

**Gilles Deleuze – The Deleuze Seminars (deleuze.cla.purdue.edu), summaries: Charles J. Stivale**

**On *Anti-Oedipus* I, 1971-72**

[All dates approximate]

**Session 1  
November 16, 1971**

Deleuze had already spent one academic year (1970-71) and possibly even part of the previous year considering key elements that would appear in *Anti-Oedipus*, which was published in early 1972. Here Deleuze lays out material from *Anti-Oedipus* chapter four, notably the grounds for the important tasks of schizo-analysis, in contrast to traditional psychoanalysis, and also returning to the positions developed in “Introduction to Schizo-analysis” (chapter 4). Deleuze connects capitalism directly to schizophrenia, both based on decoded and deterritorialized flows, their identity occurring at the level of the economic process, through a system of conjunction, deterritorializing flows and then tying together an identity. Responding to student questions, Deleuze explores the internal threats to society, the danger of flows decoding themselves, and he considers competing anthropological explanations of flows and their blockages and possible recourses for continued flows, including sorcery, all of which is swept away by the introduction of money with a new circuit of consumption given that capitalism no longer counts on any code. Deleuze also details the opposition posed by schizo-analysis to psychoanalysis’s introduction of the triangular axiomatic by emphasizing dual dimensions of desire: desiring machines working within the unconscious with no reference to Oedipus or castration, and desire understood in terms of its socio-political investments rather than familial. Hence the three tasks of schizo-analysis: the first destructive task, countering the Oedipal and castrating structures; a first positive task, a functional analysis of desiring machines; and a second positive task, understanding the investment of desiring machines in the social machines.

**Session 2  
December 14, 1971**

As previously, this session begins in progress, and its brief length indicates that this only a fragment of a longer session. Deleuze starts by suggesting the need to define flows more clearly in order to render an initial system of concepts related to flows and their interruption as social investment of desire. Deleuze’s development yields additional concepts, in rates of transformation, sectors, and stocks, and he indicates that the utility of stocks varies with each case, and yet they maintain linkages through flows which yield movements of value between the poles (cf. *Anti-Oedipus* ch. III, sections 9 & 10). Deleuze proposes to focus on the notion of break-flow, a notion emerging both as a break-subtraction of flow and break-detachment of code, which Deleuze calls the mechanism of delirium in the double schizz operation. Deleuze suggests that the economic operation of coding flows entails the double break-flow operations, with capitalism’s formation as madness in its pure state, yet also the opposite of madness, at once producing decoded flows, and yet establishing itself on that which terrified all other social

formations. Here lies the deep link between capitalism and schizophrenia, the decoding of flows, yet also capitalism's harsh repression of madness for this very reason. Deleuze then shifts to a detailed historical presentation of this unfolding linkage, starting with Marx's depiction of the Asiatic state, demonstrating the radical contingency of capital's formation, its generalized decoding of flows yet also an apparatus for conjugating such flows. The session ends with an interruption as Deleuze, describing the merchant capitalists' seizure of production by turning associations of producers into sub-contractors, follows Marx toward a second aspect of this movement, which is cut off.

### **Session 3** **December 21, 1971**

Deleuze considers psychoanalysis as related to economics, predominantly material from chapters II and III. He begins with social investments of the unconscious, particularly as related to libidinal investments, a linkage disconnected by Freud, whereas for schizo-analysis, the libido's primary function is to fuel the social field's unconscious investments of desire, and schizo-analysis emphasizes rich-and-poor as apprehension of class struggle by unconscious desire, as a nonfamilial Other, thus rendering the family exterior to this process. Deleuze maintains that the traditional perspective is a race towards death, desire choked off, and the Oedipal framework focusing on the triangle father-mother-me, thereby creating an Oedipal-narcissist machine, eliding any fourth term (which would be the phallus, missing in place). Deleuze focuses on how Freud constructed this emphasis on familialism and toward the death drive, comparing this construction to how certain proponents of anti-psychiatry remain stuck in familialism, emphasizing the need to sever the linkage between desire and the family. Shifting to an economic perspective, Deleuze emphasizes the fundamental linkage between schizophrenia and the capitalist machine's schizo mode of functioning, and he recalls the previous session's discussion of the schizo's channeling of decoded flows in contrast to the neurotic's grounding within Oedipal recoding. Deleuze pursues an economic analysis of the two heterogeneous flows, constant capital and variable capital, as mechanisms of capitalism, leading to the distinction of money of exchange and credit money. After an unspecified question about economics, the truncated session ends with Deleuze raising additional distinctions about the types of money in banking circuit and the credit domain.

### **Session 4** **January 18, 1972**

This extremely fragmentary session consists mainly of two responses by Deleuze to student questions and also of Deleuze's reiteration of the three tasks of schizo-analysis. The first question concerns the axes of code and axiomatics proposed by Deleuze, then desire's investment of the social field, and also the investment of the social field by desiring machines. While the first positive task of schizo-analysis is to reach the lines of flight of the unconscious, he recognizes that all investments are necessarily molar or social. Hence the second task, discovering how social investments function at the level of the unconscious, and he notes that this usually requires recognizing how desiring machines are repressed by molar apparatuses of the State or the family. Another question concerns the Schreber case, whether the social

investment takes several generations for the paranoiacs to be established. Deleuze points to several approaches (anti-psychiatry; Lacan) toward this aspect, and he considers such chicken-or-egg questions difficult but necessary, yet provided one avoids the indefinite familial reduction. Deleuze manages to express a certain hope that rather than ultimately reterritorializing on artificial land, the movement of deterritorialization might create a new earth. The session ends with Deleuze disagreeing with a student's Lacanian emphasis who insists that the generational question is relevant, to be pursued the following week.

### **Session 5** **January 25, 1972**

In yet another fragmentary session, solely with responses by Deleuze to students' questions, first, regarding contrasts between community psychiatry versus institutional analysis, which includes group psychotherapy, shifting the focus briefly to reflect on which writers present a perverted text (Raymond Roussel, who invents a territoriality and group) versus a psychotic text (Antonin Artaud). To another query about what authentic reterritorialization would be, Deleuze sidesteps this to ask whether deterritorialization might create a new land [*nouvelle terre*], but the transcript omits his complete response. Responding to a student who seems to see "the real as sexed", Deleuze agrees but also opens this possibility to bisexuality, and he maintains that the main distribution point arises in the human representation of sexuality culminating in the phallus as principle, this representation being an illusion that consciousness forms about the unconscious. To a proposal that one can still think difference as life and death, as real otherness, Deleuze considers the death drive as a Freudian trick, but he also argues that one would need to discuss the relationship of death and desiring machines. This discussion continues actively between several students with Deleuze, but ultimately Deleuze interprets the comments as agreeing with his own, i.e., desexualization as the operation whereby some portion of the libido is desexualized and moves over to the death drive, hence a middle term through which the libido passes while moving toward other investments. The session's fragmentary nature is confirmed as it ends in mid-sentence with a student speaking.

### **Session 6** **February 15, 1972**

Another session starting in progress focuses initially on the intersection of psychoanalytical concepts with Marxist analysis, hence material developed in chapter III of *Anti-Oedipus*, but also the framework of schizo-analysis already proposed in previous sessions. Deleuze continues to insist on understanding the unconscious rather in terms of political economy, and specifically concerning "objectities", i.e. the objects to which economists attached importance for wealth (land for the Physiocrats, the State for mercantilists). As capitalism functions through the axiomatic, always reterritorializing, it matters little if one believes in this assemblage; it still functions through the real flow of finance and revenues, in both domains. Hence, Deleuze considers the psychoanalytical reliance on figures such as Oedipus, i.e., on tragedy and myths, and following a student's comments, Deleuze adds Claude Lévi-Strauss to the Freud-Ricardo duo, notably his discovery in ethnology of the incest prohibition which he reinserts into the system of lineage. Following a missing segment, Deleuze's focus jumps to how intensities

function at a cellular level, with trips and passages, the egg's movement similar to the schizo's stroll, i.e., becomings in intensity. Here Artaud serves as stating that the organism is the enemy of the body without organs, whereas the schizo stroll encompasses passages through zones, and Deleuze again proposes the egg as this pre-organic, undifferentiated zone of intensity from which the extensive migration proceeds. To another query regarding Deleuze sharing with Lacan the idea that a structure only functions as a machinic element and not a structural element, Deleuze argues that this is evident in the context of analysis where the analyst, rather than invent these structures, confirms them, whereas the unconscious ignores Oedipus and castration entirely which are conscious projections on the unconscious. The session ends abruptly, presumably with the recording excluding additional discussion.

### **Session 7** **February 22, 1972**

Beginning in progress, the session continues Deleuze's reflections on socio-economic theories under capitalism and their relationship to schizophrenia and psychoanalysis, with the session's main topic being the structure and status of flows in the capitalist State. Deleuze addresses how flows traverse the monetary body without organs by considering the "system of immanence" of capitalist society, specifically how the libido invests flows in a social field, linked to the collective and unconscious investments in this very social field. The first aspect addressed is the system of differential relations between decoded flows (the axiomatic's very definition), on the levels of industrial capital, financial capital, and merchant capital. Raising a second aspect, Deleuze emphasizes the infinite nature of accumulation, labor's flow ceaselessly deterritorialized, capital's flows ceaselessly decoded, capitalism gleefully extending its machine to its limit only in the schizo flow, schizophrenia as the limit of capitalism's decoding and deterritorializing. This process corresponds to how Deleuze understands the axiomatic's mode of functioning and argues that all axiomatics are the means of drawing science into the capitalist market as abstract, decoded Oedipuses. Deleuze locates such abstract Oedipal expressions in art and music, providing a detailed analysis of Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, concluding that in art, Oedipus can cause awful expressions of the great phallus-Oedipus-anus trilogy. Deleuze returns to distinctions between codes and flows: whereas the codes in the primitive machine can only be composed in their indirect relations as finite blocs, not the same as flows, the axiomatic reveals no quality of flows outside their relations, with capitalism inventing the infinite on the economic level, and the axiomatic being a finite operation working on infinite matter. Whereas psychoanalysis initially applies the social axiomatic, at once capitalism's social coordinates regarding subjectivity, Deleuze suggests that psychoanalysis sought to impose its own axiomatic, or finite principles, hence a structural Oedipus, again, the axiomatic initiating formal relations between fluid quantities. He concludes in response to a student question about the body without organs under capitalism which encompasses money as a tool and thereby causes something to be produced, to flow.

### **Session 8** **March 7, 1972**

After reviewing points from the previous session regarding the capitalist machine's three aspects of the system of immanence as well as presenting the five differences between codes and axiomatics, Deleuze argues that under capitalism, a new regime of alliance emerges with filiation as the operation through which capital produces money as industrial capital and continues to expand its schizo-limit through two sorts of displacement. Deleuze considers different examples from ethnography (researched by Robert Jaulin and Victor Turner) and then, after an unrecorded discussion concerning the Pierre Overney affair, he shifts focus to the intersections of capitalist economics and psychoanalysis. He refers to the role played by Christianity and its trick of placing subjects under the regime of infinite interiorized debt, with a pole of the despotic formation and a pole with the regime of immanence under capitalism. He links these poles to the death drive in the successive social formations, and he concludes that with capitalism, death is decoded. The session is interrupted as Deleuze refers to Freud belief that the death drive is transcendent and silent.

## **Session 9**

### **April 12, 1972**

While the transcript of this final session of seminar 1 is divided into two specific parts, the second section (bearing the title "The body without organs") seems incomplete given its brevity. With Deleuze returning to session 6's discussion of Marx's analysis of bourgeois political economy and to analyses from sessions 7 and 8, this session serves in many ways as a review of the intersections between psychoanalysis and political economy, hence material corresponding to both to chapters I and III of *Anti-Oedipus*. Following Marx, Deleuze says that a new form of realienation occurred for economy, within conditions of private property, i.e. wealth as the generalized activity of production detached from any object, and subjective essence realienated in a system of subjective representation for desire. The coordinates for desire determined as libido are within the familial act, specifically Oedipal coordinates, suggesting that in this shift, psychoanalysts created an entirely ambiguous relationship with myth and tragedy, a new reterritorialized form emerging either as the bourgeois family or bourgeois private property. Deleuze outlines two steps in this process: on one hand, human beings that furnish a labor force gain an abstract equality insofar as such individuals and the family gain a theoretically equal value from the perspective of capital's reproduction. On the other hand, social reproduction creates an overlap between economic and political figures and specifically familial figures. Under the capitalism's axiomatic, psychoanalysis becomes the necessary application corresponding to capitalism's political economy, three aspects of which Deleuze outlines. Deleuze concludes this first part of the session by considering how psychoanalysis reveals its own ambition of constituting its own axiomatic, at once in direct relation to the real, but also breaking with political economy. In the brief final section, Deleuze returns to discuss the body without organs as an intensive matrix, crisscrossed by flows, notably delirium crossing thresholds of intensity and between thresholds. He then begins to outline this process on four kinds of body without organs (masochistic, addicted, schizophrenic, hysterical). For the masochist body, the intensity is that of pain; for the addicted body, the intensity is that of cold and heat; as for the schizo and hysterical bodies, Deleuze seems to liken these to the egg's systems of coordinates, and he closes this final fragment with discussion of the intensive grids and flows of the egg's topology.

