

Invention and Surrection of la Deleuziana

by VÉRONIQUE BERGEN

Translated by Benoît Dillet

Any given portrait of la Deleuziana is a negative portrait entangled in the paradox of appearing when disappearing, under the banner of *The Unknown Masterpiece*: the painter Frenhofer attempts to give a pictorial consistence to a woman who flees in the ungraspable. Frenhofer found the impossible point, that which subtracts the representative expression.

By making Alice one of the possible instances of la Deleuziana, in all her compossible becomings (becoming simultaneously larger and smaller, in the order of the event, evading the imperious line of *Chronos*), we stumble across one of the main conceptual batteries of Deleuze: the distinction between *Chronos* and *Aion*, between the actualised time of history and the suspended time of virtualities. It is this inflection from the transcendental/empirical binary to the indissociable couple of the virtual and the actual – or to put it too quickly, this graft of Bergson (but also the Stoics and Nietzsche) on Kant – that seems to raise problems and objections. With these lines of flight, emancipation-driven becomings, and desiring deterritorialisations can only count if we hope for existing distinctions between actualisation and the virtual remanence. The actual does not exist without the virtual, which acts as its double; history does not exist without events that act as catalysts. The only chance life has to liberate itself wherever it is imprisoned, is by affirming its powers against what lessens it but also by intensifying the ever-acting resource of a virtual not fully integrated in the state of things. This minuscule optimism can only come from a faith in the immanence-reserve of internal forces [*forces internes*] escaping actualised forms.

Could it be the magic trick of Alice's rabbit inside this *dispositif*? A tendency to resignation, the Bartleby syndrome? This Bartleby syndrome takes the form of a powerlessness, an over-passivity raised by a war machine that unravels the state of things: any given defeat in the empirical course of linear history can shelter a victory on the line of events, only when *Aion* is endowed with a latent existence growling under *Chronos*. Extreme disengagement steps in as the figure of political engagement. In putting oneself offside, outside the dough of history, in devoting oneself to an ethical retreat, a non-alignment, do we unplug the power assemblage? Do we really produce a political subjectivation?

With *Aion's* joker, the factual failure of every revolution carries in itself the virtual forces of a regeneration. Under the actions anchored in the present, liberating forces are dozing, the empirical failure presents undiscovered powers to the genetic forge. What I find most problematic in Deleuze's thought is the lodging of a resource for the liberation of desires and an intensification of life in the uncoupling of effectuation and counter-effectuation (these two dimensions are of different natures according to Deleuze).

As a conceptual persona, *la Deleuziana*, together with the multiple and heterogeneous *deleuzianas* that populate her, inherits these difficulties carried by the virtual/actual *dispositif*. How can *la Deleuziana* give us new modes of subjectivation, new ways of being, existing and thinking without being caught by the snares of neo-capitalism? Can *la Deleuziana* authorise creations of the self, of writing, of struggles that articulate desire, the economy of drives, without being enclosed in the market orb? With what modalities and operations does she bring into motion the desiring machines that erode and turn upside down societies of control, that undo the makings of the Empire, the reign of the Troika and transnational corporations? Can she be the anti-Young Girl (the Young-Girl thought by Tiqqun as the model citizen subsumed by the market empire)? What is her sex or her sexes? What other uses of the body does she impel?

*

Two problems arise. First, our totalitarian market societies have reterritorialised *Aion* and becomings. The becoming-nomad and the becoming-molecular are exactly what our contemporaneity has formed into order words. Anyhow, if we ignore these objections, and we pursue the distinction between Chronos and *Aion*, we find ourselves using a framework that is no longer capable of providing a conceptual and political space to trace lines of flight that decode the state of things. The paradoxical logic of counter-effectuation and the plasticity of the virtual, as conceived by Deleuze and Guattari, was recuperated and brought to work by a logic of control and consumerism. They were deformed and subjected to state forms or to their liquid subsequences. In our societies, the molar is portrayed as the molecular, the becoming-woman, the becoming-animal, the becoming-minoritarian are promoted but as a subterfuge to perpetuate and reinforce the system.

Our little queen of a given space-time, we would name her Paradoxy. Our *Deleuziana-Alice* would spend her time avoiding the present, jumping in the wormholes of the virtual burrow. She accelerates or decelerates particles to allow events to break out without their burdened actualised effects. But what is the point of dodging the present for becomings when our present is in charge of dodging itself, of fleeing itself, in caricatures of nomads and lines of flights? In front of these caricatures, it seems a vain project to call for the restoration of authentic becomings against their actualised effects. We

need to act when everything un-acts. To act war machines. To break the sociosphere of the simulacrum by acts that wake us up from the anaesthetising vapours of alienation and planetary indoctrination. To use negativity and not to wait for a possible catastrophic apotheosis of the market empire, and its point of no-return from the endemic crises – the same negativity that Deleuze excluded from his thought. We need to reintegrate and appropriate again the very negation that lines of flight avoided.

The second problem is the counterpoint to the first one (the molarisation of the molecular): the master of all assemblages that converts the minoritarian towards the majoritarian. On the one hand, the molar wears the mask of the molecular while keeping its striated functioning, its power and practices of control. On the other, many minoritarian lines of flight were recaptured by its microfascist drifts, at the level of individual and collective assemblages, on existential, ethical, aesthetic and micropolitical planes. The fascist and territorialising becomings are one of the forms of anti-becoming and induration, contracting refrains of movement, constructivism, the absence of grounding and an-essentialism. Our contemporaneity is full of normative, coded and rigid usages of the becoming-minoritarian, the becoming-woman and the becoming-animal.

How do we create dissidence when actual neoliberal biopower has succeeded, by using its governmentality of total control, in attracting (by submission) the margins of society, women, gays, immigrants, drug addicts, and prisoners, in the market persona? Anyone who enters the sphere of exchange – human or non-human exchanges, domestic or wild exchanges – is summoned to claim her subjection to the hyperspectacle. Nothing escapes the laws of generalised exchange: representatives of the majority, minorities, animals, flora, natural elements, resources and riches, all are caught in these circuits. Can there still be an outside to capital's witch-like cannibalism? If we set forth an outside of the totalitarian sphere of neocapitalism, which is my position, it will not be reached by tracing lines of flight escaping the grip of the state of things, since it is the latter that flees.

*

What is to be done when the market economy loves the discovery that there is 'not one or even two sexes, but n sexes'? When the world order turns into its own advantage the creations of the Bodies Without Organs, acclaiming and valorising the new ecumenicism of a world of flows and speeds acquired by deterritorialising relations and connections over the terms, by subverting the essence by pragmatics?

It is not capitalism that would be amended, coming closer to the desiring machinism. But it is the desiring machinism that has dissolved in the axiomatisation of capital.

What is to be done when the woman is taken, beyond her gender, as a process of crea-

tion and resonates with fascism?

What is to be done when the society of fathers, that Deleuze wanted to overturn, has given birth to a society of sons that reterritorialise themselves on the lukewarm dead body of the Name-of-the-Father?

What are strategies, and improvisations without strategies to adopt, when the ancient masculine/feminine divide (beyond the sexed attribution) together with their derivatives (masculine as majoritarian, the principles of identity, essence, power, against the feminine as becoming-minoritarian, siding with difference, genesis and potentialities) are no longer the truth of what is at stake, reshuffling the picture without producing new gusts of emancipation?

What is to be done when the figures of popular culture (as wanderers, migrants and nomads) work for the neoliberal fury? And their non-identity identities are folded into and used as conceptual piece to varnish with a metaphysical coating the neoliberal machinism that feeds on the death of the emancipating amplitude?

What is to be done when the crossing of hard segments, the implosion of strata (age, sex, ethnic group, class...) is presented as the blessed bread of the world order?

Would la Deleuziana be a creature that establishes relations, alliances with non-humans and the cosmos? Would she invent new links with the powers of life? She would first need to make sure to free the exo-human elements from their integration in the meshes of generalised exchange and their absorption by neoliberal territories. No figure can condense in his or her essence the promises of emancipation. Whether they are workers, unemployed, precarious life, disposable life, women, the youth, migrants, *sans-papiers*, militants, 'deviants', madmen, delinquents and so on, they cannot condense in their person the opposition to the system and become the privileged agent of insurrectional movements.

From the theory of the Young-Girl, developed by Tiqqun, we retain the diagnostic of the ways in which the world figure of the Young-Girl imposes itself. Whether she is a woman, a man, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, transsexual, young, old, rich, poor, white, black, worker, unemployed, *sans-papiers*, atheist, religious, abstinent, drug addict, yuppie [*bobo*], conservative, the Young-Girl is the totemic conceptual persona of neoliberalism: the creature who became a commodity. The difficulty of separating la Deleuziana from any all-reigning Young-Girl comes from the mental colonisation, the internalising of profiling and formatting. The market Empire has succeeded in doubling the forces of the external order by implanting in each brain a small cop.

Excommunicating the dialectic of the negative once delineated the battlefield of the virtual. La Deleuziana will now use the negative as an instrument to leave the captivity of thoughts, bodies, enfeoffed by the needs of capitalism.

La Deleuziana to come, slowly arising, includes those who do not put the weapons down, and do not give in to auto-repressive and auto-policing mechanisms. By dynamiting the automatic ingestion of the constraint, those who are relegated by the world order since they are un-subsumable — they are irrecuperable, they are the grain of sand that disaggregate and sabotage the system, they are unreceptive to the hypnotico-repressive fable — invent offensives, and then forms of existence incompatible with the generalised exploitation. For the post-Young-Girl to emerge and recuse the fictive life, in order for her to avoid being crushed by the biopower and so that she can dance at the front of the war between worlds, Alice will make unions between human and non-human assemblages, accelerating the zones of decomposition and the exhaustion of the neoliberal security hegemony. She will be on the lookout, ready to thwart the fear of emptiness and the replicants of neoliberalism, the new Big Brother, asphyxiating the other temptations of abdication that come: the fundamentalism of the religious rallying and abandoning of oneself to a transcendent principle. By choosing anonymity and by making impossible points possible, the Nameless connects expectations of a systemic self-disaggregation to the mobilisations that anticipate the end of the state of things and the dawn of another world.