

¹ Either Deleuze is referring to an unrecorded part of Session 3 (14 May 1973) of this Seminar, or to an intervening, unrecorded session that would presumably have taken place on 21 May 1973; cf. footnote 40 below.

² The *École freudienne* was a psychoanalytic institutional body founded in 1964 by Jacques Lacan (and dissolved in 1980).

³ Probably a reference to the work of the 'Circle of Epistemology' [*Cercle d'épistémologie*], published in the journal *Cahiers pour l'Analyse* from 1966-1969.

⁴ *Pulsion* is often translated as ‘drive’; *pulsionnel* can be translated as ‘instinctual’ or ‘impulsive’; however, there is a case for the coinage ‘pulsional’, to denote ‘what appertains to drives’. The term *pulsionnel* is frequently used in the French psychoanalytic theory of the time (and in philosophical commentaries on it).

⁵ Louis Hjelmslev, *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*, translated by Francis J. Whitfield, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969 [1943].

⁶ Jean Baudrillard, ‘The Art Auction: Sign Exchange and Sumptuary Value’, in *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* [*Pour une critique de l'économie politique du signe*] (translated by Charles Levin, St. Louis: Telos Press, 1981 [1972]).

⁷ The recent book by Foucault is presumably *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (translated by A.M. Sheridan-Smith, London: Tavistock, 1972 [1969]), which takes up and re-evaluates Foucault’s own work in *History of Madness* (translated by Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa, London: Routledge, 2006 [1961]) and *The Birth of the Clinic* (translated by A.M. Sheridan, London: Tavistock Publications, 1973 [1963]).

⁸ Jean-Pierre Faye, *Langages totalitaires* [*Totalitarian Languages*] (Paris: Hermann, 1972). In the fifth recorded session of the current Seminar Deleuze also refers to Faye’s *Théorie du récit* [*Theory of Narrative*], subtitled *Introduction aux ‘Langages totalitaires’* (Paris: Hermann, 1972). In *A Thousand Plateaus*, there are several references to these works, as well as to a collection of essays, *La Critique du langage et son économie* [*The Critique of Language and its Economy*] (Paris: Galilée, 1973); *A Thousand Plateaus* (translated by Brian Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988 [1980]), pp. 82, 139, 231, 536 n.11, 570, n. 62.

⁹ Félix Guattari, ‘Causality, Subjectivity and History’, translated by Rosemary Sheed in *Psychoanalysis and Transversality* (South Pasadena, California: Semiotext(e), 2015).

¹⁰ Jean Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, op. cit., note 8 above.

¹¹ Here Deleuze is possibly referring to the first section of Baudrillard’s chapter on ‘The Art Auction’ in *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, ‘The Other Face of Political Economy’, where the logic of “material production” is subordinated to a “logic of sumptuary values” primarily involving “sign values” (pp. 112-116). Cf. Chapter Three, ‘Fetishism and Ideology: The Semiological Reduction’, pp. 88-90 on the difference between material production and ideological production. Cf. also Chapter Nine, ‘Requiem for the Media’, p. 166 n.5, where the notion of production itself is put into question. Baudrillard subsequently ratchets up his critique of the notion of production in *The Mirror of Production* (translated by Mark Poster, St. Louis: Telos Press, 1975 [1973]), pp. 17-51, where Deleuze’s own valorization of production is in turn targeted (p. 17).

¹² Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, Chapter Two, ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’: “We should refer at this point to Veblen, who, even if he posited the logic of differentiation more in terms of individuals than of classes, of prestige interaction rather than of exchange structure, nevertheless offers in a way far superior to those who have followed him and who have pretended to surpass him the discovery of a principle of total social analysis, the basis of a radical logic, in the mechanisms of differentiation. This is not a superadded, contextual variable, situationally given, but a relational variable of structure” (p. 76). On Veblen, cf. also *For a Critique*, Chapter One, ‘Sign-Function and Class Logic’, p. 31.

¹³ Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, Chapter Two, ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’, p. 76; translation modified.

¹⁴ The notion of ‘sign exchange value’ is introduced at the beginning of Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, in Chapter One, ‘Sign-Function and Class Logic’, pp. 29-32. On ‘sign value’, see Chapter Two, ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’, p. 65; on ‘sign form’, see Chapter Five, ‘The Art Auction’, p. 112.

¹⁵ Baudrillard, *For a Critique of a Political Economy of the Sign*, Chapter Five, ‘The Art Auction’, pp. 115-120.

¹⁶ Baudrillard, *For a Critique of a Political Economy of the Sign*, Chapter Eleven, ‘Concerning the Fulfillment of Desire in Exchange Value’, pp. 204-212.

¹⁷ On the ‘bar’ between signifier and signified, see Jacques Lacan, ‘The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious’, *Écrits*, translated by Bruce Fink et al., New York: W.W. Norton, 2006 [1966]), pp. 497-504 (French pagination).

¹⁸ Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, ‘Toward a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign’, p. 161-162, n. 19.

¹⁹ Baudrillard, ‘The Body, or the Mass Grave of Signs’ [*Le corps ou le charnier de signes*], first published in *Topique*, no. 9-10, 1972, then reprinted in *L'échange symbolique et la mort* (*Symbolic Exchange and Death*, translated by Iain Hamilton Grant, London: Sage Publications, 1993 [1976]).

²⁰ The basis for Deleuze’s statement is to be found at the beginning of the third paragraph of ‘The Body’: “In this fundamental schema, analogous to that of the linguistic sign, castration is *signified* (it passes into the state of a sign) and therefore subject to misrecognition [*méconnaissance*].” (p. 100). See footnote 25 below for the full passage.

²¹ Baudrillard, *For a Critique of a Political Economy of the Sign*, ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’, p. 69.

²² Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, p. 69, note 6: “Desire, on the other hand, is signified throughout an entire chain of signifiers. And when it happens to be a desire for something experienced as lost, when it is a lack, an absence on which the objects that signify it have come to be inscribed, does it make any sense to treat such objects literally, as if they were merely what they are? And what can the notion of need possibly refer to, in these circumstances?” (translation modified) (« *Le désir, lui, se signifie au long de toute une chaîne de signifiants. Et du moment où il est désir de quelque chose de perdu, où il est manque, absence sur laquelle viennent s'inscrire les objets qui la signifient — que peut bien vouloir dire prendre les objets pour ce qu'ils sont? Que signifie la notion de besoin?* »).

²³ Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, p. 101-102: “Fashion, advertising, nude-look, nude theatre, strip-tease: the play-script of erection and castration is everywhere. It has an absolute variety and an absolute monotony. Ankle boots and thigh boots, a short coat under a long coat, over the elbow gloves and stocking-tops on the thigh, hair over the eyes or the stripper's G-string, but also bracelets, necklaces, rings, belts, jewels and chains the scenario is the same everywhere: a mark that takes on the force of a sign and thereby even a perverse erotic function, a boundary to figure castration which *parodies* castration as the symbolic articulation of *lack*, under the structural form of a bar articulating two *full* terms (which then on either side play the part of the signifier and the signified in the classical economy of the sign). The bar makes a zone of the body work as its corresponding terms here. This is not an erogenous zone at all, but an erotic, eroticised zone, a fragment erected into the phallic signifier of a sexuality that has become a pure and simple concept, a pure and simple signified. // In this fundamental schema, analogous to that of the linguistic sign, castration is *signified* (it passes into the state of a sign) and therefore subject to misrecognition. The nude and the not-nude play in a structural opposition and thus contribute to the *designation* of the fetish. The image of the stocking top on the thigh derives its erotic potential not from the proximity of the real genital and its *positive* promise (from this naïve functionalist perspective, the naked thigh would have to play the same role), but from the apprehension surrounding the genitals (the panic of recognising castration) being *arrested in a staged castration*. The innocuous mark, the line of the stocking above which, instead of lack, ambivalence and the chasm, there is nothing more than a sexual plenitude. The naked thigh and, metonymically, the entire body has become a *phallic effigy* by means of this caesura, a fetishistic object to be contemplated and manipulated, deprived of all its menace. As in fetishism, desire can then be fulfilled at the cost of warding off castration and the death drive.”

²⁴ Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, p. 102: “The bar is always there as the clothes come off, signalling the emergence of the body as phallus.”

²⁵ Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, p. 102: “The body is not arranged into masculine or feminine symbols: at a much deeper level, it is the site of the drama and the denial of castration” (cf. p. 104). Baudrillard bases his ideas here on Freud's theory of fetishism (in particular, the 1927 paper ‘Fetishism’, translated by James Strachey et al., *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press, 1955, Vol. 21). In an earlier essay, ‘Fetishism and Ideology: The Semiological Reduction’ (first published in the *Objets du fétichisme* [Objects of fetishism] issue of the *Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse*, No. 2, Autumn 1970), Baudrillard develops a similar line of thought: “[T]he perverse psychological structure of the fetishist is organized, in the fetish object, around a mark, around the abstraction of a mark that negates, bars and exorcises the difference of the sexes” (p. 92). Baudrillard is also here developing ideas about castration, fetishism and the phallus from Lacanian psychoanalytic theory. One possible source of Baudrillard's idea that the woman's body itself ends up functioning as both a ‘fetish’ and a ‘phallus’ can be found in Lacan, ‘The Signification of the Phallus’ (*Écrits*, p. 694, French pagination).

²⁶ Cf. the second section of Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, on ‘Secondary Nudity’, or fetishised nudity (pp. 104-107).

²⁷ Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, p. 105: “The tights in which ‘you are more naked than is natural [*au naturel*]”’. Cf. p. 121, n.2.

²⁸ Cf. Baudrillard, ‘The Body’, p. 105: “The James Bond film *Goldfinger* provides a perfect example of this [‘secondary nudity’]. In it, a woman is painted in gold, all her orifices are blocked up in a radical make-up, making her body a flawless phallus (that the make-up should be gold only emphasises the homology with political economy), which of course amounts to death. The nude gold-varnished playgirl will die by having incarnated to an absurd extent the phantasm of the erotic, but this is the case for every skin in functional aesthetics, in the mass culture of the body. ‘Body hugging’ tights, girdles, stockings, gloves, dresses and clothes, not to mention sun-tans: the *leitmotiv* of the ‘second skin’ and the transparent pellicle always come to vitrify the body.”

²⁹ The first use of the term ‘symbolic value’ in *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* occurs in ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’, p. 65, where it is related to the example of the gift, which had been discussed at the beginning of the book in the first essay, ‘Sign Function and Class Logic’, pp. 30-31, in the context of ‘symbolic exchange’.

³⁰ Cf. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, ‘The Ideological Genesis of Needs’, p. 65: “The ambivalence of all symbolic exchange material (looks, objects, dreams, excrement) derives from this; the gift is a medium of relation *and* distance; it is always love and aggression”. Cf. p. 66.

³¹ Possibly a reference to the opening sentence of ‘The Body’: “The entire contemporary history of the body is the history of its demarcation, the network of marks and signs that have since covered it, divided it up, annihilated its difference and its radical ambivalence in order to organise it into a structural material for sign-exchange [...]” (p. 101).

³² Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, ‘The Art Auction: Sign Exchange and Sumptuary Value’, pp. 115-120.

³³ Jean Baudrillard, *The System of Objects* (translated by James Benedict, London: Verso Books 1996 [1968]), Section C, ‘The Metafunctional Dysfunctional System: Gadgets and Robots’, pp. 109-133. Baudrillard also uses the term *machin*, translated as ‘gizmo’. On the ‘schizo-functional’ world of gadgets and gizmos, cf. p. 113; on gizmos and machines, cf. pp. 114-118: “The word ‘machine’, in becoming applicable to the realm of social labor, has acquired a precise enough generic sense; as recently as the late eighteenth century, however, it had much the same meaning as ‘gizmo’ [*machin*] today” (p. 115).

³⁴ Arghiri Emmanuel, *Unequal Exchange: A Study in the Imperialism of Trade* (translated by Brian Pearce, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972 [1969]).

³⁵ Samir Amin, *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment* (translated by Brian Pearce, 2. Vols combined, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974 [1970]).

³⁶ Cf. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (translated by Paul Patton, London: Athlone Press, 1994 [1968]), p. 174: “Calculus considers only those magnitudes where at least one is of a power superior to another.”

³⁷ The French distinction between *argent* and *monnaie* is sometimes mapped onto the English distinction between ‘money’ and ‘currency’, and in this and the following sentence such a transposition would have its advantages. However, in the following paragraphs, Deleuze seems to use *argent* as a neutral term for money, and to specify two forms of *monnaie*: money as financing structure (which is said to include capital) and money as means of payment (or purchasing power). Since ‘currency’ is not synonymous with ‘means of payment’, it is not used here for *monnaie*. This makes rendering the present sentence awkward, and the makeshift solution of putting quote marks around ‘money’ for *argent* has been chosen. In any case, it is not clear whether Deleuze’s uses of *argent* and *monnaie* are systematically differentiated.

³⁸ See Jean-Pierre Faye, *Langages totalitaires*, pp. 664-676 (cited in *A Thousand Plateaus*, pp. 570-571, n. 62), where the secret economic plan of Hjalmar Schacht, the president of the German Central Bank in the first years of Nazi rule, to fund German rearmament through the system of ‘Mefo bills’, is discussed. Deleuze returns to this topic in the fifth recorded session of this Seminar, taking up Faye’s account of the complex relationship between the movements of the Nazi economy and the ‘narrative’ level of political statements.

³⁹ The transcript has *valeur d’échange* (‘exchange value’), but *valeur d’usage* (‘use-value’) would make more sense.

⁴⁰ There is no discussion of a case of alcoholism or a “drunken crisis” in the transcript of the third recorded session (14 May 1973) of this Seminar, therefore (see footnote 1 above), either the discussion occurred in an unrecorded part of that session, or Deleuze’s remark refers to an unrecorded intervening session.