
The Body Without Organs in Schizoanalysis

Chloe Kolyri National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Abstract

Félix Guattari spent his entire working life at La Borde psychiatric clinic where a radicalised form of psychoanalysis, ‘schizoanalysis’, was applied, based on the theory that emerged in *Anti-Oedipus* and was elaborated in *A Thousand Plateaus*. In the medium of this non-Oedipalised therapeutic plane lies the ‘body without organs (BwO), a body not fully organised but open to every form of expression and metamorphosis. The ideas and practice involved in schizoanalysis, which have now been in effect for fifty years in every social and cultural field, have produced a new hybrid of Lacanian analysis and schizoanalysis, with the recent queering psychoanalysis expanding further the revolutionary character of the latter. The general logic and the determinate ideas of *A Thousand Plateaus* were applied as a reciprocal presupposition between content and form: free expression, interconnectedness, becoming-woman and -imperceptible, a deterritorialisation of models, roles and relations.

Keywords: mechanic unconscious, desiring production, queer, Oedipalisation, full body, schizoid

I. Introduction

Felix Guattari spent all his working life in La Borde psychiatric clinic, where schizoanalysis as a nomadic and minor science emerged. The impact of schizoanalysis, as the radicalisation of Oedipal psychoanalysis, was apparent in both therapeutic processes and the theorisation

Deleuze and Guattari Studies 14.3 (2020): 481–506

DOI: 10.3366/dlgs.2020.0413

© Edinburgh University Press

www.euppublishing.com/dlgs

of mental illness. The experience of working at La Borde with schizoanalysis as a fully abstract machine had serious consequence for participants and shaped their social and therapeutic profiles. The intertwining of schizoanalysis with queer theory subsequently produced a new psychoanalytic hybrid: queering psychoanalysis (q/p). The processes involved were more inclusive for people who have since become transparent to the system. In the medium of that therapeutic plane, in theory and practice, content and form, lies the body without organs, constituting a reversal of the Freudian notion of the death drive as the purpose of life.

II. From Psychoanalysis to Schizoanalysis: Epistemology

Deleuze and Guattari have revolutionised the notion of the unconscious, from the Oedipal to the machinic, and they have radicalised the royal science of psychoanalysis into the nomad science of schizoanalysis. This has had, from the 1970s onwards, a tremendous impact on many aspects of social and cultural life including that of the theorisation of gender and queer.

Many invented ideas, such as becoming-woman, becoming-minoritarian, the non-human sex, and the schizoid as nomadic, were created in *Anti-Oedipus* and elaborated in *A Thousand Plateaus*, published ten years later. Those ideas dynamically affected not only gender studies but post-colonial and comparative literature studies as well. As a hybrid of schizoanalysis, q/p responded to the increasing need to broaden the range of psychoanalytic orthodoxy by extending it to a more inclusive model of truth and meaning, not only for trans and queer but also for the full spectrum of dissidents, disparities and minoritarians, all of whom, until then, had been invisible and imperceptible to psychoanalysis. The mutual distrust and lack of appreciation between psychoanalysis and queer people was a traumatic gap with disastrous consequences for both that would never have been filled if not for schizoanalysis. In fact, the newly established q/p is a form of schizoanalysis, a non-formative process whereby the conscious presses the unconscious and not the other way around (Deleuze and Guattari 1983:371).

In schizoanalysis, gendered desire is formed not Oedipally, through the restoration of that which has been repressed, but from autonomous facets and elements of a 'non-human sex' (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 354). The basis of desire is no longer repressed by law but rather is immanently constituted and mechanically generated everywhere in

gendered and embedded bodies. Deleuze and Guattari reversed the Freudian interpretation of desire as delineated in 'The Unconscious' (Freud 1915a) and rewrote it directly on the surface of the body. In schizoanalysis and q/p, the Lacanian '*réel*' is the body without organs, which will prevail as 'If desire produces its product as real ... The objective being of desire is the Real in and of itself' (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 26–7). The unconscious is now a machine in which the Ego and the Id are in disjunction and conjunction and produce desire in harmony together. Still, for both Freud and Deleuze the fuel that drives the machine is life itself, regardless of the many different names given to it: libido or cathexis in psychoanalysis, *conatus* or *ορεξις* for the Stoics and Spinoza, and the will to survive for Nietzsche. However, in schizoanalysis this universal force in psychoanalysis is not considered an alien, a paragon of failure or distress that must be repressed or transformed into less dangerous equivalents (Freud 1915b). In Freud's speculation on the id or on the Lacanian *réel* respectively, a sexually insatiable or illogical subject cares only about the fulfilment of its pleasure and at the same time is subjected to what lies beyond the pleasure principle (Freud 1920). Thus, death is inaugurated as the higher purpose of life. The *urge for death* and the longing for inexistence, the compulsion to return to the non-organic state, antagonises the instincts of life and survival. In schizoanalysis, life circulates freely through alloplastic, organic and inorganic strata; the only thing that neutralises on a plane of desire, the lines of death, are what increase connections. The conscious and logical Ego confronts the Other and turns him/her into a stranger, an unknown, unreachable by desire and intractable to intersubjectivity. Then, when unconscious urges prevail, the subject is unavoidably attracted to its end; thus, psychic life is negative scoping to its end and with the Other out of reach. In schizoanalysis, everything pursues new connections of creativity. Schizophrenia is the ultimate movement of release from social conventions and the state's machines; that is precisely what eliminates the cancerous and empty bodies, rivals to the Bodies without Organs (BwOs), the body of the schizophrenic artist. Freud's only positivist concession in theorising death as the purpose of life lies in accepting that human beings can nevertheless choose the way they die, which for him equates to their way of living. But this is not enough. Freud, in his meta-psychological period, extrapolated the notion of the unconscious so that it was not only personal but also social and collective, a reservoir of repressed instincts and urges that the civilised person in society keeps at bay at a high cost: *Civilisation and*

Its Discontents (Freud 1927) foreshadowed, in a way, the machinic and socially formulated unconscious in schizoanalysis.

Schizoanalysis was necessary for q/p and for the radical psychoanalysis of today to inform with new subjectivations the form and content of therapy of our times. Counter to what was conceived as being ‘without any substance’ by Lacan, or ‘provisional and mechanical’ in Freud’s ‘Project for a Scientific Psychology’ (1895: 32) – a work that displays Freud’s materialist side – Guattari’s position on the subject is astonishingly ambiguous. In his less well known, but very important, essay *La Révolution Moléculaire* (1977), Guattari dissects the politics of psychiatry by conceiving subjectification in the place of the narcissistic formation of the subject in four functions: material – actant and semiotic fluxes; abstract and concrete machines of Phyla; virtual universes of value; and infinite existential territories, from the Chaosmos. The finite material subject has an unsignified chain of potential freedom to fly in unification with Chaosmos (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 69).

So, counter to the subject of psychoanalysis, constrained in a ‘lack of being’ (Lacan 1991b, Seminar II) and oscillating between a phantasmatic and an equally false super-ego in the form of a logocentric self, there is the nomadic subject of schizoanalysis. Rather than repression as the site of the Oedipal unconscious there is a machinic unconscious; and instead of social and cultural production-based processes of sublimation and the frustration of unaccepted urges, there are social and cultural desiring machines, self-organised and emergent through intertwined psychological processes, but always determined.

The terrain on which this game of epistemological and ethical rupture was enacted was not simply academic amphitheatres, seminars and psychoanalytic societies, but also university aulais, urban spaces, mental hospitals, asylums for the non-privileged, any deterritorialised space ... a mental institution in France called La Borde.

III. La Borde: A Utopia?

On 3 April 1953, at 11 p.m., a group of ninety-one exhausted people arrived and almost filled a quasi-ruined mansion and its deserted garden in Sologne. They had walked 130km from their former institution – a traditional psychiatric unit – sleeping in forests, schools, churches and even maternity units. They numbered seventy-six patients, twelve doctors and several nurses, cooks and administrators, with Dr Jean Oury – a progressive psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, politically positioned on the radical left – at their head. The French

social security system, the SNCF, granted him the estate but without the resources to repair it—so they rebuilt it themselves, with some help from volunteers, autonomous groups and locals. Félix Guattari joined them a little later and stayed for almost all his life. All the teachers in La Borde–Oury, Guattari, Tosquelles—had one thing in common: they were Lacanian psychoanalysts and Marxists. Nevertheless, the schizoanalytic cartographies used in their therapy and administration had the imprint of a third philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche. His critiques of nihilism and ascetics were mapped by schizoanalysis onto libidinal and social economy as the real medium of therapy.

Imagine a place of confinement without walls; in other words, a place where one must protect the inmates and at the same time stay in line with the Outside to keep possible lines of flight open in both directions. A schizoid can keep going in his perambulations even though he is confined to a hospital room; and, most importantly, he can still interact with the community he has just left behind. The Guattari-Deleuzian formula of a nomadic subject following lines of flight without moving was explicated thoroughly in *A Thousand Plateaus*. A paranoiac in an asylum and a potentate of the governing class in a Western metropolis can have similar schizo-desiring productions; the stereotypes and catatonias of the demented duplicate the repeated ad nauseam movements of a worker on a Ford production line; a starving anorexic girl stands next to victims of famine in Africa or the millions of young people eating in fast-food restaurants. All are connected with members of a pious Christian family eating their Sunday dinner of the parcelled body of Christ. The only practical way to determine whether the socius and schizophrenia are interconnected and decoded in their mutual desire is to ascertain whether psychoanalysis is still valid for understanding psychosis outside of its social context and whether it is capable of grasping the psychotic motifs repeated in everyday life.

That was exactly the frame of collective therapeutic endeavours in La Borde; nothing was judged as being out of line before entering the plane. Objective administrative difficulties and abuses of power and security were understood as symptoms of state power; subjective difficulties in transference were invited to be mediated and incorporated into clinical practice. The administration of the institution and the therapeutic alliance followed one simple common rule: *la grille*—the grid. More than a *dispositif*, the grid was an *organogram* of rotating and ever-changing employment, assignments and tasks. A small committee comprising Guattari and few others organised the programme as a true machine of production. Personal skills and wishes were taken into

account but everything else was left to contingency. It was not at all rare to have a cook conducting group psychotherapy or a psychiatrist like myself preparing moussaka in the kitchen. Thus, the therapeutic group was not solely occupied with treatment and psychotherapy but considered all the constitutive economies of the collective: the monetary (physical resources, profit, expenses); the libidinal (Eros in the broader sense); and the linguistic (who was speaking to whom and how that language was constituted). Interpretations as part of therapeutic practice were a very delicate matter; closer to phenomenological hermeneutics than to representations and analogies, and something different that was not a given in the classic psychoanalytic tête-à-tête, they were extracted from the collective assemblages of patients and staff. No distinction was made between people, their status, their assignment, their role; all these were considered entirely circumstantial. The language (*parole et langue*) that was spoken was not a symbolic chain of signifiers but a 'materialist' language, an '*agencement*' of forces, intentions, hazards, haecceities, machinic formations and social techniques; it was not a scientific language but a cartography with many parameters, a place to meet and understand each other. The emerging subject of those collective dimensions was no longer the Lacanian '*moi parlant*', but a speaking and signifying corporeal desiring machine. And what of the schizoanalytic training and supervising that took place not in a state sanatorium or in an elite psychiatric clinic for the privileged, but on the premises of a full psychiatric hospital, La Borde, annexed to the social welfare system? With Guattari on board it was never easy to supersede the Freudian or Lacanian disposition of the doctors, and that included Oury and Guattari. There were three major points where, under critical analysis, all of them referred to the role of the incest taboo in capitalistic production: (1) repression; (2) distortion of desire into a symbolic order, that is, language; and (3) refraction in the *réel* of all real objects and substitution of all of them by their Oedipal equivalents.

For the first time ever, psychoanalysis was competently applied in group psychotherapy for psychotics in a closed psychiatric unit. Psychiatrist or gardener, administrator or nurse, analyst or analysand, each and every one of them, to the last, stood for the whole collective and its nomadic status. This was exactly what happened at La Borde: the transition to a nomadic way of being through schizoanalysis.

At La Borde we moved in circles around bodies. Of course, in our Freudian or Lacanian form we were never encouraged to follow the Cartesian scission of body and mind. What revolutionised medical practice at La Borde was a conceptual system involving psychotherapy,

philosophy, art, ethnology and physical treatment that considered bodies in their full Spinozan meaning: not as exclusively human bodies but as material and immaterial entities circulating in what nature and technology provide—mental conditions, states of affairs alongside material beings, animate like the cook's dog or inanimate like the guitar of chief nurse Carlos, or utensils, spoons and forks from the kitchen that were used to mark rhythm in *ritornello*, *the little refrain* (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 1). Many of us were seriously resistant to adopting the new spirit of group psychotherapy when working with psychotics rather than in analyst—analysand pairs. Everything seemed out of place, out of time, but fully capable of producing ever-changing flows of assemblages that disrupted pre-established therapeutic processes and protocols. Sessions and meetings could take place in the most unexpected sites: the garden, the kitchen, almost anywhere. Given our legendary parity of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts with nurses, patients and staff—although the medical staff had been outstandingly educated, and not only in psychiatry—the therapeutic alliance was not subordinated to one common hierarchical rule. A minor psychiatric science emerged in La Borde. For instance, the folk medicine of native traditions was discussed and fairly critiqued. At Guattari's insistence, there were no emergencies; panic was rationalised in the *bouffée délirante* of the patient that we have all been in. Open traumas were never stitched in haste, our priority being to avoid at all costs making inmates amenable and subdued. The new conception of schizophrenia—as a desiring production misrepresented by capitalism—was in fact formulated on the basis of La Borde before appearing triumphantly in *Anti-Oedipus*.

IV. The Politics of Schizoanalysis

Deleuze explained the general logic of *A Thousand Plateaus* in his famous interview with Catherine Clement (1995): 'It was not a theorization for the use of a Power state but an effect where chance met necessity, contingency and possibility "all spoken" in their own right, it was an assemblage.' Forty years since its publication, the influence of the book on political theory or groups has never been written as a manifesto. Nomadology, the equivalent of schizoanalysis in politics, has never been formulated into a theory per se but has instead been used ad hoc. La Borde was neither a mental institution nor a place of experimental or innovative therapy; it was the ad hoc expression of schizoanalysis; the epitome of all its concepts. A book, in the Deleuzo-Guattarian universe, is a full entity, affecting and affected by others.

Throughout this book, desiring production is seen as equivalent to life itself, with desiring machines working in both the mind and the psyche. The central theme in both schizoanalysis and the political scene of the 1970s was the classic question of De La Boétie: 'Why do people love and fight for their chains?' Every schizoanalytic therapy was centred on dismantling the mathesis and normalisation of self-denial and negation that occurred mainly in the nuclear Oedipal family.

Becoming a schizoanalyst was not about the re-education or reformulation of a medical worker or a Freudian or Lacanian psychoanalyst but was a radical change of perspective towards a 'nomadic analysis'. Felix Guattari and Jean Oury had both been pupils of Lacan. Guattari had been analysed by Lacan himself and was considered by the Société Psychanalytique de Paris (SPP) the heir to his master's throne. However, the political situation and other perspectives increasingly absorbed Guattari's interests. He was involved, in one way or another, in the Front de Libération Nationale (FNL) in the patriotic war in Algeria, Italian autonomy, the Latino-American resurrection and German anarchism. But the reason for his definitive split with Lacan, the second major schism in Lacanian psychoanalysis, was their disagreement on the position of the female in the Oedipus complex. Indeed, the three most prominent analysts in the SPP—Françoise Dolto, our teacher Luce Irigaray and Félix Guattari—all left, finding the general theorisation of woman's psyche in the famous 'other jouissance' an intolerable position. New interpretations of the place of women were underway outside of structuralism: the omission of women from language (Irigaray, 'Speculum of the Other Woman'), woman's primal sexuality (Dolto) and, finally, becoming-woman. The latter is one of the pillars of *A Thousand Plateaus* and the basic doctrine we were taught in schizoanalysis: 'The beginning of every subjectivation is from the woman's side'—a dramatic reversal of the Lacanian doctrine and of 2,000 years of Western gender metaphysics.

Forty years on, I consider the crucial point to have been the political implications, ethics and pedagogy rather than mere theoretical diversions or even *creative misunderstandings*. One must not be too hasty in deciding whether psychoanalysis won the game at the epicentre of theory and practice in the humanities. Schizoanalysis, as theory and practice, is applied today only in certain places in France, Italy, Belgium, Brazil and Central America; its reformulations have permeated mental health care, creating a more egalitarian system. It has produced new hybrids of therapy, such as queering/psychoanalysis and radical psychoanalysis. Besides, Freudian orthodoxy is now adopting some of the thematic

entities initiated by schizoanalysis, such as gender, class, ethnicity and feminism. Psychoanalysis after schizoanalysis will never be the same. Today, the spirit of La Borde permeates every group assembled for work, artistic creation, political resistance or simply pleasure. The machinic unconscious stands against logical conscious forces, which can become the war machines of the state if they do not take into consideration that unconscious hold on desire. Today, the conflict is not so much between psycho- and schizoanalysis. The current diagnosis of schizophrenia reterritorialises it, in the new spirit of neoliberalism, as an organic or hereditary disease that must be understood and treated by miraculous pharmacological treatments, genetic engineering or worse, using supportive cognitive psychotherapy for social adjustment. All that, in a mental health system with hospitals in a precarious sectorisation, which is precisely what we should call a segmented striatum space of control for mental health.

V. The Body without Organs

Educational and theoretical seminars at La Borde were always intermingled with practice, while the therapeutic protocols were oriented to the understanding of three major points: the machinic unconscious, nomadic subjectivity and the body without organs. These three major issues were conjunctive in schizoanalysis, constructing schizophrenia as a war machine against every mental and physical apparatus. In fact, in the context of *A Thousand Plateaus*, the issue was not how to draw a diagram or how to construct a body without organs (BwO), but rather how to dismantle the full, organised body and impede its consolidation and the expansion of its authority to its parts. In contrast, the BwO is always in a state of metamorphosis, open to all its potentialities. A BwO fights against the unification and totalisation of its own production. The full body is a teleological whole, a full organism that dominates and dictates the operation of its parts; 'the BwO is produced apart from its parts and at the same time is related to them' (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 42–51). Thus, the parts are independent but interrelated and merged productively, and no higher communicative organisation is needed for that. A BwO as a prototype of forces undertakes the destabilisation of striation and segmentation; it stands on the earth, on a rhizomatic net with its subterranean communication hidden from the eye of the state.

All that matters is what one can put in it and what output one can expect; any machinic production depends on the fuel we put in, the

proper fuel for that machine being desire. Let us consider the formation of the Freudian Ego in the primal erogenous body of the infant (Freud 1915b) where particular areas—usually around orifices or canals, such as the mouth, the anus, the ears and the nipples—are related to survival and pleasure. Those territories produce a sense of belonging together, of being something exterior to the fulfilment of the aforementioned needs. This is the primordial narcissistic Ego whose formation is negativistic through illusion. In the machinic unconscious, organisation is acquired through the conjunction and disjunction of tiny entities or particles that are grouped together in areas we call *organs*. They have no hierarchical organisation; the full body acquires that only later, in the phallic period. What psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis have in common is that the self and the incarnated body are constituted by desire. But their difference—the former’s preference for negativity and the latter’s for connectivity—is crucial. One must always bear in mind that being a schizoanalyst at La Borde or elsewhere did not mean having to forget all one’s former psychoanalytic or psychiatric training; rather, one could achieve a totally different attitude towards what mental illness means in the context of capitalism. Schizoanalysis was a science—without doubt a minor one—but also a political interpretation of late capitalism. So, if psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis share the constitution of the subject as desire as common ground, then in what exactly do they differ? Moreover, what made Deleuze say that Freud discovered the fountain but never drank from it? The fundamental difference is their different understanding of instincts and urges. If instincts are conforming types of reaction to an exterior stimulus for all members of a species or groups, in a desiring machine like the BwO the more singular the expression of desire, the more attractive it becomes, while the less subjective or personal, the more valid in the psychic and the political field it becomes. The BwO stands at the crossroads between the particular and the collective; the more heteronymic it is, the more collective it becomes. What lies in the antithesis between a BwO and a full body is what rejects the homogeneous surface of the latter that diverts the lines of flight. These particles and zones are assembled into what is never pre-given; they are in a process of becoming through their physical—virtual affectivity. In the absence of any external or metaphysical influence, a BwO is more what it is not than what it has already become in its radical immanence; it is a machine of desiring production, in its own terms independent of any exteriority. The BwO is not a partial object, as in the case of Phallus, which describes a binary sex: male—female. This operation of Phallus constitutes the body as a sexual organism, renders

it amenable to the hands of patriarchy and the power of the state, and produces it as a potential operative system of surplus value in the context of capitalism. A BwO resists becoming gendered or an embodied binary self and is dispersed from all the sexes of nature, choosing and changing at its own will.

A. The Machinic Unconscious

Bodies, in schizoanalysis, are fields of the conjunction and disjunction of affects, within which are both antagonising and congruent elements. In psychoanalysis, the antagonism is between the conscious and the unconscious, between the law and the censorship of the Super-ego against the insatiable drives of the Id. The corporeal body corresponds to such internal antagonism between instincts and repression by organising our biological and mental norms culturally and socially. In schizoanalysis, this fatalistic model is totally reversed by the fact that every(body) is always between other bodies and subjected to external organisational powers directly forming the machinic unconscious. State power uses the corporeal body as its basic instrument (Foucault 2008). Counter to the fully formed actual body, which both manipulates and is manipulated, Deleuze and Guattari conceived the virtual body without organs, exempt from any organisational or hierarchical formation and the instrumentality and alienation that follows. In place of the Oedipal unconscious—a speculative and transcendental psychic form—Deleuze and Guattari insert an immanent machinic unconscious as a positive formation of urges, tensions and propensities regardless of their conscious or unconscious extraction. Symptoms, dreams, mental signs, habits and traits of character are no longer projections of repressed urges but simply flaws in the machine. Death is no longer ‘the purpose of life’ (Freud 1920), and life is no longer considered the passage from inorganic to organic, from inanimate to animate; rather, it is an eternal continuation of the uninterrupted flow of matter that equally takes the form of the living or any other material form. In this context, schizophrenia is not a machine that cuts the flow of desire but a machine that forbids the suppression of such a flow by the state. The unconscious is not the only machine, as humans are machines too: they work and then stop, and then they are started again by other machines. A transcendental empiricism moves without interruption from an explicated to an implicated form. The BwO is constantly moving from the implicated side of an organised body to its explicated spiritual—psychic form, and vice versa; both parts are generated from

materiality. This new formulation of psychic life as a coin with two sides, materialist and transcendental, had a tremendous impact back in the 1970s. The understanding of our own body in direct connection with our political, social and cultural structures dramatically changed the representation of our bodies as docile and subservient objects, so beloved by capitalism. The way to become a body without organs starts from a machinic unconscious and resumes their own potential in immanent becomings, leaving outside every biopolitical intention that the state might have reterritorialise. As Guattari in *La Révolution Moléculaire* explains, that new subjectivation has a finite existential component but also semiotic and unsignifying tractors and phyla. There is a kind of liberty in the BwO that is not always actualised but is definitely free from the death drive because the pleasure principle directly permeates desire. Life and death belong together, in the same process that includes organic, inorganic and apoplastic strata, all meeting and acquainted in the uninterrupted flow of desire. The intensities of liberty and justice we deserve as human beings are intensities that flow from the organised body to the BwO, and vice versa. This is exactly what, for Guattari himself and for all of us he taught, the ‘flight’ from psychoanalysis to schizoanalysis is. The only thing that matters here is not the Being evoking the zero and avoiding at all costs a collapse into the void (Heidegger 2008 [1927]: A.4,19), but the univocity of being to which all entities respond, insisting on their own plane of immanence.

B. Passive Syntheses of Desire

The most remarkable innovation of psychoanalysis, the unconscious, stands for Guattari and Deleuze not as a reservoir of repressions but as a factory that produces various types of desire, with a common basis in *regime* and *performativity*: their passivity of production as opposed to the active and logical production of desire in consciousness and logocentricity. The BwO is engineered in three stages—connection, disjunction, conjunction—as well as by partial objects, including the breast, mouth, anus, hands and so forth, and not from the regressed, unaccepted material of mental life or fetishised representations of body parts. The constitution of the BwO is definitely positive materialist and immanent without an *a priori* notion ‘of what it really means’; it does not need Hegel’s Spirit or Husserl’s Cosmos, because everything is already included in it from the start as parcels of the flow of matter. The meaning of passivity is fundamental to the Deleuzo-Guattarian understanding of the politics of everyday life, the non-fascist way of living. Deleuze and

Guattari, in both volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, prioritise this way of living, considering it to be ‘what it is all about’, as in the famous Aristotelian ‘ού ένεκεν’ / ‘Ou eneken’ (Aristotle, *Metaphysics* I). Passive synthesis protects the desiring machine from being a product of deliberation, of the repressed decisions of the phallo-logocentric self of capitalism. What the desiring machine passively engineers is parts and particles, instances and haecceities; everything that always exists or subsists in the general flow of materiality that it constantly produces new assemblages, ‘not thinking but counting’, as a real machine does. All those elements ceaselessly move between chaos and their own plane of immanence; their *tropos* of being is contingency, their mode random and their cogito aleatory. They do not occur as a product of the mind but they are the mind of the Cosmos, the *Chaosmos*; and therein lies its ultimate positionality (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:16; Guattari 1995). In the Cosmos is ‘nihil unbound’; everything is bound to everything by choice and contingency. This aleatory and bifurcative understanding is ubiquitous in schizoanalysis; no formal indications are used here, nothing is classified or archived, everything is on the move. But schizoanalysis applied in a clinical context necessitates tremendous human effort—therapeutic alliance through equality, resoluteness and focusing in a real ‘becoming patient’. Schizoanalysis paid the price very quickly and very heavily. If capitalism was the major territorialisation and schizoanalysis its major deterritorialisation, state power and royal science were more than willing to reterritorialise schizophrenia, exiling it this time to an asignifying system: today’s humanitarian and sectorised mental health system.

Is there any evolution in the notion of the BwO from *Anti-Oedipus* to *A Thousand Plateaus*, and from *A Thousand Plateaus* to today? Has its place changed between the production and anti-production of desire? Deleuze and Guattari are definitely more cautious in *A Thousand Plateaus*, since they underline the dangers inherent in the BwO. Wild de-stratification can produce a cancerous proliferation of habits as, for example, in a *bouffée délirante*—a manic explosion—or even a suicide attempt. Besides, the strata have their own BwOs in political economy and could produce inflation or even fascism. The key here is the potentiality of the depersonalised BwO to assemble with others, the ‘*bestimmung*’, the tuning with the music of the world.

So, if in the first book we have a picture of the definitive decomposition of every despotic power, Oedipal or otherwise, in *A Thousand Plateaus* (chapter 7: Year Zero Faciality) we have the radical decomposition of any personal or subjective foundation of desire. One

feels closer here to the Spinozan ‘orexis’ than to the Nietzschean *will to power*. Here, subjects always come afterwards; they are the products and not the agents of the selection of elements and facets of the desiring machine. The face, the almost sacred element of subjectivity, is nothing but ‘an intersection between subjectivation and signification, a white wall with one black hole on it, what is making it a moon-white mime is his inhumanity’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 196). Any sense of a proper body with an angelic face, bound to logocentricity and a normative representational character, is surpassed by a BwO; every illusion of the sovereignty of the Ego and the misrecognition of ourselves and others it produces is abolished: the face ‘is produced by a machine and in order to meet the requirements of the special apparatus of power that triggers the machine and takes deterritorialization to the absolute while keeping it negative’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 190). In contrast, the BwO keeps the pre-facial and inhuman faciality protected from the powers of the organism; it remains open to becomings; becoming-animal and becoming-imperceptible are, perhaps, the most appropriate here. There is always a risk of collapse in an untimely and violent de-stratification; on the other hand, it is open to improvisations with the world.

Forty years ago, Deleuze and Guattari, in *A Thousand Plateaus*, drew desire as incipient to any subjectivation or movement of thought, art or science. Today, the BwO is still the prototypical desiring machine, extended to new entities in our post-human era: cyborgs, mechanical prostheses, part human-part machine. Is there a desiring machine in a real machine? Humans are fully biological creatures with a mind not subjected to any personhood but turned to the transversality of Chaosmos. Deleuze and Guattari foreshadowed the meta-human era: computers with a conscience, disembodied brains making their own body an object to use and manipulate, catoptric neurons for the understanding of embodied and intelligent selves, complicating matter. All of the above are, in a way, generated from the openness of the BwO.

C. A 1001th Plateau?

The invention of the BwO as a concept was devised in equal parts by Artaud, Marx and Lacan. The schizophrenic dominance and fluidity versus any hierarchical organisation came from Artaud, the insubordination and resistance of the proletariat body from Marx, and the phantasmatic body occurring after the mirror stage from Lacan. As a classical Marxian metonymy, the BwO is the capital itself with the workers as its parts. The capital assimilates the workers’ production as its own while reproducing

it as surplus value. This process could continue for ever if autonomous communication between the workers and the parts of the BwO could be completely manipulated and incorporated into the fully organised body of the despot. It is precisely this point where the schizophrenic machine rises up against capitalism, using its own forces which are no longer submitted to the central logical authority of capitalist organisation. One central feature that has remained unchanged for forty years, since the first edition of *A Thousand Plateaus*, is the fact that conjugated, mutilated or violated bodies always return with new desiring machines, by looking back to their prior form, to their independently effected parts, to their contingency and to their subterranean rhizomatic intercommunication which is imperceptible to capitalism. Life always prevails, since the nomad knows how to fight capitalism in a multiplicity of territories. We only have to look to what happens today with immigrants and refugees in borderlands, camps and hotspots. There is valuable experience in deterritorialisations in the making, where potent BwOs are animated in front of our dazzled eyes. The recent intensification of social and economic crises – among other distressing incidents – is particularly manifest in the current ongoing immigration crisis in the eastern Mediterranean. The unexpected degree of explosion of flows seems to be constructing a new field in the dynamics of tension. Capitalism could never succeed in totally subduing the people's will, using its local and global financial weapons. In vain, it seeks to turn locals and emigrants – living side by side with only a border separating them – against each other. A new war machine is abolishing state boundaries, helping people on both sides to realise that 'they have nothing to lose but their chains' and their common exploitation. Here, we can already observe the emergence of multiple incidents of solidarity and friendship among immigrants and locals, who are also affected by another kind of war in their country as a counterforce to the initial capitalistic intentions of racist animosity. In the hotspot of Moria, on the Aegean island of Lesbos, and in many other borderline places around the world, those intensifications of flows are producing the new 'plateaus' of our times.

D. The Biology of the Egg: BwOs in the 'Survot'

Is a BwO a scientific entity? In our civilisation, it is royal science that guarantees the nature–culture continuum. Georges Canguilhem, mentor and tutor to French structuralists and post-structuralists, in his classic 'Essai sur quelque problemes concernant le normal et le pathologique' (1991 [1966]), made clear that biology through concrete

binary formations defines what is natural or unnatural—or in other words, pathological. Royal science in the hands of the state conflates the pathological with bad and unnatural, the normal with good and natural. The most renowned paradigm is binary sex; thus, what is outside *cisgender*—that is, strictly male or female—is pathological. State morality presses binary modelisation upon scientific biology. The BwO contravenes false binaries, such as ‘useful is good and useless is bad’, no matter how vehemently royal science attempts to repress it from the outside. In *A Thousand Plateaus*’ biology, the perfect, all-inclusive form of an egg is in a pliable space, is molecular and bifurcates segmentation into all directions, and is in tandem with a molar and disjunctive One. Each entity differentiates itself initially from the flow of matter precisely in the form of an egg. An egg has a unified content and form that codifies every possibility of its life; every meaning is carved on its surface, always multiple and aleatory and never binary; never as an ‘either ... or’ but always as an ‘and ... and ... and ...’ (Deleuze 1968). The codification and de-codification of every meaning is what concerns schizoanalysis. A lot of psychoanalytic ambivalence, as found, for example, in neurotic traits, is bypassed by schizoanalysis through multiple bifurcative choices. On the psychoanalytic couch, one asks: ‘Am I a parent or a son, am I a man or a woman, am I myself or another?’; in real life, a BwO says: ‘I can be all my possibilities’. In the famous words of Arthur Rimbaud, another artist who became a BwO: ‘Je est un autre’ (‘I is another’). The full egg before the extension of its parts into organs has the fluidity of pure intensities, as pure immanence. The BwO has the potentiality even to turn into the non-possible as its own uttermost possibility, in which lies a part of liberty and justice that humans can share with every other form of life in the world.

Everything in *A Thousand Plateaus* is about difference: the freedom to move, to express, to metamorphose; the deliverance of one’s own body from reactions dictated by the organism that in the end become automatic; humans as automata in the era of late capitalism, bodies with pre-given reactions to constant crises. The BwO is the prototype of its own difference in itself. What one needs is the ‘survol’, a flying over one’s own body to achieve a better view of it from the outside (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 18).

E. BwOs in Schizophrenia and Nomadology

In March 1946, Antonin Artaud was released into the care of his friends after seclusion for almost two years in the psychiatric hospital in Rodez,

under the charge of the psychiatrist Dr Gaston Ferdière. Fifty-eight electroshocks were delivered upon him without anaesthesia, in order to be more effective. In fact, some of the convulsions were so 'effective' that they fractured his third thoracic vertebra. Artaud had been diagnosed as delusional, potentially harmful to others and to himself. Miraculously, some of his delusions formed parts of his exquisite poems, such as the famous 'wooden stick' that belonged to both St Patrick – he had recently come back from a trip to Ireland – and the devil. Later, his friends placed Artaud in the psychiatric clinic at Ivry-sur-Seine, from where he was free to come and go. There, he began to write and draw again, developing a critical distance from his disease but never renouncing it: 'My sole refuge', the great poet and cinéaste later wrote, 'has been to become a body without organs'.

Deleuze and Guattari had already understood the epistemological bias in the pathologisation of schizophrenia. In psychoanalysis, Freud entered the psychosis scene a little late, with the famous Schreber case; Lacan, Derrida, Deleuze and almost everybody else followed. Deleuze acknowledged the remarkable Freudian turn from the bourgeois neurotic to the proletarian psychotic, and adopted all the Freudian analytical mechanisms and manoeuvres, amongst others, primal and secondary repression: *One cannot challenge the schizoid process except by starting with elements drawn from the cure.*

But the cure can easily create the disease and not the other way around. New desiring machines are created all the time; a schizo-desiring machine as a relay cuts the flow of the state war machine. What constitutes that secondary cutting machine? Is it therapy or the social and cultural formations, the unconscious or conscious desires? Not every part of the machine is pre-given, contrived or fabricated; it emerges from chaos and is constituted at any time when chance and choice combine. What Deleuze and Guattari attempted in *A Thousand Plateaus* was to dismantle the general structure of social and psychic life and let the fragments, released from their former anthropocentric fabrications, assemble into new forms of socius and subjectivation: the schizophrenic subject was en route to its nomadic universality, schizophrenia being one route to nomadic life.

The book's impact was uneven: on academia it was very delayed, but on the public it was paramount – especially amongst the young in '68 – 'getting older' in the aftermath of May, in the era of intensive globalisation and the rise of governmentality and fascism in the guise of a new right coming back with a vengeance. The book heralded a different revolution in three domains: the way we think outside logocentrism – if

there is a cogito, it is absolutely aleatory; the way we act in the micro-politics of everyday life—revolution in our times has nothing to do with taking the Winter Palace in St Petersburg but about fighting micro-fascisms wherever we locate them; finally, and most importantly, the production of desire against any logical structure dictated by the state. If there could ever be a dictum in *A Thousand Plateaus*, it would be the priority of desire released from every repression, even if that means to ‘schizophrenise’ everything. If the schizoprene is the conceptual persona in *Anti-Oedipus*, in *A Thousand Plateaus* it is the nomad; but we pass to the latter only through the former. The schizoid holds on to forces of attraction and repulsion while the nomad uses disjunctive and conjunctive syntheses to stay forever open to multiplicities and new assemblages—the BwO becomes the body of the schizoid and then the body of the nomad.

VI. One or Several Wolves?

Deleuze and Guattari did not abolish psychoanalysis for the sake of schizoanalysis; they simply reversed them internally by reformulating the position of the family in the latter. In schizoanalysis, the mother is neither the cause of the primal repression (Freud 1925) nor the object cause of desire (Lacan 1991c: Seminar XVII); nor does the father impose the law by forbidding incestuous desire at the cost of castration. Family as a whole is the organisational principle that consolidates the hold of the state on society (Marx and Engels, 2013 [1844]). Familial and parental ties are also the basic force of subjectivation; we are all what our place in the family’s triangular formation determines. Again, here binary formations prevail; what we accept in the family system is invested with authority and identified as natural. Hierarchies, role-playing, binary sex, education, mathesis and cultural morality are all used to consolidate the three positions in the family system: the father with authority, the mother with tenderness and care, the child with submission and all three with solidarity and the need to share. Every social formation, group, class and political party reinstates these three family positions (Freud 1921), and everything outside of the anthropocentric family is neglected or excluded. In schizoanalysis, the positionality inside the family ceases to be the basic organisational category, while the unconscious is no longer the stage for tragedy: Oedipus is a king rather than a father and a son; he seeks power in its devastation, desires the position of despot and transgresses against the taboo of incest in order to acquire state power. His shattered self is not the central theme, but rather his enmity

with his rivals in Thebes, Aegisthus and Tiresias; his will for power is what constructs his ego and his subconscious: 'Mother and father exist only in fragments . . . and are present in the Unconscious, as the various agents of collectivity' (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 1060). The Phallus as a symbolic object implies two sexes, male and female, in confrontation with each other. It is through this antagonism that their mutual lack is constituted. In psychoanalysis, desiring production is always negative; there is never plenitude, always a lack and want (*ananke*), and nothing to give or share unconditionally. In schizoanalysis, everything is positive and potentially joyful, and desiring production is never reactionary but is always emergent: 'the machinic unconscious is indefinitely moving toward or away from zero' (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 34). Desire is a matter of intensity: one simply desires or does not desire. There is no transcendental 'beyond' that controls life and death (Freud 1920); they are both parts of the same circle. 'The art of the unconscious is an art of molecular multiplicities which they tirelessly bring back molar unities and reverse them to familial themes' (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 31). One wolf is always hunting alone to dominate the herd but many wolves hunt together, always deterritorialising the power of the one and assembled in the way of their movement. The wolf-man can never exist outside of a Freudian metaphor: 'it is the zero of the body without organs never being able for new productions' (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 24). In the 'big outdoors' there are only wolves fighting and deterritorialising together.

A. A New Happiness?

Libido – in real life or in 'novellas' – is not just a cathexis between subject and object that is constituted by the molecular desire machine and empowered by microphysics. Desire generates all the subjectivations that follow. The ego in psychoanalysis is formed from primary narcissism, but in schizoanalysis it is understood as subjectivation generated by larval (pre-subjective) elements circulating and dispersed in the subconscious. The invaluable innovation of schizoanalysis is that the subconscious never exists independently of the social and the political. One more thing is needed now for the unity of conscious thinking: the acquaintance of unconscious desire with experience. The idea of the world as 'das Ding', as a separate object, which has dominated Western metaphysics for 2,000 years, is repulsive to Deleuze. Freud and Deleuze were never closer than in their mutual distrust of the Cartesian subject who is completely transparent to itself and who holds the world

in its hands as an object. In contrast, the political unconscious never disavows its Freudian ancestry; a fair and just decision is precarious without clarification of its subconscious motives. Schizoanalysis has the political unconscious at its core, categorically repudiating the neo-Freudian illusions of curing every deviation from the norm. Freud himself considered that kind of cure illusionary; sublimation and perversity—the normal and the abnormal—are considered equal parts for overcoming the Oedipal stage. When a political subject, personal or collective, is fully determined by class it fails to grasp its unconscious motives and turns to confide its agency in mere conscience; in doing so it can easily fall prey to the fallacies of the phallo-logocentric ego omnipresent in the micro-fascisms of everyday life. This is what Deleuze and Guattari meant when they said, ‘to stop at the roots and not advance to the rhizome’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1988). Instincts, in schizoanalysis, are not only libidinal but their larval elements are everywhere, not just in sexuality or in the reproductive system. It is desire that assimilates and ‘captures’ the Self, not the other way around; this is of paramount importance in schizoanalysis and it has been taught in La Borde as a materialistic, revolutionary psychology. Today, radical psychoanalysis frees libido from Oedipus, desire from pleasure and labour from capital. The rise of the capitalist market is considered in parallel with libidinal instincts for the first time.

B. The Subject of the Statement and the Subject of Enunciation

Is the distinction between the subject of the statement and the subject of enunciation still valid in schizoanalysis? Deleuze and Guattari turned psychoanalysis against itself using its own weapons. Does a statement belong to one or multiple persons, and does a speaking person enunciate only for him- or herself? In the famous paradigm from *What is Philosophy?*, ‘the genesis of thought in the Greek world is generated through the multiplicity of a single statement referring to various subjects, a lover, a warrior, a spouse’. What connects the same statement by different speakers is for Foucault a simple analogy but for Deleuze becomes a confession in front of the Other, an acknowledgement of alterity or intersubjectivity without subjects but fully equipped with statements referring to multiplicities. When a multiplicity speaks, the symbolic structure is submerged; the speaking entity reduces the symbolic language to its semiotic necessity. Here, Marxism is present too, since there are no personal statements, only collective ones. The enunciation is already in the *réel*, outside language, in the core of desiring

production—as in when one howls when one is hurt or screams when in peril of death one is articulating *help!* Everything is unmodified; there is no psychoanalytical explanation of screaming since it lies outside of language. This kind of confession in front of the Other is what outlines therapy and treatment in La Borde. When we practised schizoanalysis and its protocol of therapeutic alliance, the schizoid was not bypassed but acknowledged as such without any symbolic deformation; he or she was invited to participate in new assemblages through his or her enunciation of ‘help’. The diagnosis of schizophrenia is a statement that burdens many with a linguistic stigma. The political force of schizophrenia finds its place when it expresses new desiring productions concerning multiplicities, where the subject of the statement converges with the subject of enunciation.

VII. An Abstract Machine at the Limits of Psychoanalysis and Schizoanalysis: The Phylum

Schizoanalysis at La Borde had two successive phases: the first to deconstruct, the second to reconstruct; the former with a new conceptual protocol of experience, the latter with the creation of new forms of collectivity. The aim of psychoanalysis is to relieve analysands of intolerable symptoms and help them to accept their shortcomings. In schizoanalysis, we pursue the realisation of their position in the collective; they are already on the move to their nomadic state. Who pays the fare for this monumental shift from Freudian metaphysics to schizoanalytic nomadology? Here, we are not talking about an epistemological rupture but of a general change of habits and habitats, codes and structures, making radical psychology a new assemblage of schizoids, medical workers and the entities around them. Schizophrenia is the battleship of psychiatric diagnosis, an instrument of control and state oppression. In schizoanalysis, it is reversed to a basic critical tool for that same system of power. The synchronisation of desiring and social productions must be coded, decoded and recoded many times when preparing subjects to take their social position. Guattari has been adamant on that; the *socius* is the terrain of all subjectual codings and decodings, although in doing so it initially consolidates capital. Capital frees desire from its previous attachments and uses it for its own expansion. The surplus value produced is soon separated from social production, serving only itself. Consequently, we should potentially ‘schizophrenise’ all social relations. The earth is the primordial basis of both desire and production, the initial

social meaning carved into territories like the pasture, hunting ground, meadow, hedges and fountains, forests and valleys. Humans are installed in such territories, where they scratch out provisional boundaries and construct social machines. After these first deterritorialisations, new state war machines instrumentalise the humans of a territory to generate new forms of social and cultural organisation, cutting short the nature–culture continuum. For instance, they link humans with new agricultural engineering technology. Crops, vegetation, labouring animals and finally humans themselves, in their own functions and with their own organs and fully organised bodies, become parts of that war machine. Nothing is left outside; everything is segmented, striated, becoming molar, closed to an either/or, with potentiality pre-given and objectified. The fuel for every machine of the universe is desire, so capitalism inserts into the social machine its own desire, which is profit at any cost, exploitation and expansion. The flows are now made abstract, requiring a false intersubjectivity, homogeneity and relentless quantification. The massive, collective disinvestment of primitive society and the overvaluation of the self as the agent of the utilitarian regime that follows, the upturning of every flow for the benefit of profit and at the cost of every other mental or physical production, is so intolerable for people that it must be counterbalanced by other means. Thus, capitalism now plays the card of privatisation as reinforcement of the self, and here is the point at which Oedipalisation enters: all pathologisation, including schizophrenia, for that matter, is due to the transcendental malfunction of the Oedipal trio and not to the turning off of the flow of desire of those three concrete persons as they exist in their social habitat in their contingency. The law – *le nom du père* – morals, censorship and punishment control any desiring production, while the death drive is always lurking to enforce the necro-politics of late capitalism. Only a BwO can escape total subjugation, being always protected ‘in the middle’ and having open lines of flight to organic and inorganic strata. Schizophrenia is, for capitalism, a full deterritorialising force that denies any transcendental principal and any mummy–daddy–me soothing and consolation. Schizoanalysis as the dynamic of nomadology cuts short all the supply lines of capitalism through institutions such as the family. From his Lacanian education, Guattari inherited phenomenological tools such as the concepts of isolation, manipulation and alienation. Deleuze, in the appendix of ‘Logic of Sense for Crusoe’ (a ‘proto-nomad’), arrives, in an all-Spinozan tour de force that considers precisely the foreclosure of the Other, at an astonishingly similar conclusion to that of Lacan.

But in MP we are already in the heart of nomadology; ruptures, irony, cruelty, singularities and contingency reinstate desire as the sole fuel and motor of every social machine, displacing the logocentric transcendental ego. In schizoanalysis, clinical observation is substituted by experiencing the objectivation of the patient through a common subject–object position; what guarantees the flow of social productions is re- and deterritorialisation. However, the way to look at the Things and the Other remains phenomenological, hence the quote ‘Notre chère ami, Merleau-Ponty.’

Schizoanalysis is the final decoding of Oedipal capitalist production, setting the schizoid free from servitude and alienation in societal formations: labour as exploitation; family as censoring free relations that turn bonds of love into a means of exploitation; and jurisprudence as conforming with what state power requires. All possible lines of flight are sealed off not only from the schizoid but also from the dissidents, the non-conforming and every resistant element in the current coding. There is no great difference between a progressive capitalist state ‘curing’ schizoids in reformed and well-designed mental hospitals, and a totalitarian regime refracting all linear episodes and designating where one lives and works, how one behaves and what artistic or ideological choices are appropriate. In both, one is free to select only the path of one’s mental or physical destruction, and that is definitely the most important concept of practical philosophy and expressivity that has emerged in the last forty years.

VIII. Gender Queer

Q/p, or queering psychoanalysis, is both a hybrid of Lacanian psychoanalysis and queer. More recently a new, more radical, formation between queer theory and schizoanalysis now prevails. This analytic process puts an end to the mutual distrust between psychoanalytic therapy and queer people and is a theorisation of communal life and collectivity delivered of any binary stratification. Schizoanalysis dissociates desiring production from the Oedipal trio and so dissolves any formation or binary normalisation of gender. Male–female dualistic gonads are necessary for reproduction only among mammals; nature has many other ways to select for or dispense with a species. Gendering is a principal mode of subjectification, making cisgender, docile bodies easy to control in post-capitalistic determinations and representations. The more segmented and organised a body is, the more concrete and framed its identity and the easier its external surveillance and control

becomes. However, the new queer identities have shifted the focus to flowing entities in the microcosmos, to molecular, singular, but not referential, acts, to qualitative multiplicities as opposed to quantitative, molar ones. In q/p we refer to the non-gendered BwO and its plane of immanence as an in-between different from any segmented universality of the engendered self; almost as a categorical imperative, with all the positivist stance that implies, as a way of living. From a Lacanian point of view, where desire is inherently negative, as associated with castration, we pass to Deleuze and Guattari's machinic desire, lacking nothing as it is autoconstructed and emergent; henceforth, it is free from any external or transcendental effect. Desire in schizoanalysis stands as its own object. The pleasure principle and what lies beyond it—the death drive—must be excluded as it interrupts or represses the free flow of expressivity. In this respect, the BwO has nothing to do with the old metaphysical Self enclosed in a body. Immanence consists in equal parts of exteriority and interiority, fusing both in its plane. The BwO is non-gendered since desire can follow uninterruptedly its flow by dissolving any sexual difference and assigning it to the full organismic body where it is engendered into the binary sex necessary in humans for procreation. Queer versus sexual difference is like virtual versus actual: both are necessary for the full expression of desire. In schizoanalysis, the convergence of pleasure with desire is already there and bypasses the three phantoms of psychoanalysis—internal lack, exteriority and transcendence—that are responsible for any exclusion or inequality. Everything that counts as pleasure is delivered and absorbed in the common flow of matter (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 1176). But it is not only about an obsolete structural antinomy between the structuralist Lacan and the post-structuralists Deleuze and Guattari; what makes the latter's opposition on gender and sex apparent is that for Deleuze it is immanent and constantly flowing on the surface of the BwO—territorialised only when it is needed for functions and quickly returning to expressivity. In contrast, the gender of the catoptric self as male and female requires, in Lacan, a set of Oedipal and symbolic-linguistic manoeuvres: castration, lack, the title of father, the female's other jouissance. The queer concept and understanding of the socially and culturally engendered self stand against the Lacanian doctrine of gender as symbolic and phantasmatic reliance. The self of sameness is already false and lacking in existence (Lacan 1991a), the subject in q/p being the self of difference in the nomadic subject. Perhaps the symbolic language is not enough to signify this transition. Perhaps we need to discover in q/p a new language, new methods of connectivity

between humans and meta-humans and all the other entities in the world.

What in part justifies q/p as a hybrid of Lacanian psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis is that they both converge precisely in freeing people from their illusions, their bondage. They share the importance of how one can, and must, say no to the symbolic Other, to every phantasmatic Other as the double of the self. That could be the first step in dismantling the self. The discontinuation in the flow of desire leads to the striation of the full body, which becomes refracted in its own organism and is gendered through binaries, or as a phantasmatic self out of place and time where it lacks difference from itself. Gender is ready and accessible whenever needed for recreation and reproduction, but quickly converges into the general flow of desire, rendering all the genders and sexes required with no exterior qualification or any transcendent Outside. If desire is the near side of the moon, then freedom and creativity in a non-anthropocentric world is its far side.

References

- Canguilhem, Georges (1991 [1966]) *The Normal and the Pathological*, New York: Zone Books.
- Clement, Catherine (1995) (conversation with Catherine Clement) 'Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari on Anti-Oedipus', in Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations 1972–1990*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1968) *Logic du sens*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (1983) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen Lane, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (1994) *What is Philosophy?*, trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Foucault, Michel (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978–7*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freud, Sigmund (1895) 'The Project for a Scientific Psychology', in Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (SE)*, vol. 1, trans. James Strachey, London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, Sigmund (1915a) 'The Unconscious', *SE* 14.
- Freud, Sigmund (1915b) 'On Narcissism. An Introduction', *SE* 14.
- Freud, Sigmund (1920) 'Beyond the Pleasure Principle', *SE* 18.
- Freud, Sigmund (1921) 'Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego', *SE* 18.
- Freud, Sigmund (1925) *The Ego and the Id*, *SE* 19.
- Freud, Sigmund (1927) *Civilisation and Its Discontents*, *SE* 21.
- Guattari, Félix (1977) *La révolution moléculaire*, Paris: Recherches.
- Guattari, Félix (1995) *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*, trans. Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis, Sydney: Power Institute.

- Heidegger, Martin (2008 [1927]) *Being and Time*, New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Lacan, Jacques (1991a) *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book 1, Freud's Papers on Technique, 1953–1954*, New York: W. W. Norton.
- Lacan, Jacques (1991b) *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book II, The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis 1954–1955*, New York: W. W. Norton.
- Lacan, Jacques (1991c) *Le Séminaire, livre XVII L'envers de la Psychoanalyse*, Paris: Seuil.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels (2013 [1844]) *The Holy Family: Critique of Critical Critique*, Windham Press.

Further Reading

- Boudas, C. (1994) Deleuze: Serialisation and Subject Formation. In Dorothea Olkowski, *Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy*, New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1991) *Empiricism and Subjectivity, An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*, trans. C. V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1994) *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton, London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (2004) I 'Instincts and Institutions', in Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts 1953–1974*, New York: Semiotext(e), pp. 19–21.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Parnet C. (1987) *Dialogues*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, London: Athlone Press.
- Freud, S. (1899) 1st edition. *3 essays on sexuality*.
- Genosko, G. (2016) *Critical semiotics*. Bloomsbury.
- Guattari, Félix (1982) *Chartographies shizoanalytiques*. Paris: Galilée.