

Acceleration, Revolution and Money in Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*

Acronyms bibliography

Acronym	Title	Author	Year	Edition □□□□□□
#A	#Accelerate	MacKay & Avanesian	2014	Urbanomic
AC	The Antichrist	Nietzsche	2006	Borzoi Pocket Books □□
AME	Aesthetic, Method and Epistemology	Foucault	1998	The New Press □□□□
AO	Anti-Oedipus	Deleuze & Guattari	1983	U. Minnesota Press □
C	Capital: a critique of political economy □□	Marx		libcom.org
CM	The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics	Bergson	1946	Wisdom Library □□□□
CSVAI	Code Surplus Value and The Augmented Intellect	Pasquinelli	2014	Personal blog □□□□
CV (journal)□□□□	Circulus Vitiosus	Klossowski	2009	The Agonist
CWN	Complete Works	Nietzsche	1967	Gallimard
DI	Desert Islands	Deleuze	2002	Semiotext(e) □□□□□□□□
INFL	Introduction to the non fascist life	Foucault	2012	Maldoror □□□□□□
LC	Living Currency	Klossowski		monoskop.org□□□□
LWK □□□□□□□□	Lectures on the Will to Know	Foucault	2013	Palgrave MacMillan
MMDG	Marxism and Money in D&G's Capitalism and Schizophrenia	Kerslake	2015	Parrhesia #22 □□□□
N	Negotiations	Deleuze	1995	Columbia U.P. □□□□□□□□
NPP	Nietzsche, Polytheism and Parody	Klossowski	2004	Bulletin S:A:P: □□□
NT	Nomad Thought	Deleuze	1977	Delta Books □□□□□□□□
NVC □□□□	Nietzsche and the vicious circle	Klossowski	1997	University Of Chicago
PK	Power, Knowledge and Other Writings 1972-77	Foucault	1980	Pantheon Books □□□□
Z A.	Thus Spoke Zarathustra	Nietzsche	2010	feedboks.com □□□□ W.

Chapter I

The Locus classicus of the contemporary accelerationist movement: Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus

*Do you want a name for this universe,
a solution for all its enigmas?
—Nietzsche, Posthumous Notes*

We continue the exploration of the sources behind the contemporary accelerationist movement, which lie at the end of the paragraph entitled «The Civilized Capitalist Machine». (AE 239-240) By «contemporary» we mean the period from the 90's to today, thus including Nick Land and the Ccru collective's reflections on the first «accelerationist» wave. The simultaneous reading of Christian Kerlake's *Marxism and Money in Deleuze and Guattari's Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (2015) and Matteo Pasquinelli's notes in *Code Surplus Value and the Augmented Intellect* (2014) has highlighted the persistence of a troubled interpretation of one of the most significant and pivotal passages of Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*. Moreover an unfair and blind *conventio ad excludendum* on Nietzsche from the accelerationist side, is remarkably present. In *#Accelerate*, the constitutive anthology of accelerationism, we immediately detect a noisy silence about Nietzsche. While the opening documents and extracts on accelerationism are pertinent — Marx, Butler, Fedorov and Veblen (#A, 8-11) — nothing is mentioned of a post-Zarathustra Nietzsche: *The Will of Power, Beyond Good and Evil* or *On the Genealogy of Morality*. In the chronology (#A, 3) in between Marx's *Fragment on Machines* (1858) and Firestone's *The two modes of cultural history* (1970), Nietzsche's accelerationist fragment known as *The Strong of the Future* (1887) is clearly lacking. One of the aims of this essay is to identify the correct allocation of Nietzsche's thought with reference to the accelerationist movement, to the *Anti-Oedipus* and to Deleuze and Guattari's thought. The philosopher from Röcken has been the first to speak correctly about the *overall machinery, solidarity of all gears*, and about *accelerating the process*. (NCV 161- 162).

Matteo Pasquinelli properly points out the final part of the *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* as *locus classicus* of the contemporary accelerationist movement, thanks to the deep queries Deleuze and Guattari placed. However these questions remain unanswered and therefore still open; they deal with revolutionary strategies, positions of nihilist capitalism and potential escape routes from a political and economic situation that recalls the image of a *cul-de-sac*. The text to analyze follows:

It is at the level of flows, the monetary flows included, and not at the level of ideology, that the integration of desire is achieved. So what is the solution? Which is the revolutionary path? Psychoanalysis is of little help, entertaining as it does the most intimate of relations with money, and recording—while refusing to recognize it—an entire system of economic-monetary dependences at the heart of the desire of every subject it treats. Psychoanalysis constitutes for its part a gigantic enterprise of absorption of surplus value. But which is the revolutionary path? Is there one?—To withdraw from the world market, as Samir Amin advises Third World countries to do, in a curious revival of the fascist "economic solution"? Or might it be to go in the opposite direction? To go still further, that is, in the movement of the market, of decoding and deterritorialization? For perhaps the flows are not yet deterritorialized enough, not decoded enough, from the viewpoint of a theory and a practice of a highly schizophrenic character. Not to withdraw from the process, but to go further, to "accelerate the process," as Nietzsche put it: in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet. (AO, 238-239)

The plane of consistency and the unfulfilled questions

The questions we can pose to the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* may be divided in «molar» and «molecular». As Felix Guattari says, it is necessary to establish an appropriate «plane of consistency» where everything holds: the molar order and the molecular machines (AOE 287-291). Before listing the molecular questions it may be useful to clarify the concept of «philosophical problem» - which we derive from Bergson - in order to formulate our answers. The French theorist said that in philosophy, as anywhere else *"it is matter of*

question of finding the problem and consequently of positioning it, even more that of solving it. For a speculative problem is solved as soon as it is properly stated. By that I mean that its solution exists then, although it may remain hidden and so to speak covered up and the only thing left to do is to uncover it. But stating the problem is not simply uncovering, it is inventing. Discovery, or uncovering, has to do with what already exists actually or virtually; it is therefore certain to happen sooner or later.” (CM, 51)

Molar question

The meaning of the accelerationist passage is overall difficult to comprehend and the various commentators have not submitted satisfactory answers until now (Kerslake, MMDG 61-63).

Molecular questions

1) The problem of the margin-notes in Deleuze and Guattari's *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* with reference to the accelerationist passage by Nietzsche and the «good reasons» not to quote the «sinister» fragment (Pasquinelli, CSVAI).

2) Nietzsche's supposedly «misquoted» fragment, recalled by Deleuze and Guattari in their passage about the «revolutionary path» and «accelerating the process» (Pasquinelli, CSVAI).

3) The enigmatic meaning of the last sentence of the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*: «in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet.» (AO, 239). This last sentence together with the last lines of the passage, undermines the whole logical meaning of the paragraph and creates the «enigmatic block» as shown by Kerslake's analysis (Kerslake, MMDG 61-63).

4) The evident contradiction to combine the capitalist monetary flux (the «surplus value of code» for Pasquinelli and «Bernard Schmitt's economic theory» for Kerslake) with the acceleration of decoded and deterritorialized flux conceived by the «capital» for revolutionary outcomes (as suggested by Pasquinelli and Kerslake) in the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*.

5) The political and philosophical issue that is concealed behind the “hidden” meaning of the «accelerationist» passage that Deleuze and Guattari try to clarify through the experimental theory of decoded and deterritorialized flows.

The above-mentioned molecular unanswered questions gather in a homogeneous combination of micro and macro queries which need to be accurately answered given the reliability of the proponents and the importance these questions raise in today's political and social research fields as well as in speculative-philosophical ones.

Four identification points in *Anti-OEdipus*

How to read *Anti-OEdipus*? We have identified four main prominent characteristics in the volume. The first one is its *hypertextuality*: we have considered Deleuze and Guattari's book as a broad-viewed designed hypertext, long before the hypertext was framed. Both the volumes *Capitalism and Schizophrenia - Anti-OEdipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* display and «machinate» a philosophical complexity composed by knots enucleated as «simple steps or hyperlinks» unwinding further problems, queries and narrations present in other intellectual objects, which altogether form a proper network of senses.

Deleuze himself defined *Anti-OEdipus* a flow-book (DI, 218). The two philosophers never wanted in fact to “write a madman's book [the schizophrenic], but a book in which you no longer know who is speaking: there is no basis for knowing whether it's a doctor, a patient, or some present, past, or future madman speaking” (DI, 218). At the same time it was also important that these clinical subjectivities, these conceptual tags, could interchangeably speak as “mental patients or doctors of civilization” (DI, 218). Three other characteristics are important to understand this strange attractor-book: the first one regards politics, the second Nietzsche (the work needs to be analyzed as a *Nietzschean organon*) and the last one is about style: *Anti-OEdipus* in fact employs the “style as a concept” (N, 140-147).

In a conversation with Antonio Negri published in the magazine *Futur Anterior* (1990) Deleuze defines his *Anti-OEdipus* as a “political book from top to bottom”. We firmly believe that the book is pure dynamite, able to extend from the '70s, in which it has ensued, to any present time: a book capable of expanding the limits of thought and to produce positive effects for both the individual and the community. The book offers the visions of the two drafters who originate from left wing communities of different backgrounds: Guattari followed Lacan in his seminaries, he worked at the psychiatric hospital *La Borde*, he cooperated with the magazine «La voie communiste», whereas Deleuze was less politically characterized and was not particularly linked to any political association except for his militancy in Foucault GIP (Group d'information sur les prisons). His biggest influence

had been Pierre Klossowski who - Deleuze will say in his *Nomad Thought* - may have represented the torch-bearer between the latest group of Nietzschean philosophers and the first ones who gathered around Bataille's magazine «Acéphale» in the 30's. Klossowski defines Deleuze's approach, when playing Nietzsche's card of the de-subjectivation of the author, as the one who introduced the «unteachable» in the teaching method because, he says, the most important mission of philosophy is to invent concepts: "*Philosophy's job has always been to create new concepts, with their own necessity. (...) Philosophy's no more communicative than it's contemplative or reflective: it is by nature creative or even revolutionary, because it's always creating new concepts. The only constraint is that these should have a necessity, as well as an unfamiliarity, and they have both to the extent they're a response to real problems. Concepts are what stops thought being a mere opinion, a view, an exchange of views, gossip. Any concept is bound to be a paradox*" (N, 136).

Chapter II

The morning acceleration: a headless revolution

Thinking about it today it seems to me obvious that for years, especially in the 70's, nomads were the image of Good. Nomadic was what wriggled out of tangled malicious control. Nomadic was what escaped from the persecution of the New Man, who was - in the best case - a screw and most frequently a mole.

Roberto Calasso, *L'Occhio Assoluto* (1993)

To Lenin, who asserted that Socialism was the Soviet power plus the electrification, Kronstadt answered: it is the Party plus the executions.

Jean-Francois Lyotard, *Energumen Capitalism* (1972)

On the missing notes

In 1966, Foucault and Deleuze became editors of the French edition of Colli and Montinari's *Complete Works of F. Nietzsche*. Their coauthored *General Introduction* published in 1967 as part of volume V which included Klossowski's translation of *The Gay Science* and the *Unpublished Fragments (1881-1882)*; in this edition they expressed the hope that the publication could open to a total "return to Nietzsche" thanks to Colli and Montinari's work, which they defined as crucial. The main problem around Nietzsche in the 60's was the issue of the *Nachlass* "...before accurate and credible scholars started collecting and reordering Nietzsche's *Nachlass*, we only knew that a certain book called *The Will of Power* existed and that it was an arbitrary cut of Nietzsche's posthumous writings and notes of various times and origins" (CWN, General Introduction). The major problem was not only the «fictional» book but the introduction of a rigorous and scientific criterion to definitively order the big amount of posthumous written texts left by Nietzsche; "*the handwritten notebooks are at least three times the size of Nietzsche's publication during his lifetime. The unpublished fragments already distributed are many fewer than those still to be put in print*" (CWN, General Introduction). Montinari and his team of researchers carefully searched in Weimar's archives and decided, together with Colli and the Italian publisher Adelphi, "to publish Nietzsche's notebooks following a chronological order in accordance with the corresponding periods of Nietzsche's published works". Deleuze and Foucault immediately understood the importance of such an immense work: "*It is at least on three main points that the reading of Nietzsche's work has radically changed after Colli and Montinari's work: one, it is now possible to notice distortions due to Elisabeth Nietzsche and Peter Gast's edition, two, we may trace mistakes in dates, misinterpretation of the texts and numerous omissions in the previous editions of the *Nachlass* and three, it is now possible to know the big amount of the unpublished texts*" (CWN, General Introduction). The expectation was palpable in the 60's: it was finally possible not only to get a wider and more complete idea on how Nietzsche elaborated his concepts, transforming, enriching and deforming them in his «mental laboratory» but also to detect various undiscovered and unknown meanings of his philosophy among the huge amount of the *Nachlass*. This to explain and clarify that the missing footnote in the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* is neither a lack of attention nor carelessness of the authors or the publisher, and not even an attempt to keep enigmatic a paragraph that dealt with a «somber and reactionary» writer as Nietzsche. As already mentioned in our article, *The Strong of the Future* - the final passage of the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* and *locus classicus* of the accelerationist movement - is numbered 9 [153] as established by Colli and Montinari's critical edition.

The sunset of Unpolitical Nietzsche

Deleuze wrote two Nietzsche's monographs, one entitled *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962) and the other simply *Nietzsche* (1965). The first monograph opens the «golden decade» about Nietzsche - which culminated with *Anti-Oedipus* in 1972 and with the Cerisy-la-Salle conference of July 1972 entitled «Nietzsche aujourd'hui?» - and is considered the most complete and detailed analysis of Nietzsche's philosophy. In chapters II, III and IV the French philosopher analyzes the «infamous» text *The Will of Power* and other writings of the same years: *Beyond Good and Evil* and *On the Genealogy of Morals*. In the 1962 book we have no reference of the accelerationist fragment (here numbered 898 as per Nietzsche's sister and Peter Gast's notation). As a reference for his first monograph, Deleuze considered Gallimard *La Volonté de Puissance* edition (1947-48) that, according to the Italian curator Fabio Polidori, "is an edition based on the order previously given by Friederich Wuerzbach in his *Das Vermächtnis Friedrich Nietzsches* (Salzburg-Leipzig, 1940) and that lists a completely new and enriched order of texts if compared to the second edition of the famous *Der Will zur Macht*". Despite the presence of the fragment *The Strong of the Future* in Wuerzbach's anthology, Deleuze does not mention any «acceleration» or «future forces» even in his second monograph *Nietzsche* (1965). It is with Pierre Klossowski's analysis in 1969 (*Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*) that the accelerationist fragment becomes central, creating a resolute axis Deleuze - Klossowski responsible for a new account of Nietzsche's authentic thought. It is while talking about Nietzsche's text in an interview with Jean-Noel Vuarnet in February 1968 that we may understand the reason of the «missing notes» about the accelerationist fragment in *Anti-Oedipus*. Here's an abstract of the interview: "Jean- Noel Vuarnet: *Gallimard's re-edition of Nietzsche's complete works has started to appear on the shelves. You and Foucault have been credited with "responsibility" for the first volume. What exactly was your role?* Gilles Deleuze: *We played a small role. You are no doubt well aware that the whole point of this edition is to publish all posthumous notes, many of which have never seen the light of day, by distributing them chronologically in the order of the books that Nietzsche himself published. Accordingly, The Gay Science, translated by Klossowski, includes the posthumous notes of 1881-1882. The authors of this edition are, on the one hand, Colli and Montinari, to whom we are indebted for the texts, and on the other, the translators, for whom Nietzsche's style and techniques have posed enormous problems. We were responsible only for grouping the texts in order.* (DI, 135). As per Deleuze and Foucault's explicit request, the first volume of Nietzsche's *OEuvres philosophiques complètes* (Gallimard, Paris 1967) is translated by Klossowski as well as *Fragments posthumes 1887-88* (1976). At the same time Klossowski's book *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (1969) introduces the accelerationist fragment, a fragment that he received together with the «rough material» delivered from Colli and Montinari even before they enumerated the fragments with the order we know today. A further confirmation comes from the notes of the edition of his book: "Klossowski himself provides no references for the sources of his citations from Nietzsche's notebooks. At the conclusion of the French text of the book, he simply appends the following note: 'All the citations from Nietzsche are taken from the posthumous fragments - and in particular, from those of his final decade 1880-1888.'" (NVC, 262). As shown in our previous essay *The strong of the future: Nietzsche's accelerationist fragment in Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus* the two French philosophers used the expression «accelerate the process» in their *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) as correctly introduced by Klossowski's *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* and thus they did not quote any specific reference because at the time being Klossowski was working on the edition of the *Unpublished Fragments* and Deleuze was himself responsible for the French edition.

The system of economic dependency on desire

Here comes the chapter *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* where the difficult passage lies. All the aforementioned qualities in *Anti-Oedipus* - Nietzschean method, hypertextuality, repetition as power, style as movement of concepts and so on - reach a real *klimax* in this passage considered not only the traditional cartographie for the accelerationist movement but also the *crux* of the entire anti-oedipal book. As many have noticed there is no clear logical coherence between the sense of the text and the authors' political position. Something eludes, slips away and it is plausible that a few Deleuze and Guattari's scholars wonder if the two French philosophers may have misquoted or misreported Nietzsche. A very detailed reading of the passage - divided in parts - may serve the cause.

It is at the level of flows, the monetary flows included, and not at the level of ideology, that the integration of desire is achieved. So what is the solution? Which is the revolutionary path? Psychoanalysis is of little help, entertaining as it does the most intimate of relations with money, and recording—while refusing to recognize it— an entire system of economic-monetary dependences at the heart of the desire of every subject it treats.

Psychoanalysis constitutes for its part a gigantic enterprise of absorption of surplus value. But which is the revolutionary path? Is there one? (AO, 238)

If capitalism is immanent to society and desire for it permeates society, what possible solution may we find if the two fluxes are so intrinsically integrated? If ideology is no longer an answer, as masses are not captivated by ideology but by the desire of monetary fluxes, what solution may we find? The claustro-scenario is nightmarish: from the very first steps there is no possibility of an alternative, of a revolutionary path - « is there one? » the two philosophers ask. Even psychoanalysis is of little help: part of the *system*, it is absorbed as *anti-productive* practice which «ingests and achieves» the nomadic profitability and slips into the social body. Moreover it has created a circuit of *absorption of surplus value* thanks to the desire produced by the cultural industry. Once Freud's psychoanalysis has been overtaken whom shall we pass the baton of revolution to?

The withdrawal of the left wing nationalism from the world market

To withdraw from the world market, as Samir Amin advises Third World countries to do, in a curious revival of the fascist "economic solution"? Or might it be to go in the opposite direction? To go still further, that is, in the movement of the market, of decoding and deterritorialization? For perhaps the flows are not yet deterritorialized enough, not decoded enough, from the viewpoint of a theory and a practice of a highly schizophrenic character. (AO, 238)

Samir Amin, the exponent of the marxist, anti-capitalist, unaligned «Third-World Left» with his nationalist and isolationist position, reminds Deleuze and Guattari of a revival of the *fascist "economic solution"* of 20s and 30s of the XX century. Therefore another revolutionary option is then discarded and the two French philosophers paradoxically ask: what about going "*towards the opposite direction?*" A question which produces a double effect: on one side it rejects some of the classical hypothesis of the European «revolutionary humanism»: traditional left wing movements like socialism, communism or social democracy are not even taken into consideration for a revolutionary path. Not to mention the revolutionary trade unionism, the radical reformism or the naive anarchic spontaneity, the new post '68 political manifestations, the so-called «little churches» by Guattari. (DI, 264). Neither is the armed struggle, the nihilist frontal attack to the system. So where is such a question taking us? It follows that we must look towards the exact opposite of the «marxist nationalism» that is to say a worldwide revolution against the same global capitalism of the decoded and deterritorialized monetary flux, mentioned by Deleuze and Guattari. The only possible marxist or revolutionary global theory antagonistic of capitalism is the one of Lev Trotsky, with whom Guattari sympathized in the 50's but the idea of a «permanent revolution» or of Fourth International never suited Deleuze and Guattari who have never been nostalgic of soviet times. "*Yet no revolutionary tendency was willing or able to assume the need for a Soviet organization that would have allowed the masses to take real charge of their interests and desires. Machines called political organizations were put in circulation, and they functioned according to the model Dimitrov had developed at the Seventh International Congress — alternating between popular fronts and sectarian retractions — and they always lead to the same repressive results. (...) By their axiomatics, these mass machines refuse to liberate revolutionary energy. Red flag in hand, this politics in its underhanded way reminds one of the politics of the President or the clergy.*" (DI, 268). Which chances may a turbo-trotskyist plan have when referred to «the civilized capitalist machine»? With regards to the economic aspect, can we find an economic theory alternative to capitalism with the same global tension and the same will of power? Neither Suzanne de Brunhoff's neo-Marxism, nor Bernard Schmitt with his theory of quantum fluxes, show the same strength. Without convincing answers on the horizon and with all historical possibilities of revolution set aside, which *opposite direction* is possible? At this point Deleuze and Guattari reveal the second effect of their statement: to push the revolutionary motion alongside with the decodification and deterritorialization of the economic market. Why doing so, we may ask, and what do revolutionary anti-market forces share with the capitalistic ones? Which alliance could be established from a position of «withdrawal from the market» to one of a wild *laissez-faire* economy? Moreover what are the two French philosophers referring to when they speak about «a theory and practice of a highly schizophrenic character» that is supposed to further deterritorialize and decode the flows? Were Deleuze and Guattari really looking for a compromise with the market, when questioning themselves about the revolution of the future?

Accelerate the process

Not to withdraw from the process, but to go further, to "accelerate the process," as Nietzsche put it: in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet. (AO, 239)

We may assume as a logical starting point that Deleuze and Guattari are offering an apparent pro-market path, as highlighted in the previous paragraph; at the same time, we find a contradiction with the opposite option of a worldwide anti-capitalist revolution able to go beyond localism to reach that dimension which Srnicek and Williams call *folk politics*. Not only one should go «backward» against the nationalist-marxist economy, or against those revolutionary ideals which overthrow established powers but - without withdrawing from the market - one should even join those turbo-capitalist lawless forces so as to push and «accelerate» the dangerous tendencies moving the decodification and deterritorialization of society. Why? If we take for granted that Deleuze and Guattari are not sneaky infiltrators of the enemies we may see such «unity of intentions» with the most extreme forces of the market economy as a «future benefit». Under the idea of instrumental exchange between immediate *evil* and future *good*, the statement «we haven't seen anything yet» sounds particularly sinister: the more violent the repression and the homologation of the individual arises, the fastest the «explosion of the final Good» - as a basis of a new revolution - will come. A second consideration deals with the force. Which type of force is an «accelerated revolutionary force»? The question is pertinent if we consider that «going backward» against the marxist-nationalist protectionism represents the *trait d'union* among forces moved by an active power that aims to destroy the countries (their territories) and their codes. Such forces are deregulated and mainly characterised by speed, therefore they may be called «dromocratic forces». The powers that «stand still» and protect, are against the «accelerating forces» that decodify and become different from what they were. If the traditional market economy society yielded to the intrinsically capitalist and technologically developed *dromology*, society itself would be destined to be dominated by a *monoscopic* turbo-capitalism: an infinitive accumulation in a *singular technological scenario*. Similarly, if the revolutionary forces that «stand still» were overperformed by hidden dromocratic forces, what could a revolution be? “*A desiring power accelerated to a point where it exploded all the splinter groups*” (DI, 265) as Guattari states? Can we conceive a machinic-dromocratic revolution and its consequent implications in different apocalyptic antinomic forces?

Third consideration: the time and actions of the levelling forces expressed by the «homo democraticus» have come to the end of that enlightened path which made man first a *progressive accelerationist* and then a *dull kathecon*, a reactionary, a preventer. Will a new «dromocratic community» offer a return to the Great Politics as announced by Nietzsche?

Let's drop all masks! Nietzsche galore!

To answer the molecular questions 2 and 3 - about a possible misquotation and about the meaning of the phrase “*we haven't seen anything yet*” - we need to explain the notion of flow and clarify the relationship between desire, libido and unconscious. With «flow» Deleuze and Guattari mean «process»: “*This process is what we call a flow. But, again, flow is an everyday, unqualified notion that we needed. It can be a flow of words, a flow of ideas, a flow of shit, a flow of money. It can be a financial mechanism or a schizophrenic machine: it surpasses all duality*” (DI, 218). As far as the relationship between desire, libido and unconscious is concerned Deleuze describes their origin as such: “*Guattari early on had the intuition that the unconscious is directly related to a whole social field, both economic and political, rather than the mythical and familial grid traditionally deployed by psychoanalysis. It is indeed a question of libido as such, as the essence of desire and sexuality: but now it invests and dis-invests flows of every kind as they trickle through the social field, and it effects cuts in these flows, stoppages, leaks, and retentions. To be sure, it does not operate in a manifest way, as do the objective interests of consciousness or the chains of historical causality. It deploys a latent desire coextensive with the social field, entailing ruptures in causality and the emergence of singularities, sticking points as well as leaks*” (DI, 193).

Deleuze consciously chooses to side with Nietzsche and uses that position against Marx and Freud. According to Deleuze, capitalism is based on flows but “*what really matter is the organization of power*” which he defines as “*the unity of desire and the economic infrastructure*” (DI, 262, 263). Here lies the essential criticism to the orthodox marxism and its ideological pretensions to put the desire-phenomenon on the superstructure. The Party itself is criticized by the two philosophers who see it as the *new* organization for a *repressive* power (DI, 263) refusing its definition of an avant-garde external mechanism of synthesis classified as such since Lenin times. (ID, 266). There is a *double refusal* of, on one hand, the traditional division between infrastructure and superstructure as theorized by Marx, where the economic structure expresses the relations of production; and on the other, of the Leninist theory of the Party seen as proletarian guide and political class consciousness which in

other words is the refusal of an analytic machine external to the working class and the revolutionary process. This could be the reason why it is exactly in the accelerationist passage that we meet the «conceptual persona» of Nietzsche; according to Deleuze and Guattari in fact Nietzsche may be seen as the master of the generalized disintegration of codes. Considering the triad Marx, Freud and Nietzsche as the contemporary western thought fathers, we can read a clear rejection of the first two in Deleuze and Guattari's words: "... for our part, we prefer not to participate in any effort consistent with a Freudo-Marxist perspective. And this for two reasons. The first is that, in the end, a Freudo-Marxist effort proceeds in general from a return to origins, or more specifically to the sacred texts: the sacred texts of Freud, the sacred texts of Marx. Our point of departure must be completely different: we refer not to sacred texts that must be, to a greater or lesser extent, interpreted, but to the situation as is, the situation of the bureaucratic apparatus in psychoanalysis, which is an effort to subvert these apparatuses.(...) Secondly, what separates us from any Freudo-Marxist effort is that such projects seek primarily to reconcile two economies: political economy and libidinal or desiring economy. (...) Our point of view is on the contrary that there is but one economy and that the problem of a real anti-psychoanalytical analysis [a synonym of schizoanalysis that Deleuze and Guattari started using after the Anti-OEdipus] is to show how unconscious desire invests the forms of this economy. It is economy itself that is political economy and desiring economy." (ID, 275) After a few months from the release of the volume *Anti-OEdipus*, at the conference in Cerisy-la-Salle (July 1972), entitled «Nietzsche aujourd'hui?» in his speech *Nomadic Thought* Deleuze asserts that "faced with the way in which our societies come uncoded, codes leaking away on every side, Nietzsche does not try to perform a re-coding." (ID, 253) and clearly explains his siding with Nietzsche: "(...) if one examines not the letter of Marx or Freud, but the becoming of Marxism and the becoming of Freudianism, we see, paradoxically, Marxists and Freudians engaged in an attempt to recode Marx and Freud: in the case of Marxism, you have a re-coding by the State ("the State has made you ill, the State will cure you" — this cannot be the same State); and in the case of Freudianism, you have a re-coding by the family (you fall ill from the family and recover through the family — this is not the same family). What at the horizon of our culture in fact constitutes Marxism and psychoanalysis as those two fundamental bureaucracies, the one public, the other private, is their effort to recode as best they can precisely that which on the horizon ceaselessly tends to come uncoded. This is not at all what Nietzsche is about. His problem is elsewhere. For Nietzsche, it is about getting something through in every past, present, and future code, something which does not and will not let itself be re-coded." (ID, 252). This «something» that is about getting something but will not let itself be re-coded is the expression of the unconscious produced by the primary pulsion of the individual.

Codebreakers

«Codes» are, according to Deleuze, laws, contracts, institutions. According to the French philosopher, Marx and Freud, due to their «school of thought», remain enchained to the old [renewed] codes: a new State, a new family, a new relation of production. Nietzsche is, on the contrary, completely outside this set of codes: he is the «codebreaker» of philosophy, the anti-philosopher who disowns laws, contracts and institutions. (NT,143) He gave thought a dimension of war-machine, a nomadic unit. (NT,149) Such Deleuzian interpretation of Nietzsche's philosophy marks a total break with the previous political and philosophical thought and takes the fracture into the revolutionary decoding scenario. In *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* three decoding actions take place: we may call the first one *Schizophrenia of the Capital* and it is minutely analyzed in the book *Anti-OEdipus*, the second one is the above mentioned action of the codebreaker, a useless position in terms of insurrection as it does not provide any pragmatic or epistemological indication for a potential revolution. It's none of Nietzsche's intention to create movements nor to establish parties and new states, because *he serves both as the agent and object of decodification* (NT, 146). That is the reason why Nietzsche is a powerful ally to the third decoding action expressed by Deleuze and Guattari in the *Anti-OEdipus* and by the revolutionary movement born on the barricades of May 1968 - which refused the old ways to act and think, looking for innovative theoretical paths as well as efficient subversive practice. Klossowski and Foucault are two other relevant allies: this close-knit community will be able to answer which revolutionary path and accelerationist process *The Civilized Capitalist Machine* passage refers to.

Going further in the movement of decoding and deterritorialization

Let us better analyse the proposal of *going further*. To go against Samir Amin's *left wing nationalism* means, for Deleuze and Guattari, to go further in the movement of decoding and deterritorialization of the market, where the movement does not solely apply to the market but to the revolutionary realm, too. The expression *to go further*

can be read as a prolongation not only of the *capital* itself - as it may seem under an «economical» reading of the passage - but as a movement to take the process as far as possible, overturning the initial meaning. Deleuze reports in his *Nietzsche* (1965) that the same expression had already been used by Nietzsche in a passage from *The Antichrist*: “Mankind has ventured to call pity a virtue (--in every superior moral system it appears as a weakness--); going still further, it has been called the virtue, the source and foundation of all other virtues--but let us always bear in mind that this was from the standpoint of a philosophy that was nihilistic, and upon whose shield the denial of life was inscribed. Schopenhauer was right in this: that by means of pity life is denied, and made worthy of denial--pity is the technic of nihilism” (AC, 11). The phrase «to go [still] further» is repeated twice in the passage *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*. If we follow Nietzsche’s interpretation of the nomadic deterritorialization and the lawless destruction - the decoding - we understand that the «process» to accelerate is quite the opposite of the one proper to the market. In Nietzsche’s thought the market movement implies a *nihilist praxis*, a double negative movement, a «saying “no” to life», in Nietzschean words. The first movement represses any impulse and destroys any difference, any self-organized network, being its only goal the constant flow of goods to create and distribute richness through the remuneration of the capital. The second movement, immanent to the first one, produces a process of levelling and compliance as necessary condition to the survival of humanity at such level of artificiality. In Nietzsche’s fragment entitled *The Strong of the Future* the same process is highlighted and the two positive movements of liberation and differentiation - Nietzsche’s «saying yes to life» - represent, in Deleuze and Guattari’s words, a way to “*free[ing] flows, going further and further into contrivance: a schizophrenic is someone who’s been decoded, deterritorialized*” especially when considering the process as a theory and a praxis of fluxes with high schizophrenic content. “*We make a distinction between schizophrenia as a process and the way schizophrenics are produced as clinical cases that need hospitalizing: it’s almost the same thing in reverse. The schizophrenics in hospitals are people who’ve tried to do something and failed, cracked up. We’re not saying revolutionaries are schizophrenics. We’re saying there’s a schizoid process, of decoding and deterritorializing, which only revolutionary activity can stop turning into the production of schizophrenia.*” (N, 23) At this point their question is: what is schizoanalysis if not a *militant libidino-economic, libidino-political analysis*? (N, 19) Moreover, assuming that the subconscious produces desire through a schizophrenic process, which goal does schizoanalysis have? Deleuze stunning definition follows: “*Schizoanalysis has one single aim - to get revolutionary, artistic, and analytic machines working as parts, cogs, of one another. Again, if you take delire, we see it as having two poles, a fascist paranoid pole and a schizo-revolutionary pole. That’s what we’re interested in: revolutionary schisis as opposed to the despotic signifier.*” (N, 24) Our task is now to identify whether Nietzsche’s strong of the future exponents, and anticapitalist parasitic bohemians, introduced by the accelerationist fragment in the *Anti-OEdipus*, may correspond to Deleuze and Guattari’s *anti-oedipal* desiring machines and *anti-fascist* nomadic singularities.

The heart of the plot

Nietzsche’s phrase “*accelerate the process*” is essential in shaping the concept of a «headless revolution» that Deleuze, Guattari and the *revolutionary Nietzschean community* were elaborating in the years 1968 - 1977. To fully understand the meaning of *The Strong of the Future* we need a hypertextual reading of the content because as Deleuze said “*a text is nothing but a cog in a larger extra-textual practice*” (DI, 259) to prolong and make it fruitful. An alliance with Klossowski’s exegesis of the fragment *The Strong of the Future* and his masterful book *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* is necessary. Klossowski defines *The Strong of the future* as the fragment at the «heart of the plot», Deleuze and Guattari understanding the powerful message of anti-capitalist conspiracy, transfer it into the «heart» of their accelerationist passage known as *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*, essential core of the entire book *Anti-OEdipus*. Theirs is an indirect and updated reply to Nietzsche’s sovereign anti-gregarious cast theory and a direct and affirmative reply to Klossowski’s revolutionary query of an anti-establishment and anti-market conspiracy. Foucault will share the same impressive newness as expressed in his *Introduction* to the American edition of *Anti-OEdipus*: “*Anti-OEdipus shows first of all how much ground has been covered. But it does much more than that. It wastes no time in discrediting the old idols, even though it does have a great deal of fun with Freud. Most important, it motivates us to go further.*” (INFL, 5) and about Klossowski he defines his *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* as the best book of philosophy ever read. What is then so precious and at the same time so subversive in Klossowski’s book about Nietzsche that makes the two French philosophers completely side with him?

The plot: origin and future

It is possible that Klossowski had been waiting thirty years to be able to find in Nietzsche's *Nachlass* a confirmation to his and Bataille's thesis about a possible post-Zarathustra «plotting theory» against the economic system of society. Thanks to the dual alliance with Colli and Montinari on one side and with the two French philosophers on the other (a relationship solidified during the Royaumont Conference in July 1964), Klossowski may develop and elaborate an analysis on some specific Nietzschean themes, that will be completed with both his masterpiece *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (1969) and his next reprise entitled *Circulus Vitiosus*, displayed at the Cerisy-la-Salle Convention in 1972. *Circulus Vitiosus* marks the «passing of the torch» from the generation of Nietzschean philosophers of the '30s to the new *anti-philosophers* of the '50s and '60s, independent from Marxist and structuralist schemes, like Foucault, Deleuze, Lyotard, Derrida to name a few.

Klossowski's advice in reading some of Nietzsche's fragments, namely *The Strong of the Future*, is "[to] overcome the feeling of strangeness that, prima facie, Nietzsche's affirmations inspire" (CV, 33). In this fragment Nietzsche asserts that the emancipation of European man will produce a new type of «excessive» man, *the strong of the future*, whose aim will not be the needs of society but the needs of the future. Klossowski clarifies that "*The thought that a setting apart or isolation of a human group could be used as a method for creating a series of 'rare and singular plants' (a 'race' having 'its own sphere of life, freed from any virtue-imperative): - this experimental character of the project - impracticable - if it were not the object of a vast conspiracy - because no amount of 'planning' could ever foresee 'hothouses' of this kind - would in some manner have to be inscribed in and produced by the very process of the economy.*" (NVC, 166) But the economy of any society would prefer destroying such «rare and singular plants», as the costs of their elimination would be less than those spent for their growth and their probable consequent eradication, once these plants would represent unrelated communities, whose political goal would be the overturning of any future representative deemed to have power. Thanks to this fragment the philosopher Klossowski finds an ethical opportunity to show a straightforward anti-system plot in Nietzsche's words: "*This challenge is anticipated by every industrial morality, whose laws of production create a bad conscience in anyone who lives within the unexchangeable, and which can tolerate no culture or sphere of life that is not in some manner integrated into or subjected to general productivity. It is against this vast enterprise of intimidating the affects, whose amplitude measures, that Nietzsche proposes his own projects of selection, as so many menaces. These projects must provide for the propitious moment when these rare, singular and, to be sure, poisonous plants can be clandestinely cultivated - and then can blossom forth like an insurrection of the affects against every virtue-imperative.*" (NVC, 167) The ethical and moral fronts of the counterposing forces are on display here: on one side we have the productive gregarious constantly spurred on producing goods, each gaining his daily sovereign portion, following established and controlled codes, figures, rules, and behaviours, while on the other side the *non-assimilated* men that Klossowski defines as a "... *some secret, elusive community, whose actions would resist suppression by any regime. Only such a community would have the ability to disperse itself through its action whilst maintaining a certain efficacy, at least until the inevitable moment when gregarious reality appropriates the community's secret in some institutional capacity.*" (CV, 34) Deleuze and Guattari replay the aforementioned «unproductive species» in the late XX century as insurrectionary force in the accelerated processes of desiring-production. We have evidence of this idea in Deleuze's *Nomad Thought* (written four months after *Anti-OEdipus*): "*Confronted with the ways in which our societies become progressively decodified and unregulated, in which our codes break down at every point, Nietzsche is the only thinker who makes no attempt at recodification. He says: the process still has not gone far too enough, we are still only children ("The emancipation of the European man is the great irreversible process of the present day; and the tendency should even be accelerated."). In his own writing and thought Nietzsche assists in the attempt at decodification - not in the relative sense, but expressing something that can not be codified, confounding all codes. But to confound all codes is not easy, even on the simplest level of writing and thought.*" (NT, 143) At this point a discrepancy between the interpretation of the quote «accelerate the process» in Nietzsche and in Deleuze is to be noted and explained. A political Nietzsche thinks - according to Klossowski's reading - that a possible "*secret society comprised of experimenters, scholars and artists, in other words creators will know how to act according to the doctrine of the vicious circle and will make it the sine qua non of universal existence.*" (CV, 34) This community of singularities have at their back a society that follows an incessant economic growth for a «total management of the world» and a «planetary planning of the existence»; whereas in *Anti-OEdipus* there is no hint of such plans. Theirs (Deleuze and Guattari's) is a message of hope through the conflict. The century of revolutions has occurred, maybe even ahead of Nietzsche's imagination, and it is exactly from the extraordinary load of energy/desire coming out from such breaking events, that Nietzsche's *hothouses*-differentiations - as well as Deleuze and Guattari's revolutionary events - rise. The affirmative delirium

of the nomadic codebreakers that accelerate the process of destitution of codes and spaces through a schizo-desiring production, corresponds and substitutes in Deleuze and Guattari's anti-philosophy, the figure of the *strong-of-the-future-plotter*. As far as the "we are still only children" is concerned, Deleuze in his *Anti-Oedipus* hints at a parodistic reprimand towards «the poisonous childhood charm» in the process of acceleration of delirious behaviours of the mutinous ones to come. But we need Klossowski to fully understand the meaning of it: "The power of the propagation of the species is already turned against the instrument that multiplied it: the industrial spirit, which raised gregariousness to the rank of the sole agent of existence, will have thus carried the seeds of its own destruction with itself. Despite appearances, the new species, 'strong enough to have no need of the tyranny of the virtue-imperative', does not yet reign; and unless it is already preparing for it on the backs of the classes, what it will ultimately bring about - the most fearful thing of its kind - is perhaps still sleeping in the cradle." (NCV, 167,168) What a terrible joke and dread for the gregarious of any time to breed vipers in their bosom! Nietzsche may laugh in the end, with his Dionysian laugh: "It often happens that Nietzsche comes face to face with something sickening, ignoble, disgusting. Well, Nietzsche thinks it's funny, and he would add fuel to the fire if he could. He says: keep going, it's still not disgusting enough. Or he says: excellent, how disgusting, what a marvel, what a masterpiece, a poisonous flower, finally the "human species is getting interesting." (DI, 257). Deleuze is right here in affirming: "It is perhaps in this sense that Nietzsche announces the advent of a new politics ... which Klossowski calls a plot against his own class." (NT, 149)

The truth is that we haven't seen anything yet

Let us now analyse the last phrase of the accelerationist passage of the *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*: "in this matter, the truth is that we haven't seen anything yet." (AO, 239) It is necessary to go back to Michel Foucault's speech in Royaumont in 1964 during one of the first seminars organized on Nietzsche, entitled: *Nietzsche, Freud, Marx*. Foucault's speech is about the techniques of interpretations in the three philosophers who - according to him - have "put us back into the presence of a new possibility of interpretation (...), into an uncomfortable position, since these techniques of interpretation concern us ourselves, since we, the interpreters, have begun to interpret ourselves by these techniques. (AME, 272) The works of these three authors have inflicted a heavy blow to the western thought, but these techniques are necessary especially because, Foucault continues, the language is suspicious. "Suspecting language" signifies "that it means something other than what it says" (AME, 270). According to Foucault there are four characteristics of the new hermeneutic as a basis of an interpretative system that we still apply today: depth meant as exteriority, incompleteness, primacy of interpretation with respect to signs and finally an infinite self-interpretation. Deleuze will draw from Foucault's words for his *Conclusion* of the Royaumont seminar: "The reason why we still think there are many hidden aspects in Nietzsche and his work is due to methodological reasons. Each single fact can not have a single meaning. Each fact/thing displays many level of meaning which express the forces and the becoming of such forces in it. (...) Foucault showed it to us: Nietzsche invented new ways of interpretation ... so that the interpretations themselves denounce the «type» that is he who is interpreting, renouncing to the question «what?» in favour of the question «who?»". Deleuze is clearly taking distance from the intellectuals of his time that combine these three philosophers, saying in his *Nomad Thought*: "Probably most of us fix the dawn of our modern culture in the trinity Nietzsche-Freud-Marx. Never mind that by doing so you defuse the explosiveness of each from the start." (NT, 142) Who wanted to do so? He continues: "But the fact that modern philosophy has found the source of its renewal in the Nietzsche-Marx-Freud trinity is indeed rather ambiguous and equivocal. Because it can be interpreted positively as well as negatively. For example, after the war, philosophies of value were in vogue. Everyone was talking about values, and they wanted "axiology" to replace both ontology and the theory of knowledge... But it wasn't the least bit Nietzschean or Marxist in inspiration. On the contrary, no one talked about Nietzsche or Marx at all, no one knew them, and they didn't want to know them. What they made of "value" was a place to resurrect the most traditional, abstract spiritualism imaginable: they called on values in order to inspire a new conformity which they believed was better suited to the modern world, you know, the respect for values, etc. For Nietzsche, as well as for Marx, the notion of value is strictly inseparable 1) from a radical and total critique of society and the world (look at the theme of the "fetish" in Marx, or the theme of "idols" in Nietzsche), and 2) from a creation no less radical: Nietzsche's transvaluation, and Marx's revolutionary action. So, in the post-war context, everyone was all for using a concept of value, but they had completely neutralized it; they had subtracted all critical or creative sense from it. What they made of it was an instrument of established values. It was pure anti-Nietzsche — even worse, it was Nietzsche hijacked, annihilated, suppressed, it was Nietzsche brought back to Sunday mass. " (DI, 135). To explain why "we haven't seen anything yet" Deleuze

says: "Now, Marx and Freud, perhaps, do represent the dawn of our culture, but Nietzsche is something entirely different: the dawn of counterculture." (NT 142). In the year 1972 this counterculture has just started and therefore Deleuze and Guattari state that such revolution is *in itinere* and it will probably be well-combative and well-aware. We, readers of today, do know that such destabilizing omen has not occurred [yet] but maybe *The Strong of the Future* generation is among us, embodied by silicon men and nomadic plotters.

Chapter III

For an Erotica of the Revolution

Solution to the molecular questions 4 and 5

"We realized that we couldn't just hook a Freudian engine up to the Marxist-Leninist train" (DI, 216).

The Freudian engine and the Marxist-Leninist train

Guattari's jokes position the authors of the *Anti-OEdipus* in between the Freudian theory of desire and Marxist political theory. Desire for Deleuze and Guattari cannot be simply the sum of Marxism and Freudism: "The relations of production and those of reproduction participate in the same pairing of productive forces and anti-productive structures. We wanted to move desire into the infrastructure, on the side of production, while we moved the family, the ego, and the individual on the side of anti-production. This is the only way to ensure that sexuality is not completely cut off from the economy." (DI, 216-7) In response to the fourth molecular question on how a politico-philosophical reflection on the real can conjugate in a coherent design with both economic and revolutionary dimension, it is important to isolate a few concepts expressed in the accelerationist passage of the *Civilized Capitalist Machine*. What meaning do «economy», «value», «money» and «revolutionary subject» hold in Deleuze and Guattari? And in Nietzsche and Klossowski? To describe the discouragement of the human being in the process of normalisation in XIX century society, Nietzsche uses economical categories like «exploitation», «luxury», «management» to testify that his thoughts overstep both the traditional concept of liberal economy (Smith, Ricardo, Mill) and their political expression, which is to say the Marxist concept of economics. In his view, the economy leads to a levelling of man and demands a reaction in the form of a counter-movement "aimed to bring to light a stronger species, a higher type of overman". (NVC, 160-1). In *Circulus Vitiosus* Klossowski analyses Nietzsche's vision of excess, otherwise known as *plus value*: "What Nietzsche discerns in the actual state of affairs is that men of excess, those who create, now and from the outset, the meaning of the values of existence (a very paradoxical configuration for Nietzsche) form, so to speak, an occult hierarchy for which the supposed hierarchy of current labourers does all the work. They are precisely the real slaves, the ones who do the greatest labour." (CV, 36) There is another important consequence resulting from the comparison between gregariousness and singularity in the economic movement of «incorrect Darwinian selection», that Klossowski argues and comments with the following words: "From this point of view, the singular case represents a forgetting of previous experiences, which are either assimilated to the gregarious impulses by being relegated to the unconscious, and thus reprimanded by the reigning censure; or on the contrary, are rejected as being unassimilable to the conditions required for the existence of both the species and the individual within the species. For Nietzsche, the singular case rediscovers, in an 'anachronistic' manner, an ancient way of existing - whose reawakening in itself presupposes that present conditions do not correspond to the impulsive state which is in some manner being affirmed through it. Depending on the strength of its intensity, however, this singular state, though anachronistic in relation to the institutional level of gregariousness, can bring about a de-actualization of that institution itself and denounce it in turn as anachronistic. That every reality as such comes to be de-actualized in relation to the singular case, that the resulting emotion seizes the subject's behaviour and forces it into action - this is an adventure that can modify the course of events, following a circuit of chance that Nietzsche will make the dimension of his thought. To the extent that he isolates its periodicity in history, the plan for a conspiracy appears under the sign of the vicious Circle." (NVC, 80) The comment is explosive: it implies an irreconcilable fracture between singularity on an institutional level. He is saying that the communities of *non-assimilated* human beings will form new institutions with new forms: *non-institutions* or *post-institutions* rather than *reformed institutions*. Nietzsche assumes that dark forces operate on human nature thanks to the theory of *will to power* and with the help of a *selective doctrine*: he calls it *Eternal Return*; Klossowski calls it the *Vicious Circle*. In this context, the same doctrine becomes a *tool for conspiracy*. Nietzsche's *anti-darwinian* attitude is here very clear inasmuch the implications brought about by the *selective doctrines* or the *instinctual impulses* are

antithetical to Darwin's *theory of evolution*. Deleuze and Guattari are absorbed by the implications developed by Klossowski's post-institutional gregarious scenario. The *communities of singularities* may use the *liberation of impulse* to make *mortal* what seems *immortal*: the gregarious society and its institutions. In the *Anti-Oedipus* the two philosophers state: "*The revolutionary pole of group fantasy becomes visible, on the contrary, in the power to experience institutions themselves as mortal, to destroy them or change them according to the articulations of desire and the social field, by making the death instinct into a veritable institutional creativity. For that is precisely the criterion—at least the formal criterion— that distinguishes the revolutionary institution from the enormous inertia which the law communicates to institutions in an established order. As Nietzsche says; churches, armies, States—which of all these dogs wants to die?*" (AO, 62-3).

The universal delirium and the parody

The issue about the relevance of revolutionary actions appeared in Cerisy-la-Salle conference in July of 1972 and gave Klossowski the opportunity to talk about "parody" in Nietzsche's philosophy as previously highlighted in his *Nietzsche, Polytheism and Parody* (1957). Reading Nietzsche vs. Marx as a key to interpret the riots of the turbulent 1972 enables Klossowski to sustain that: "*under the sign of the vicious circle, anti-Darwinian conspiracy entails the coming to autonomy of productions that are primarily pathological as the very condition of monumental upheaval in the relation between the social forces present.*" (CV, 39) Nietzsche's proposed insubordination therefore has dueling delirious outcomes: 1) if the thought of the eternal return is nothing other than a parody of a doctrine, even its result, the revolt of the strong of the future, will be a manifestation of some collective delirium, 2) in a nihilist historical moment occurring a hundred years after Nietzsche's idea of plot, the blossoming of a delusion [délire] when confronted with reality, can become in any way efficacious, or, more generally, any deranged comportment might be said to constitute an efficient resistance in the face of a determined adverse force. (CV, 38) During the debate Klossowski asks Deleuze: the insubordination of the delusory ones can be read as an expression of a universal behaviour or is it simply linked to the capital? And again: does delirium transcend any historical time or is it strictly related to the schizophrenic behaviour generated by the capital? Is the appreciation of delirium generated only by the same subverting process reproducing itself? Klossowski's questions suggest that the same valorisation of delirium outlines an empty subject which frees itself from its identity and constantly moves into a metamorphosis of singularities to reach a final acceptance of the doctrine of Eternal Return. Klossowski also indicates the strategies and the new ways of fighting that we may infer from Nietzsche's accelerationist fragments: "*Nietzsche's position draws us away, in any case, from all that which I have up to the present called "political action"; it requires the creation of a new comportment with regards to conflict and strategising. It seems to me more and more - and here I allude to Gilles Deleuze - that we move towards a kind of anti-psychiatric insurrection (...), that is to say, the discovery of a species of pleasure (...), on the part of psychiatrists or doctors in becoming the "object of investigation"- and moreover the pathological case will feel more and more comfortable if he lives, and imposes himself, by subverting the institutional investigations which brand him pathological.*" (CV, 42) Derrida asks explanations about the aforementioned declaration and the discussion becomes very interesting to sketch the Nietzschean Rhizosphere with Klossowski, Deleuze, Lyotard on one side and a very concrete and alert Derrida on the other:

Derrida: "You suggested that parody could become political, and that it was, ultimately, subversive...."

Klossowski: "To the extent that «politics» is taken to entail «strategy» or «comportment»".

Derrida: "But how, in any case, does parody operate? Should one distinguish between two kinds of parody: between the one, which, on the pretext of being subversive, takes the risk of establishing a political order (which very much likes a certain type of parody and finds its own confirmation there) and, on the other hand, a parody which can really deconstruct the political order? Is there a form of parody which actually marks the body politic, in contrast to a parody which would be a parody of a parody, which would play upon the surface of the political order, playfully teasing, rather than destroying it?"

Klossowski: "I think that «in the long run» nothing can resist such a parody."

Derrida: "But someone who wants to transform the political order - can he really trust in the long run?"

Klossowski: "The time that is needed is a function of exercised pressure, and pressure depends, as a consequence, upon contagion.

Lyotard: "For Nietzsche the «parody of a parody» consists in a kind of «ressentiment» against power, it goes no further, it is a condition of mediocrity or weakness in intensity. To differentiate it from the other kind, I think the fundamental criterion is that of intensity. However, it is impossible to determine beforehand what the effectiveness of a parody will be, that's why Nietzsche says it is necessary to be experimenters and artists, not

people who have a plan and try to realise it - that's old politics. Nietzsche says it's necessary to try things out and discover which intensities produce which effects." (CV, 43)

Here are two different revolutionary positions: Derrida's more traditionalist inclination towards socialism and the more heterodox interpretation outlined by Nietzschean Rhizosphere members who support a free-from-ideologies and non-top-down insurrectional action, conceiving revolution as headless, that expresses itself through aimless emissions of energy. Klossowski reminds us in *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* that "*Nietzsche sought from the experience of the return of all things - namely, to lead intention back to intensity*" (NVC,112). The theme of intensity is the real challenge, Deleuze and Guattari write: "*And then, above all, we are not looking for a way out when we say that schizoanalysis as such has strictly no political program to propose. If it did have one, it would be grotesque and disquieting at the same time. It does not take itself for a party or even a group, and does not claim to be speaking for the masses. No political program will be elaborated within the framework of schizoanalysis.*" (AO, 380) They mean that the *next revolutionary ones* may have to face up the effort to occupy and consequently free the *Anti-OEdipus* «space» so that its mechanic and energy may be of help for the future fights. Chlebnikov docet.

Simulacrum, copy and model

Another example of Nietzschean double-parody that rises from Deleuze's words in a discussion in Cerisy-la-Salle, is about the popular justice. At the time the positions on this issue were very emphasized: Sartre and the Maoist representatives of the Gauche Prolétarienne were in favour of revolutionary courts, Deleuze and Foucault's GIP plus the Nietzschean Rhizosphere members were against any USSR/Chinese-style countervailing-power. "*(...) I think of the question posed by Derrida on the kinds of parody. In some ways it evokes the two currents which emerge in recent debates on what might be called "popular justice". One group says, roughly: the goal of popular justice is to make "good" what bourgeois makes "evil", consequently, they institute a parallel court, then try the same case; it is a type of parody that defines itself as a copy of an existent institution, with jurors, accusers, lawyers, witnesses, but that considers itself better and more fair, more rigorous than the model. But another group might pose the problem in a very different way, saying that a popular justice, if there were one, would not proceed according to the formalism of courts because it would not merely be a copy which claims superiority to that which models it - it would be a parody of another type which would pretend, at once, to overthrow the copy and the model. (...) It seems to me that this is exactly the criterion of effective parody in the sense that Nietzsche understands it.*" (CV 43,44) As we can notice the resolution of the Nietzschean Rhizosphere members is to be «part» of the revolutionary moment adopting an «open mode», offering a dialogue but also they criticize monolithic mainstream thought, if necessary. One of the central goal of the French Nietzschean Rhizosphere in the '70s was to avoid the violent outcome that partially occurred in those years. The big crisis of the Maoist Gauche Prolétarienne will see its dissolution in 1973, for reasons mainly due to its internal maoist organization, but we like to think that a positive and anti-terrorist push may have arrived from the philosophical community lead by Deleuze and Foucault through the benefic role of *Anti-OEdipus* and in particular of the crucial accelerationist passage of *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*.

Drives and affects in favour of an insurrectionary erotica

At the end of the '60s the figures of Freud and Marx represented in France a conformist position that the two authors of the *Anti-OEdipus* tried to overcome. Through Klossowski's comment of the fragment nr. 10 [145] Deleuze and Guattari show that the gregarious drives are so deeply introjected, - because of the various waves of *regularization* - to become *unconscious*, leaving no space to any trace of resistance or diversity. In case this trace reveals itself, society - namely the human beings, *the species* - will refuse it, but given the chance to affirm itself, a new awakening, a «yes to life» will display. Thus - Klossowski continues - it is the *drive state* that enables the individual to rediscover an anachronistic primordial condition of existence and the *emotion* produced by the *dis-alignment* of two contrasting realities - the differentiated reality of the single and the gregarious dimension of the larger group - influences the conduct and promotes diverted actions. Deleuze and Guattari introduce here the Freudian concept of «Oedipal group fantasy» and echo it in the social body quoting a passage from Klossowski's *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*: "*In this respect Klossowski has convincingly shown the inverse relationship that pulls the fantasy in two directions, as the economic law establishes perversion in the "psychic exchanges," - called drives by Nietzsche and Klossowski - or as the psychic exchanges on the contrary promote a subversion of the law: "Anachronistic, relative to the institutional level of gregariousness, the singular state can, according to its more or less forceful intensity, bring about a de-actualization of the institution itself and denounce it in turn as*

anachronistic." (AO, 63) Let us apply such divarication to the accelerationist fragment in *Anti-Oedipus* and see the two possible directions, as the capitalism of the fluxes distorts the wage earner and grabs the capitalist through money in a constant exchange where "profit will flow alongside wages, side by side, reflux and afflux", or as the drive state of the revolutionary singularities will subvert the codes of a controlled and money-directed society, operating in a universal affects-driven economy, as Deleuze and Guattari testify with the following words "In a certain sense capitalist economists are not mistaken when they present the economy as being perpetually "in need of monetarization," as if it were always necessary to inject money into the economy from the outside according to a supply and a demand. In this manner the system indeed holds together and functions, and perpetually fulfills its own immanence. In this manner it is indeed the global object of an investment of desire. The wage earner's desire, the capitalist's desire, everything moves to the rhythm of one and the same desire". (AO, 239)

The nomadic unity and the Guattarian schizophrenic man

The last molecular question inquires which hidden philosophical and political thought lies in the accelerationist passage of *The Civilized Capitalist Machine*. Let us analyze the historical and political background of those years in France. Deleuze and Guattari spoke about the political issue in the early 1970s on several occasions: "We also know that the problem for revolutionaries today is to unite within the purpose of the particular struggle without falling into the despotic and bureaucratic organization of the party or status apparatus. We seek a kind of war machine that will not re-create a status apparatus, a nomadic unit related to the outside that will not revive an internal despotic unity." (NT, 149) These are Deleuze's words at Cerisy-la-Salle, words that he will reaffirm in an interview with Vittorio Marchetti for the Italian philosophical magazine «Tempi Moderni»: "The problem is not determining which science will be the human science par a certain number of "machines" endowed with revolutionary potential are going to fit together. For example, the literary machine, the psychoanalytic machine, and political machines: either they will find a unifying point, as they have done so up to now, in a particular system of adaptation to capitalist regimes, or else they will find a shattering unity in a revolutionary utilization." (DI, 236) Guattari is on the same level of analysis when he answers to Michel Antoine Burnier in an interview for the magazine «Actuel» published in 1973: "The most important thing is not authoritarian unification, but a kind of infinite swarming: desires in the neighborhood, the schools, factories, prisons, nursery schools, etc. It's not about a make-over, or totalization, but hooking up on the same plane at its tipping point. As long as we stick to the alternative between the impotent spontaneity of anarchy and the hierarchical and bureaucratic encoding of a party-organization, there can be no liberation of desire." (DI, 266)

He continues underlining the issue of «opponents» in the revolutionary organization: "It's always the same old trick: a big ideological debate in the general assembly, and the questions of organization are reserved for special committees. These look secondary, having been determined by political options. Whereas, in fact, the real problems are precisely the problems of organization, never made explicit or rationalized, but recast after the fact in ideological terms. The real divisions emerge in organization: a particular way of treating desire and power, investments, group-Oedipuses, group-super-egos, phenomena of perversion... Only then are the political oppositions built up: an individual chooses one position over another, because in the scheme of the organization of power, he has already chosen and hates his opponent." (DI, 264)

To overcome such political poverty Deleuze and Guattari firmly believe that only a brand new type of revolution can produce a brand new type of politics: "... revolutionary organization must be the organization of a war-machine and not of a State apparatus, the organization of an analyzer and not of an external synthesis" (DI, 269). Guattari insists: "And in our view, this corresponds to a certain position vis-a-vis desire, a profound way of envisioning the ego, the individual, and the family. This raises a simple dilemma: either we find some new type of structure to facilitate the fusion of collective desire and revolutionary organization; or we continue on the present course, heading from one repression to the next, toward a fascism that will make Hitler and Mussolini look like a joke." (DI, 269). Fascism then becomes the main strategic enemy of the ethical-political option proposed by Deleuze and Guattari and it will be the basis on which the two philosophers will develop their theory of molar and molecular fascism in the second volume of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia, A Thousand Plateaus* in the chapter entitled *1933 Micropolitics and Segmentarity*. Foucault himself will highlight this important non-fascist feature in his *Introduction* to the American edition of *Anti-Oedipus* when he defines the book as an "introduction to a non fascist life because it tracks down all varieties of fascism, from the enormous ones that surround and crush us to the petty ones that constitute the tyrannical bitterness of our everyday lives" (INFL, 13).

The Great Politics and the revolutionary

Another point we have to make is to identify the revolutionary type of the *Anti-OEdipus*. The physiognomy has been already outlined in two different forms in *Anti-OEdipus*. Guattari in an interview for the magazine «Neue Zeitung» in 1972 with regards to the identification among analyst, patient and activist says: *“First of all no one has ever said that the analyst is the same as the schizophrenic man but that the analyst, as well as the activist or the writer or anybody else, is more or less engaged in a schizo process and there is always a difference between the schizo process and the schizophrenic man interned in an insane-asylum, as his schizo process is blocked or goes uselessly around in circles. We are not saying that the revolutionary need to identify with the madmen going uselessly round in circles, but that they need to push their actions into a schizo-way process.”* According to Guattari the schizophrenic man does not coincide with the madman but becomes *schizo* when he clashes with an individual or collective «desiring process» which holds at its centre a «libidinal energy» able to drive him from an assessed subject to a new open code subject, passing through a metamorphosis and a process of both de-subjectivation and neo-subjectivation. In this transition we can identify parts of former subjectivity - the doctor, the worker, the white man, the human being - and some of the new one - the homosexual, the trans-gender, the foolish man, the analyst. It is therefore not possible to locate one single typical revolutionary man, but multiple individual and/or group connections in schizo-revolutionary processes. What revolution really requires, according to Guattari, is an experimental revolutionary process and not revolutionary subjects tailored by ideology. *“Repeated mistakes and insignificant results are more necessary than a stupid passivity and claw back mechanisms.”*

To deeply understand the concept of the revolutionary man as intended by Deleuze we need to look at Klossowski again and in particular to his speech at the Collège de Philosophie in Paris during a conference entitled *Nietzsche, Polytheism and Parody* in 1957. Klossowski was considered one of the central figures in French Nietzsche's studies, especially after his masterful translation of Nietzsche's *The Gay Science* in 1954. In this speech Klossowski underlines the figure of the «actor as interpreter of a celestial revelation» able to contrast the catechontic institutions with artistic antinomic «accelerated» creations: *“But art has a very wide meaning, and in Nietzsche, this category includes institutions as much as works of free creation. For example -and here we can see immediately what is at issue-how does Nietzsche consider the Church? For him, the Church is constituted grosso modo by a cast of profound impostors: the priests. The Church is a masterpiece of spiritual domination, and it required that impossible plebian monk, Luther, to dream of ruining that masterpiece, the last edifice of Roman civilization among us. The admiration Nietzsche always had for the Church and the papacy rests precisely upon the idea that truth is an error, and that art, as willed error, is higher than truth. This is why Zarathustra confesses his affinity with the priest, and why, in the Fourth Part, during that extraordinary gathering of the different kinds of higher men in Zarathustra's cave, the Pope -the Last Pope-is one of the prophet's guests of honor. This betrays, I think, Nietzsche's temptation to foresee a ruling class of great meta-psychologists who would take charge of the destinies of future humanity, since they would know perfectly both the different aspirations and the different resources capable of satisfying them.”* (NPP; 106, 107) What he is saying is that Nietzsche at the end of the 80's of the XIX century had already understood that the Great Politics needed an entertainment sphere where institutions, dominating castes, gregarious masses could express a certain will to power. Deleuze admires Klossowski and his *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (as he will write in a letter sent to him on December 19th, 1969) and will retrieve the concept of acceleration of processes of a community of irregulars who confound all codes, thus entwining Klossowski and Nietzsche's theory of conspiracy with the political riots of the 70's in France. Their alliance is clearly detected in the talks at the famous meeting of Cerisy-la-Salle in July 1972 where Klossowski defines the fragment entitled *The Strong of the Future* - 9 [153] - as the «heart of conspiracy». After he has finished reading the fragment he poses a question wondering what Nietzschean comportment we would adopt in relation to the current upheavals - namely youth poverty, revolutionary riots, clashes between the adverse forces - *“no longer from the point of view of power, or potency, but from the perspective of the vicious circle, which is a manifestation of the nihilist judgment passed upon all acting.”* (CV, 38)

Klossowski, choosing the comportment of the nihilist judgment, reaffirms Nietzsche's parodistic behaviour on the economic planetary planning scenario and again he reminds an attentive audience - Deleuze, Lyotard, Derrida, Calasso and Nancy - the thought of eternal return: *“As I have insisted, this thought, as the theme of Nietzsche's highest contemplation, becomes the instrument of a conspiracy. It is from this stage that the god of the vicious circle can truly be considered the blossoming of a delusion. The question that I now pose is whether delusory or deranged behaviour, in this sense, when confronted with reality, can become in any way efficacious, or if, more*

generally, any deranged comportment might be said to constitute an efficient resistance in the face of a determined adverse force.” (CV, 38) According to Klossowski, Nietzsche moves from the position of the biological contemplative observer of the law of the Eternal Return to the one of the strong political watcher, thus building - employing Deleuze and Guattari terminology - a real war machine so to be able to transform the Eternal Return into a conspiracy which should subvert the current domination of the levelled industrialized man. But why should such conspiracy be delirious? For at least two reasons: the first one because the double parody of the current social model and of its simulacrum subverts all codes, as a consequence of the nihilist judgment passed upon all acting. The second reason is linked to Deleuze and Guattari's interpretation of the post-68 revolutionary riots: “*Delirium is the general matrix of every unconscious social investment. Every unconscious investment mobilizes a delirious interplay of disinvestments, of counterinvestments, of overinvestments*”. (AO, 277) Similarly Klossowski's delirium - the radical departing from the established path - coincides with the delirious polarity in *Anti-Oedipus*: if every social investment is delirious, the same will be for a no longer secret conspiracy plotted by idle urban dissidents whose aim justifies and realizes itself through the same means of manifestation. The question at this stage is about fulfillment: can the schizo-delirious approach be incisive both in the revolutionary riots of the '70s and on any other future moment to come, as the law of the Vicious Circle seems to suggest? In Klossowski words the question is: does the schizo delirious process simply represent the current version of the Vicious Circle or are we in front of a *general preemptory coherent identity* between Process, Circle and Return?

Second portrait of the revolutionary: the Deleuzian rhizomatic nomad

Following the words of *Anti-Oedipus* we portray a quite canonical image of the *schizo-delirious* revolutionary man: “... a *schizo-revolutionary type or pole that follows the lines of escape of desire; breaches the wall and causes flows to move; assembles its machines and its groups-in-fusion in the enclaves or at the periphery—proceeding in an inverse fashion from that of the other pole: I am not your kind, I belong eternally to the inferior race, I am a beast, a black.*” (AO, 277) But in other writings Deleuze's position is less reassuring: “*Militant revolutionaries cannot be concerned with delinquency, deviance, and madness — not as educators or reformers, but as those who can read the face of their proper difference only in such mirrors.*” (DI, 201) The subversive is then a *prismatic simulacrum* who collects various points of view: the criminal's or the diverse and fool man's and is forced to elaborate the different aspects in which he mirrors his diversity: himself, his marginality, the phantasmal world he belongs to and the rest of the social body, reaching a *deformed singularity* which self-affirms differently from what the *false counter-identity* of a presumed antagonistic vocation would do, once compared to «respectable people». Differently from Nietzsche the rhizomatic is not nihilist, he appreciates the revolution as an accelerated event of transvaluation of all values, and provided that he accepts the register of Nietzsche's *corrosive parody*, he will revolve it in positive looking for «new ways». This new rhizomatic politics is very different from the more traditional one of the communist and socialist movements in the XIX and XX century. To evaluate such difference let us read the *conspiracy* notion as interpreted by Klossowski and Deleuze: “*There is a topic which Klossowski addressed, I believe, at the same time that he was addressing the loss of identity, namely, the topic of singularity, by which he means the “non-identical”. A conspiracy, if one understands Klossowski's thinking, is a community of singularities. The question, then, configured in term of the political (understood either in its contemporary or ancient sense) is this: how are we to conceive of a community of singularities?*” (CV, 46). Here, for the first time in history, one could locate a new way of being revolutionary, a strategy of ways, of non-identities: an overturning of the basic concepts of revolution as an expression of organization of a social group, in favour of a heuristic insurrectional. A revolution which does not recognize useful any of the previous revolutionary models, and whose final aim is not gaining power. As Deleuze said, “*the so-called society is a community of regularities or more precisely, a certain selective process which retains select singularities and regularises them. In order to maintain the proper functioning of society it selects for regularisation, to use the language of psychoanalysis, what might be called paranoiac singularities. But a conspiracy - this would be a community of singularities of another type, which would not be regularised, but which would enter into new connections, and in this sense, would be revolutionary.*” (CV 46, 47) Here lies the real “heart” of the fragment *The Strong of the Future* and of Deleuze's *Nomad Thought*. With the eyes of the book *Anti-Oedipus* the great process of regularization is the same great process of the Western *oikonomia* which allows the rational functioning of a highly numbered community of market-subjugated singularities: “... *the human species... articulates itself, through production, in order to maintain itself at the level of humanity, [and] can only do so through the absurdity of a total reduction of its moral resources achieved through work itself.*” (CV,37) What remains open is the way singularities can be linked among them, we mean «connections» and not «institutions».

The selective criterion of the Eternal Return - if the *perspective* is the extreme bifurcation of discrete productions of non-identities from macro-repetitions of homogenous identities - is possible only on the basis of a double selection of *human types*: the *essential* - seen as «mass-value» in relation to the mercantile society, and the *surplus* - seen as «waste-value», an impersonal and singularized-plusvalue apt to form *societies and groups* (CV, 47). According to Deleuze the «surplus men» “*are motionless, and the nomadic adventure begins when they seek to stay in the same place by escaping the codes.*” (DI, 259) The nomad is defined by Deleuze as a mobile centre of resistance, an enchanted traveller with inconceivable horizons, a motionless traveller on collective bodies. The last big problem to face now is the following: both gregarious and unassimilated ones live and fight in a demoralizing unjust macro-scenario. How is it possible to weave the net of light self-organized bounds in the existing massive-unifying social structure? Will such a net be able to support the various connections among diversities in future times?

Chapter IV

The infinite money: desire, value and simulacrum

Truths are coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins.
—Friedrich Nietzsche, *On truth and lies in a non-moral sense*

We need units in order to count, but it may not be assumed that such units [of measure] exist.
—Friedrich Nietzsche, fr. 14 [79]

To subvert the braking effect of totality

If we examine the main works of Deleuze, Foucault and Klossowski published between 1968 and 1972, we can observe that the courses of these texts objectively bear enigmatic and common features that could allow us to regard them as «fragmentary research projects»; these are investigations that could hardly be conceived and envisaged if we evaluate them from a 'revolutionary' perspective with the aim of identifying on which common battleground and common agenda these three intellectuals act. They swing with remarkable *aplomb* from far-sighted and vibrant essays with an academic flavour, such as *Difference and Repetition* or *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, to hermeneutic works on Nietzsche – which include both anthologies of fragments like *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*, and of first editions of his *OEuvres Complètes* published by Gallimard – continuing with literary criticism or *tout-court* literature works such as *The Logic of Sense* or *The Women of Rome*, and finishing with cryptic economical essays, *La monnaie vivante*, or aggressively political pamphlets, *The Anti-OEdipus*; not to mention, then, their academic lectures ranging from Freud to Marx, from Aristotle to Nietzsche, from Greek currency to the Medieval Inquisition or history of sexuality, without any interruption. Foucault himself, with a certain irony, in his first lecture on 7th January 1976 part of a course titled *Society Must Be Defended*, wanted to terminate a line of research that he himself defines incoherent and discontinuous. Foucault feels the need to end and systematise, in some way, the several lines of research, insight and analysis that he had been carrying on since he started his lectures at the *Collège de France* (1970). From a certain point of view, Foucault does not mention only his research, but alludes also to a common path of the French revolutionary Rhizosphere when he lists among the relevant, or at least interesting, elements of the previous fifteen years “*I am thinking of the efficacy of a book such as L'Anti-OEdipe, which really has no other source of reference than its own prodigious theoretical inventiveness: a book, or rather a thing, an event, which has managed, even at the most mundane level of psychoanalytic practice, to introduce a note of shrillness into that murmured exchange that has for so long continued uninterrupted between couch and armchair*” (PK, 80). This is an important indication to his students since the philosophical work of Deleuze has always been a crucial point of reference for Foucault, because it had openly established itself as an “ally” of his theories since the early sixties, or at least from the beginning of the *Nietzsche Renaissance* and, thus, from the publication of *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962) and the Royaumont conference (1964). What is most surprising is the importance that Foucault confers to the anti-oedipic text, because his analysis takes into account “*the last ten, fifteen, twenty years at most*”, hence the timeframe that goes, approximately, from 1956 and 1976: not only *The Anti-OEdipus* is the only book to be referenced, but its position in Foucault's argument surprises us the most. The volume, indeed, is referred to in the context of “*this amazing efficacy of discontinuous, particular and local criticism*” and its efficacy is compared to

that of entire movements such as anti-psychiatry, existential analysis, and attacks upon the legal and penal system. Foucault concludes: “I would say, then, that what has emerged in the course of the last ten or fifteen years is a sense of the increasing vulnerability to criticism of things, institutions, practices, discourses. A certain fragility has been discovered in the very bedrock of existence—even, and perhaps above all, in those aspects of it that are most familiar, most solid and most intimately related to our bodies and to our everyday behaviour. But together with this sense of instability and this amazing efficacy of discontinuous, particular and local criticism, one in fact also discovers something that perhaps was not initially foreseen, something one might describe as precisely the inhibiting effect of global, totalitarian theories. It is not that these global theories have not provided nor continue to provide in a fairly consistent fashion useful tools for local research: Marxism and psychoanalysis are proofs of this. [...] In each case, the attempt to think in terms of a totality has in fact proved a hindrance to research.” (PK, 80-81) By following Foucault’s outline, we can identify two opposite fronts: on the one hand, the «accelerationist» front, irregular, peculiar and local; on the other hand, a front more “restraining”, “braking”, continuous, global, total, and openly totalitarian. Marxism and psychoanalysis can still be useful instruments at a local level, but, according to Foucault, when confronted with facts, they have had a «braking» thus negative function for the insurrectionary front. *The Anti-Oedipus*, in Foucault’s opinion, fits perfectly in the domain of those critical entities capable of causing landslides and provided with some peculiar characteristics that could be summarised as follows: 1) autonomous – instead of centralized – technical production 2) wisdom returns to scale which descend from the insurrection of subjugated wisdoms.

The insurrection of subjugated knowledges

In the lecture he gave on 7th January 1976, Foucault focused his attention on the returns of forgotten knowledges that descend from what he calls “*insurrection of subjugated knowledges*”. With this expression he refers to two specific factors: 1) the ‘knowledges’ that derive from historical contents, which he deems buried, and thus adequate to be subjected to a rediscovery attributable, to a ‘sumptuous’ research linked, in a way, to “*typical secret societies of the West*” since ancient times and emerged at the time of early Christianity: the “*great warm and tender Freemasonry of useless erudition*” – here, with his peculiar and subtle humour, Foucault introduces his own analysis and the one of his *rhizospheric* fellows just like modern variations of the struggle and insurrection of Alexandrine gnosis related to the idea of salvation through knowledge. The French Rhizosphere is, according to the malicious Foucaultian *antichristian-Nietzschean-accelerationist* interpretation, a sort of secular and revolutionary neo-gnosis which hands its wisdom and research over from one generation to the next, following the Hellenic-Alexandrine tradition.

2) those ‘knowledges’ that are assumed to lay on the opposite side of “*dusty and useless*” erudition, that is, those disqualified and inadequate knowledges – here, once again, presented in an extraordinary way. In this category of “*naïve knowledges located low down on the hierarchy*” beneath the required academic and scientific levels, Foucault includes popular knowledge (“*le savoir des gens*”) – which must not be confused with “*general common sense*” – like those of criminals, crazy people, ill persons, psychiatric patients, detainees. The direct knowledge of these subjects, merged with the specific knowledges of specialised workers, like nurses, doctors and soldiers, will not result in a “*general common-sense knowledge*”, but in a “*a differential knowledge incapable of unanimity and which owes its force only to the harshness with which it is opposed by everything surrounding it.*” (PK, 82)

Foucault does not miss the paradox of enclosing in the same rhizomatic framework of subjugated knowledges both «the academia and the street»: nonetheless he finds in this well-marked disparity the essential leverage of the critique promoted with those discontinuous discourses. According to Foucault this is “*historical knowledge of struggles*”: “*In the specialised areas of erudition as in the disqualified, popular knowledge there lay the memory of hostile encounters which even up to this day have been confined to the margins of knowledge. What emerges out of this is something one might call a genealogy, or rather a multiplicity of genealogical researches, a painstaking rediscovery of struggles together with the rude memory of their conflicts. And these genealogies, that are the combined product of an erudite knowledge and a popular knowledge, were not possible and could not even have been attempted except on one condition, namely that the tyranny of globalising discourses with their hierarchy and all their privileges of a theoretical avant-garde was eliminated.*” (PK, 83) In this passage, Foucault attempts an early outline of his overall plan, where he generously includes and aligns the French components of the rhizosphere and, above all, the authors of *The Anti-Oedipus*, although the detailed description of the “returns of knowledge” fits perfectly his research style. That style which he adopted at the beginning of his lectures at the Collège de France (1970) and carried on until the end of that period, 1975-1976, the year before the crucial 1977 when he entered a period of crisis and suspended his course. It was Foucault’s *annus horribilis*, during which he

received attacks from multiple fronts – such as Baudrillard's *Forget Foucault* – and started a profound reformulation of his thought, his analysis and his political approach, which in turn would end his friendship with Deleuze and destroy the *underground* empathy within the French Nietzschean revolutionary community. What seems extraordinary is the way in which Foucault linked his research to the fight and critique of his rhizospheric fellows, attributing the essential leverage of the critique and of the “success” of those years precisely to the discontinuity and de-centralisation of practices and discourse advocated by Klossowski, Deleuze and Guattari, Blanchot and Lyotard, among others. In 1976, Foucault is able to advance this critique: “*Let us give the term genealogy to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories which allows us to establish a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of this knowledge tactically today.*” (PK, 83) During the same lecture, Foucault links the genealogy to the struggle against the alleged “scientificity” of the new sciences, namely Marxism and Psychoanalysis, guilty of bearing “power ambitions”, not even concealed, and thus of pursuing those “effects of power” that usually institutions assign to enthroned sciences. According to Foucault, “*By comparison, then, and in contrast to the various projects which aim to inscribe knowledges in the hierarchical order of power associated with science, a genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from that subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. It is based on a reactivation of local knowledges – of minor knowledges, as Deleuze might call them – in opposition to the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and the effects intrinsic to their power: this, then, is the project of these disordered and fragmentary genealogies. If we were to characterise it in two terms, then 'archaeology' would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursivities, and 'genealogy' would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play.*” (PK, 85) In Foucault's works, within the genealogy/archive relation mentioned above, special attention is reserved to money, ever since the first lectures of his inaugural course in 1970-71, directly after the re-emergence in Klossowski and Deleuze of Nietzschean topics such as will to power, formations of sovereignty, impulse and value. Indeed, an early taste of the strong and innovative critical capacity on this front – which includes aspirations, will to power, universal rhizomatic economy, physical and noologic subconscious – comes from the debut of Deleuze and Guattari as authors, under the sign of Klossowski. *La synthèse disjunctive* is the title of their first essay dedicated to Klossowski and published in the 43rd issue of the journal «L'Arc», precisely in the third term of 1970. The text is presented already as an essay of a book titled *Capitalism and schizophrenia*. The writing style is already the imaginary, transverse, aggressive, humoristic and “genealogic” one of the *Anti-Oedipus*. *La synthèse disjunctive* is an incisive prelude to an announced explosion: Foucault immediately grasps the collateral effects that it would have on the style and content of his own research.

The xeno-dollar and money as an instrument of hegemonic power

At the beginning of the 70's, the topic of money became a primary concern in the rhizosphere. Thanks to differential-money, namely the main instrument used by liberal democratic systems to assault, restructure and regularise national and international economic crises, the French Nietzschean revolutionary community wanted to build a new analytic grid that could overcome the «ideological morass» which still clutches a significant portion of the traditional Left as well as of the new antagonistic Left. Klossowski produced, as his farewell to publishing and writing, a brief text, dense and enigmatic, titled *La monnaie vivante (Living Currency, 1970)*, which presented his peers with more than one critical interrogative on the industrial and commercial world, and on money as an instrument and simulacrum of the vital agent soothing human impulses. In a handwritten letter sent in autumn 1970, Foucault greeted Klossowski's volume as “*the greatest book of our times*”. That was the same period in which, at the beginning of 1971, Deleuze and Guattari attended Foucault's lectures at the Collège, having just finished the *in itinere* draft of the *Anti-Oedipus*. The role of the «imperial» currency – the US dollar as hegemonic currency – within the Western economic system, as well as the Bretton Woods fixed exchange rates regime, were at the centre of the tense international political debate. In December 1969 inflation in the United States reached 6%. Nixon, as soon as he was elected president, was struck by the prediction made by his own staff that the dollar had to be rescued in maximum two years. The world was jammed by xeno-dollars and the US reserves could not compensate anymore the increase in the global amount of dollars with the corresponding amount of gold as contemplated in the agreement. In a few months, in 1971, violence in the Vietnam war reached its peak, and so did military expenses and the related budget deficit. The United States had entered a recession in 1970 and unemployment was at 6% and growing. The issues presented by domestic economic circumstances were unprecedented: inflation was high in a phase of recession, as opposed to the usual combination of recession and

deflation, as it had previously happened during the Great Depression in 1929. The situation was out of hand. There was no empirically tested academic theory which corresponded to such an economic situation; there was no plan. Any technical decision could equally mean the salvation of global commercial leadership or its collapse, precisely at a time when the international Communist movement was challenging Anglo-Saxon industrial capitalism the most. The sudden breakdown of the Bretton Woods system could cause a rapid downfall of the hegemony of American power, the winner of World War II. *Power can switch sign*. Nixon's staff was divided between monetarists, namely the rising star Friedman and the Chicago School, and orthodox mainstream economists, such as Burns and the Federal Reserve. Friedman and those favouring the free floating of exchange rates unpegged from the gold standard prevailed. Timing was crucial. In May 1971 West Germany left the Bretton Woods system, instituted in 1944 on the ashes of the Axis Powers, letting the German Mark free to float. The situation deteriorated and Nixon's economic staff had to hurry: it was time to take actions because the element of surprise and the promptness of intervention were crucial. In August 1971, Nixon suddenly announced to the nation and to the whole world that the US dollar was not convertible in gold anymore, leaving the American currency free to float too. After about 3,000 years from its invention, money lost its tie to an objective and concrete value. It was the first time in Western history, without considering the periods of war and brief experiments, always ended in failure: money completed its final transformation, to which it was probably destined ever since its invention, becoming a pure simulacrum of value in all its forms, from the round-shaped metal piece to banknotes. The question that economists asked themselves are several: Will the "orphan money" be able to stand only based on its face value? Will the hegemonic currency, i.e. the dollar, be able to walk on an "empty space"? Has money grown enough to demonstrate its maturity? The monetary *de-aurification* is the temporary situation in which we are still today: a mixture of sovereign, post-sovereign, xeno- and headless currencies that float freely without any fixed exchange rate, victims of speculations and market imbalances. However, the monetary coordinates within which Foucault develops his analysis are not simply related to the contingency of events, but rather to the study of forces and their effects on the domain of sovereign formations associated to the research and analyses conducted within the Rhizosphere. The concept of money considered by Foucault in the lectures that he gave between 10th February and 10th March 1971 is, surprisingly for most people but not for the Rhizomatics, the Ancient Greek currency employed between the seventh and fifth century B.C.; that is the historical, social, economic and institutional period when money, conceived as Greek measurement, eventually becomes the core of an "*immense social and polymorphous practice of assessment, quantification, establishing equivalences, and the search for appropriate proportions and distributions*" (LWK, 134). According to Foucault, this analysis should approach the hypothesis according to which money constitutes a political instrument used to create and preserve new balances during profound social transformations: thus, money does not preserve relations of sovereignty but relations of dominance. It is fascinating how Foucault introduces the concept of money towards the end of the lecture he gave on 17th February 1971, as redistribution of relations between the discourse of justice and the discourse of knowledge, and of the relations between the just, measurement, order and truth: "*The institution of money, which is not just a measure of exchange, but which was established mainly as an instrument of distribution, division, and social correction.*" (LWK, 129)

The birth of money-simulacrum

The approach described in *Lectures of the Will to Know* (1971) is very distant from the traditional interpretation of money imposed by mainstream economics, from which not even Marx in *The Capital* nor Foucault in *The Order of Things* (1966) could evade. On the one hand, mainstream nineteenth-century economists believed that the mature use of money as a means of exchange started with the birth and development of market economics. On the other hand, the Foucault of *The Order of Things* argues that the analysis of wealth and money theory can be traced back to the classical era, that is, the period between Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and de Sade's *Justine*. Alternatively, in 1971 Foucault traces a conception of money according to the eighteenth-century perspective of traditional political economy: "*Commercial, international, market origin of money. Mercantilist interpretation of money restricting it from the start to function of representation and exposing it to that "fetishism" which consists in taking the sign for the thing itself, through a sort of primary and radical philosophical error. In fact, this interpretation may account for some early uses of money in Lydia and Phoenicia. But money was not adopted and used in Greece on the basis of this model.*" (LWK, 135) To support his argument, Foucault examines two opposite examples of the employment of money in Ancient Greece in the seventh century B.C.: Corinth and Athens. What interests us is in which way the two cities and in particular the two political protagonists, respectively Cypselus and Solon, associate their politics to the introduction of a currency. In both cases, the two

options would contribute to cause, and anticipate, relevant historical effects on Western governance vicissitudes. For Corinth, and its tyrant Cypselus, it was a political operation in which “*the rich have been forced to make an economic sacrifice [and] money comes to the fore enabling the preservation of power through the intermediary of the tyrant*” (LWK, 159); for Athens, and the legislator Solon, the political choice has the opposite course of that of Corinth because “*the rich have been forced to a political sacrifice, [and] eumonia enables them to preserve economic privileges.*” (LWK, 159) It is clear that Foucault points at Solon’s way of managing the *nomos* as the agenda for Western democracies in the nineteenth and early twentieth century: faced with growing social demands, the wealthiest classes chose to allow substantial power distributions in order to preserve their economic privileges. The refined Corinthian economic choices, to which corresponds a brutal tyrannical one, show an excellent example of monetary measures – i.e. the systemic management of the *nomisma* – which would be adopted throughout the twentieth century and this first period of the twenty-first. In fact, contemporary money intervenes at the core of an institutional operation in which wealth is redistributed to an already wealthy minority without redistributing power to the majority of the social body. This is because the social sharing of power has reached its boundary – the maximum limit of feasibility for economic oligarchies – within which less wealthy classes participate to liberal democracies. Foucault seems to suggest that there has not been a time in Western history from the seventh century in Greece in which our societies have not struggled between the two poles of distribution, the economical and the political one, with money playing the role of functional membrane manageable between the two antipodes. Returning to the Greek cities: money became money-*simulacrum* and, at the same time, money-*metron*, i.e. money as measure. The Corinthian invented money as “*the instrument of power which is being shifted, and which, through an interplay of new regulations, ensures the preservation of class domination. At this point, money is no longer a symbol which effectuates and is not yet a representative sign. It should be understood as a fixed series of superimposed substitutions.*” (LWK, 141) Foucault, indeed, looks at Corinthian money as a series of substitutions: religious, economic, political and social. The game of substitutions and superimpositions between money and effectual reality generates fixation and not representation: “*whereas the sign represents, the simulacrum replaces one substitution for another. It is its reality as simulacrum that has enabled money to remain for a long time not only an economic instrument but a thing issuing from and returning to power, by a sort of inner intensity or force: a religiously protected object it would be impious, sacrilegious to adulterate.*” (LWK, 141) But, with even greater depth, Foucault argues that money is “*as simulacrum that is sign: getting it to function as sign in a market economy is an avatar of its real history as simulacrum.*” (LWK, 142) For money, being a regulatory simulacrum is primary, before entering history as a sign and then as fetish. Actually, the sign is only a moment within the duration of money-simulacrum: it is on such fine edge of strategy, power and substitution that Klossowski’s living currency intervenes, description of that triangle that dominates us: desire, value and simulacrum (Foucault, personal letter sent to Klossowski, autumn 1970).

The modes of expression of impulsive forces

There are only few pages, but they are dense and enigmatic perhaps more than any book ever published: *Living Currency* is the text through which Klossowski gives his farewell to writing – from then on (1970) he would be involved in different projects, such as translations, art exhibitions: paintings and movies – and at the same time it constitutes a powerful introduction to the *Anti-OEdipus*, an anoedipic incipit from a different author. *Living Currency* creates a philosophical space to decrypt, building an underground passage that connects all different publications and stations of thought constituting the French revolutionary Rhizosphere: *Nietzsche’s Notebook (1887- 1888)* by Nietzsche, *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (1969), *The Anti-OEdipus* (1972), *Nomad Thought* (1972), *Circulus Vitosus* (1972), *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History* (1971), *Lectures on the Will to Knowledge* (1970-1971), *Libidinal Economy* (1974). The Klossowskian volume breaks, breaches, overflows and distributes with few incisive sentences large gashes of thought and possible research avenues that Deleuze, Guattari, Foucault and Lyotard will then walk wildly, rapidly and productively, as “*young wolves of future revolutions*”. The context within which the paradox of *Living Currency* is articulated is one where industrial civilisation – Klossowskian term which seems more accurate than the general “capitalism” – has diffused its negative effects by infecting the whole society through institutes of uprightness and conformity, which connotes the attribution to the means of production of a powerful contamination – and, thus, affective engraving – capacity on the individuals and the community. That is the same homogeneous, levelled, economized and nihilistic society that Nietzsche described in the fragment *The Strong of the Future*. The Nietzsche-Klossowski axis, then, assigns to the levelled industrial civilisation a dangerous production capacity that is both *affective* and *infective*. Foucault, on the same wavelength, would explain the «positivity» of power with a similar argumentative leverage: “*What makes power*

hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression." (PK, 119) Deleuze and Guattari hold a similar position and raise the level of analysis bypassing ideological and psychoanalytical nuances: "[E]verything is objective or subjective, as one wishes. That is not the distinction: the distinction to be made passes into the economic infrastructure itself and into its investments. Libidinal economy is no less objective than political economy, and the political no less subjective than the libidinal, even though the two correspond to two modes of different investments of the same reality as social reality" (AE, 345). If Marx believes that the structure is the economic skeleton of society and the superstructure is everything that derives from it, Klossowski reverses the framework and sets as the «ultimate infrastructure» the "behavior of emotions and instincts." (LC, 3) Consequently, it follows that "economic standards form in turn a substructure of affect, not the ultimate infrastructure" and that, more in depth, "economic norms are, like the arts or the moral or religious institutions, or like all the forms of knowledge, one mode of the expression and representation of instinctive forces." (LC, 3) As Foucault had already realized in his letter to Klossowski, the triangle "desire, value, simulacrum" that dominates us and has been characterising us for millennia, already existed ever since the invention of money in Asia Minor in the VIII century B.C.; hence, the triangle must be treated as something forged in the depths of times, because the historical period of time in which reality gets «monetarized» is certainly the product of a slow centuries-long process of transformation, before reaching its own metal round form that has been bequeathed until today. In Phrygia, where Greek mythology locates the fundamental passage from pre-money to actual money, the coining of the *nomisma* bore the effigy of the goddess Money (*Dea Moneta*), the wife of King Midas, Demodice or Hermodice; according to Heraclides Lembus, on the money of Cumae coined by queen Hermodice the *Genius of Money (Genio della moneta)* holds the scale and the cornucopia in his hands. Greek mythology suggests us that, ever since its invention, the concept of money figures in popular wisdom as a concatenation of sovereignty, sacredness, fertility and equity; and already in ancient times there were people who used to rise against the improper use of the circulation of the "metal disks": Julius Pollux, at the apex of Hellenism in the Roman Empire, critiqued the *obolastates*, i.e. those who used to lend and weight the *oboli*, and the *obolastatein*, the practice of lending *oboli*. The perverse intersection of simulacrum, value and desire, presented by Foucault as the explanatory structure of *universal economy*, is then absolutely coherent with the rhizospheric analysis of money. Klossowski of *Living Currency* suggests that *monetary economics* and *theology* are nothing but reciprocal disguises: money, from the beginning of Western civilisation, has been regarded as the universal representative instrument of a generalized economy which already has an innate abstract potential for sacredness and sovereignty, and, in turn, for desire-will to power at its highest level. According to Klossowski, money is the universal simulacrum; in industrial societies the domain of money, after centuries of adjustments, has completely substituted the real world and misrepresents its subjugated phantasm. Klossowski had already matured the concept of a universal economy through the scrutinizer of Chaos (Nietzsche) of the passages on energy in relation to world structure: "At a given moment of the accumulated force of the emotions, there is also the absolute condition of a new distribution, and hence a disruption of equilibrium. Nietzsche conceives of a universal economy whose effects he experiences in his own moods." (NVC, 110) The line that links *Nietzsche and the vicious circle* (1969) and *Living Currency* (1970) is, thus, the analysis of impulsive simulacra that act upon a generalized universal economy. We have already entered the *Anti-OEdipus*, the Nietzsche of the 80's of XIX century, and the Foucault of the 70's of XX century. This represents the core of revolutionary Nietzscheism which influenced the street struggle of 1968 and further on, pure energy and dynamite ready for future struggles: Klossowski develops with great clarity the theoretical nucleus of impulse, body, simulacrum, value, production, consumption, arguing that "The way they [instinctive forces] express themselves, both in the economy and finally in our industrial world, is subject to the way they have been handled by the economy of the reigning institutions." That this preliminary and ultimate infrastructure is more and more determined by its own reactions to the previously existing substructures is unquestionably true, but the forces at play continue the struggle among infrastructures into the substructures. So, though these forces initially express themselves in a specific manner according to economic standards, they themselves create their own repression, as well as the means of smashing that repression, which they experience to different degrees: "and this goes on as long as does the battle among the instincts, which is waged within a given organism for and against the formation of the organism as their agent, for and against psychic and bodily unity. Indeed, that is where the first 'production' and 'consumption' schemes come into being, the first signs of compensation and haggling." (LC, 4) Thus is the key passage for the whole Rhizomatic universe: Klossowski shows in this

theoretical nucleus the hidden role of the sphere of instincts. Given its concealment, or its secluded core due to a lack of visible external outlets, the sphere of instincts gets «economized» inside the industrial world. What the industrial world consumes the most is the instinct to procreate, which is a product of the voluptuousness of the instinctual body, labelling it as a good but at the same time, and in the opposite direction, the body procures emotions, concealed and excessive, abstract substance for a «phantasm» – the ghostly entity which recurs obsessively in Klossowski's thought – upon which instincts act again as backward-action. *“Nothing exists apart from impulses that are essentially generative of phantasms. The simulacrum [i.e. the Nietzschean Trugbild] is not the product of a phantasm, but its skilful reproduction, by which humanity can produce itself, through forces that are thereby exorcized and dominated by the impulse.”* (NCV, 133) This is the level at which the phantasm has been already created and instincts and passions are not available anymore to consume and cede the phantasm itself – that is, the producer of desire which reproduces itself. Additionally, this is the crucial point around which the emotional value, otherwise called libidinal value, is formed – as Nietzsche points out, *“in place of moral values, purely naturalistic values”* (Opere fr. 9 [8] vol. VIII, section 2, p. 6, quoted in NVC, 106). The translation of impulsive forces, the instincts, in *“economic representations”* of the emotional value – according to Nietzsche, the only being that we know is a being that has representations (O, fr. 11 [33] vol. V, section 2) – will then be a simulacrum: which simulacrum could be better than the merge of money, simulacrum itself of objective value, and a living body, simulacrum which incarnates the procreative phantasm? The synthesis of such double simulacrum in the economy of industrial civilisation is the living currency, a simulacrum reinforced by emotion that it procures, hence the «living currency» is the expression of the libidinal value carved in bodies. What industrial civilisation consumes through standardization – the various simulacra of the phantasm: prostitution, sexual slavery, eroticism, assorted industries of pleasure – the body produces through economization. Consumed good vs. libidinal value. This means that the body *“manifests itself”* attributing value to the instincts but, in order to defend it *“impulsive phantasm”* that is desire, opposes the *«mechanical simulacrisation»* of industrial economy. The body is the battlefield of the harsh clash between opposite forces: social production against desiring production. Such clash can yield two opposing outcomes: the first – and unfortunately the prevailing in both the industrial civilisation and in the rising digital one – is the hyper-gregariousness of the individual, who is reduced to a mere instrument to support tamed passions and desires captured by social standardization whose objective is the unity reproducible in the production line; the second is where instincts and affections prevail on the repression of impulses and the *“support”* acquires its own sovereignty by degregarizing itself. In the stage that follows such rediscovered sovereignty - through the evident self-organisation of behaviours - singularity itself gets desubjectivised overturning its own nature of *stable subject*, and opening itself to the industrious metamorphosis of desires, and, thus, to perpetual transformation and to the *extreme idleness of the nomads of the future*.

Compliant supports and formations of sovereignty

The settlement and the coalition of instinctual forces in an endless turmoil aimed at opposing the besieging social and economic body provide us with the grid of the battle that happens inside and outside bodies. The *“grim organisations”* of social syntheses that surround bodies and impulsive forces are nothing but Nietzsche *Herrschaftsgebilde*, the formations of sovereignty which we can trace in Nietzsche's posthumous fragments of 1887 and 1888. Inside and outside the body, the battle between impulsive forces infuriates. Sensuality, and its following stage, sexuality, impede any perspective, even an economic one, thus they must be repressed. The first wave of repression is used by formations of sovereignty to structure a «compliant whole», or, in Klossowski's terms, an *“organic and psychic unity”*. Although it is formed inside the shell of the whole as *“completed essence”*, the compliant support is always and anyway object of the battle of impulses and instincts in the attempt to free themselves from formations of sovereignty and from the forces that constitute them. The expression outbursts of these struggles and counter-struggles, attacks and oppositions, manifest themselves *“through a hierarchy of values translated into a hierarchy of needs.”* (LC, 4) According to Klossowski *“the hierarchy of needs is the economic form of repression that the existing institutions impose by and through the agent's consciousness on the imponderable forces of his psychic life.”* (LC, 4) Klossowski's condemnation of traditions – and his gregarious «translations» – which dominate society is rather incisive. He faces three contemporary interpretations which fight the liberation goals of the Rhizosphere and attack the generalized economy in which the *“libidinal values”* participate through *“the new hierarchy of impulses”*, which philosophers like Deleuze want to initiate: the *laissez-faire* attitude that traverses the hierarchy of needs dictates a different hierarchy of values thanks to the exclusion of the sexual need from primary needs, nullifying its emotional value; Marxism, which enthrones industrial economy and commercialized values as the primary structure, relegating the sexual sphere to the

super-structure; psychoanalysis, which accepts to segregate the libidinal economy to the family triangle, separating the social aspect from the object of study, and suffering the same division operated by Marxism – society will be the object of study of scientific socialism, while the subconscious and the family social atom will be of interest to psychoanalysis. In Klossowski, the authors that belong to the triad of dominance and subjection are Raymond Aron, Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud. The purpose of the Rhizosphere will be to liberate the individual and collective revolutionary potential by overturning and overcoming on this point Nietzsche, who, on the contrary, in *The Strong of the Future* wished for a discrete community of irregular and exchangeable seditious. Deleuze and Guattari in the *Anti-Oedipus* intervene on the topic of the opposition to the dominant economic rules through secret impulsive production, and they do so by linking their argument to this exact crucial passage of Klossowski's *Living Currency*. The two Parisian philosophers point out that “[t]he two kinds of fantasy, or rather the two regimes, are therefore distinguished according to whether the social production of “goods” imposes its rule on desire through the intermediary of an ego whose fictional unity is guaranteed by the goods themselves, or whether the desiring-production of affects imposes its rule on institutions whose elements are no longer anything but drives.” (AE, 63) We will have, in the first regime, the subjugated, the gregarious-supports and exchangeability, while in the second regime, the “*desiring machines*”, nomads and the schizo of the future who crave for commercial inconvertibility. In the history of utopian socialism, a French philosopher, among the least current, worked on topics like community, affections, economy and social harmony: Charles Fourier. Both Klossowski – in the *Living Currency* – and Deleuze and Guattari – in the *Anti-Oedipus* – recall his work: “If we must still speak of Utopia in this sense, à la Fourier, it is most assuredly not as an ideal model, but as revolutionary action and passion. In his recent works Klossowski indicates to us the only means of bypassing the sterile parallelism where we flounder between Freud and Marx: by discovering how social production and relations of production are an institution of desire, and how affects or drives form part of the infrastructure itself. For they are part of it, they are present in every way while creating within the economic forms their own repression, as well as the means for breaking this repression.” (AE, 63)

Impulsive forces and the will to power

If, according to Deleuze and Guattari, “true is it that the schizo practices political economy, and that all sexuality is a matter of economy” (AE, 13), then, we can commence the final summary of this essay by presenting schizophrenia in market societies. The reason is that, if, on the one hand, “[c]ivilization is defined by the decoding and the deterritorialization of flows in capitalist production”, on the other hand “[o]ur societies exhibit a marked taste for all codes – codes foreign or exotic – but this taste is destructive and morbid.” (AE, 245) The destruction of codes would represent a result common to both entities, capitalism and revolution – since the pure spirit of insurrection is in favour of the destruction of the “*prominent taste for codes.*” We ought to clarify the differences of regime between the two accelerationist entities, given the identity of nature, otherwise we shall fall in great misunderstandings. To this end, we summon «Nietzsche the Destroyer» of autumn 1888: “the will to power is the primitive form of affect, that all other affects are only developments of it; that it is notably enlightening to posit power in place of individual ‘happiness’ (after which every living thing is supposed to be striving): ‘there is a striving for power, for an increase of power’; - pleasure is only a symptom of the feeling of power attained, a consciousness of a difference.” (O, fr. 14, [121], vol. VIII, part 3, quoted in NVC 101) “There is neither ‘mind’, nor reason, nor thought, nor consciousness, nor soul, nor will, nor truth: so many useless fictions. It is not a matter of ‘subject’ or ‘object’, but of a certain animal species who thrives because of a justice, and above all regularity relative to its perceptions (so that it can capitalize on its own experience)...” (O, fr. 14, [122], vol. VIII, part 3, quoted in NVC 102). And finally “there is no law: every power draws its ultimate consequence at every moment. Calculability exists precisely because things are unable to be other than they are. A quantum of power is designated by the effect it produces and that which it resists.” (O, fr. 14, [79], vol. VIII, part 3, quoted in NVC 108) Klossowski comments the three fragments as follows: “As a primordial impulse – this is what must be emphasized – the will to power is the term that expresses force itself. If the will to power appears in the human species and the phenomenon of animality – that is to say, in the phenomenon of the ‘living being’ – as a ‘special’ case, and thus as an ‘accident’ of its essence, it will not be conserved in the species or the individual it acts upon, but by its very nature will disrupt the conservation of an attained level, since by necessity it will always exceed this level through its own increase. Thus, for everything that might want to preserve itself at a certain degree, whether a society or an individual, the will to power appears essentially as a principle of disequilibrium.” (NCV, 103) Deleuze and Guattari use in the *Anti-Oedipus* the term “*desire*” as a substitute for the Nietzschean “*will to power*” (CO, 95) and, thus, for “*primitive form of affect*”. Nietzsche himself asked “Is ‘will to power’ a kind of ‘will’

or identical with the concept 'will'? Is it the same thing as desiring?" (O, fr. 14, [121], vol. VIII, part 3, quoted in NVC 102). Such conception of desire is the weapon that shakes – as an irresistible impulsive force – both the individual and society, transforming through a process of metamorphosis and instability each individual in a potential *nonconformist* and each society in a potential field of wild and energetic revolutionary intensity. However, we ought to distinguish the two natural poles within which the *proactive*, or affirmative, intensity field oscillates in order to understand the risks hidden within the de-structuring desire: for what concerns society, on one side we will have destructive and decoding capitalism, and on the other side the “*desiring and headless*”, destructive and liberatory revolution, as an accelerated moment of unburdening from accumulated power; instead, for what concerns the individual, on one side we will have the paranoiac and reactionary pole, and on the other side the schizophrenic and revolutionary one. However, it would be a serious mistake to generally confuse and identify the processes of destruction and liberation of capitalism and of paranoid man, with those of revolution and of the schizophrenic man. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari wrote that “*While decoding doubtless means understanding and translating a code, it also means destroying the code as such, assigning it an archaic, folkloric, or residual function, which makes of psychoanalysis and ethnology two disciplines highly regarded in our modern societies. Yet it would be a serious error to consider the capitalist flows and the schizophrenic flows as identical, under the general theme of a decoding of the flows of desire. Their affinity is great, to be sure: everywhere capitalism sets in motion schizo-flows that animate "our" arts and "our" sciences, just as they congeal into the production of "our own" sick, the schizophrenics.*” (AE, 245) As both Srnicek and Williams, and Pasquinelli remind us, capitalism “*axiomatises with one hand what it decodes with the other.*” (AE, 246; GADC, 20, point 3) If, at the border of chaos, the function of axiomatisation bears signs of recovery and control, as well as of exploitation in order to maximise profits and collect new values from “*new lands*”, the function of schizo-revolution bears the sign of demolition and overcoming in order to evade from containment fields where the impulsive primordial force would hover, neutralizing itself. In order to conquer new boundaries and spot “*new lands*” the energetics of desire does not accept capitalisation, regularisation, and equilibrium. For contemporary capital, the anti-chaotic fastening agent and the Recovery Teams are respectively money and unlimited abstract quantities, storage for accumulated money-risk, absolute liquidity and the infinite repetition of credit and debit.

Incessant movement and the breaking of balance

Here Nietzsche's Eternal Return comes into play. According to Klossowski, the distinctive sign of the Vicious Circle – this is the term he uses to define the Nietzschean Eternal Return – is an incessant movement, “*readying the individual to will its own annihilation as an individual by teaching the individual to exceed itself by re-willing itself, and to re-will itself only in the name of this insatiable power. The Eternal Return would here form the counterpart to knowledge, which, if it increases in proportion to power, nonetheless has the conservation of the species as its major preoccupation. Now the Eternal Return (as the expression of a becoming with neither goal nor purpose) makes knowledge 'impossible', at least with regard to ends, and always keeps knowledge at the level of means: the means of conserving itself. This in turn is what determines the reality principle, which therefore is always a variable principle. But not only does the Eternal Return not determine reality, it suspends the very principle of reality, and in a certain manner leaves it to the discretion of the more or less felt degree of power – or better, to its intensity.*” (NCV, 104) The essence of the Return, or the Phantasm, is, thus, the repetition of the same Unequal, that is, the reiteration of random difference, the energetics of the *fortuitous*. Simulacra keep returning, and their unavoidability determines a series of *disindividuations*. The perpetual transformational power of schizo-nomad singularity that embraces the doctrine of the eternal return is certainly antithetical to the gregariousness deriving from the *Axiomatized Return of Capital* and from *the Return to the Identical* of the subjected individual: in fact, the doctrine of the Vicious Circle elaborated by the axis Nietzsche-Klossowski foresees the “*return of power*”, which is nothing but the “*sequence of balance breakings*” and ultimately the destitution of the identity subject. Deleuze and Guattari, indeed, fully understand this difference between relative limits, always reconstituted, of the capitalist process and the absolute limits of the revolutionary schizophrenic process. The schizo-revolutionary process interacts with Chaos, seeks the creative dimension in order to interact with chaotic forces, altering the existent; the capitalistic process stops at the boundary of Chaos, it does not remove the boundary, the wall that separate itself from the chaotic outside, but – rationally – it capitalises its steps, returns to virgin spaces recently acquired and ploughs them in order to enrich them with new axiomatics. The boundaries that capital assigns to itself are determined by the network of centres of balance and of monetary trans-valuation, which it plans and builds at the limits of its delirium. If “*schizophrenia pervades the entire capitalist field from one end to the other*”, for Capitalism “*it is a question of binding the schizophrenic charges and*

energies into a world axiomatic that always opposes the revolutionary potential of decoded flows with new interior limits.” (AE, 246) From these words it seems that the barrier – the line that separates capitalism from the boundary of Chaos – is the line of the monetarisable. The area of creation, of experimentation, of implicit failure of the analysis and of research for its own sake, according to capitalism cannot be irrigated with monetary flows: too many energetic impulses with no sense nor purpose circulate: in fact, it lacks the main purpose of capital, namely the profitability derived from the “*extraction of value*”. Both sense and purpose are determinations of the principle of reality to which ultimately market firms always refer. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari write that “[m]onetary flows are perfectly schizophrenic realities, but they exist and function only within the immanent axiomatic that exorcises and repels this reality.” (AE, 246) The equalising axiomatic recovers what has been decoded and indirectly represses the subversive charge released by the primitive affirmative force, enclosing in the monetarisable space of the global circuit what had just been dispensed by the code. Money controls, through the blazes of flames and the fumes of combustion, and distributes at a higher level, a global one. For such reason, money does not *evolve*, but rather *remains* into the circuit, in which arranges itself according to indigenous speeds. There, in advanced circulation, money itself and, as Marx wrote, “[t]he value originally advanced, therefore, not only remains intact while in circulation, but adds to itself a surplus value or expands itself. It is this movement that converts it into capital.” (C, vol. I, part 2, ch. IV, p.79) However, the fracture happens exactly here, the overcoming of the Marxian concepts of money, money-value, money-good, money-fetish, by the new function attributed to money by the political philosophy of Deleuze, Guattari and the whole French revolutionary Rhizosphere. Money, in its unlimited abstract quantity is *indifferent* to the qualified nature of flows; this means that money is trans-qualitative, as its process of distribution and circulation; it has made itself independent and self-organised, both with respect to short cycles of exchange (money-commodity-money; M-C-M) as well as the circulating special nature (territory-exchange-territory; T-E-T), that is, sovereignty. And if “*the strength of capitalism indeed resides in the fact that its axiomatic is never saturated, that it is always capable of adding a new axiom to the previous ones*”, this would mean that it is “*monetarisat[i]on [which] everywhere comes to fill the abyss of capitalist immanence, introducing there, as Schmitt says, “a deformation, a convulsion, an explosion – in a word, a movement of extreme violence.”*” (AE, 250) Control, power, desire, independence, self-organisation, indifference, violence, trans-quality: these are the new characteristics of money at the time of the *Anti-OEdipus*, that is, at the time of *infinite and abstract monetary economy*, which add themselves to those classic determinations already highlighted by critics of political economy. Nowadays, money-liquidity accumulated, abstract, and digitalized – in other words, dematerialized and financialised money which preserves the characteristics of the seventies, accumulating them – is the main instrument of capitalist accelerationism. It develops itself through capitals’ restless *nomadism* in the quest for *punctual and planetary profit* together with the *monetary infinite* as an effective anti-crisis instrument, generated by the increase in monetary mass and by the perpetual creation of liquidity thanks to the wise dosage of vertical and horizontal transactions of the public and private sector by Central Banks across the world, coordinated among themselves. It is the system of Central Banks independent from political power that ultimately determines the liquidity of the system and the injection of money in the traditional banking system and in the network circling of capital markets. The crucial innovation of the roles of circuits, platforms, markets, currencies and Central Banks, already in expansion and in phase of consolidation during the years of the rhizospheric analysis, has been actively registered in the accelerationist passage of *The Civilised Capitalist Machine* under the section of “*Immanent Axiomatic of Capital.*” (AE, 250)

The modern immanent machine

“*The modern immanent machine, which consists in decoding the flows on the full body of capital-money: it has realized the immanence, it has rendered concrete the abstract as such and has naturalized the artificial, replacing the territorial codes and the despotic overcoding with an axiomatic of decoded flows, and a regulation of these flows; it effects the second great movement of deterritorialization, but this time because it doesn't allow any part of the codes and overcodes to subsist.*” (AE, 261)

If, at the time of the *Anti-OEdipus*, the two movements of evasion from the territory and return to the territory could express conformant powers or at most powers provided with a temporary equilibrium, in the period of time that separates the present from the seventies we have assisted to the hyper-performance of money and its evasion from the territory, creating a strong imbalance with respect to the return to «dry land», which has manifested itself in a progressive and advanced undermining of nations, of popular identities, of local institutions and of the social sector ramified on the surface of the Earth. Monetary abstraction, in symbiosis with

mathematics, cybernetics, computer science and logistics, has acquired so much value in drawing itself closer to unlimited extensions and elastic chronoscopic speeds that the *rapid domination* reached in these last few years of *domestication* has no equals in history, accelerating that radical nihilism envisaged by Nietzsche in the second half of the XIX century. The boundaries of monetary abstraction still have to be drawn, especially now in a time of forced circulation determined by negative interests, which is a signal of the approximation of the *nummus* to the «zero degree» of infinite monetary circulation. It is likely that formations of sovereignty have entered a phase of *metamatic* constraint of the monetary instrument in order to test the state of preservation of the force of imbalance of the whole system. The crisis of industrial capitalism and the birth of a post-industrial capitalism triggered by credit and monetarism surfaced and erupted - as recalled earlier - in the renown "Nixon shock" of August 1971, when the US dollar was unpegged from the gold standard, overturning the millenary principle of sovereignty of the gold currency - *nomisma Caesaris in auro est*. The epochal passage from «geological» currency - the US dollar - to the abstract and «headless» currency, unlimited because free from any fixed rate or concrete value, is certainly the product of circumstantial dynamics and paroxysmal processes going back to Bretton Woods and to the competition between nations and opposing geopolitical forces, but it also marks the moment of authenticity of the statement of the economist de Brunhoff when she writes that there is no contemporaneity between capital and credit: "*That is why in capitalism even credit, formed into a system, brings together composite elements that are both ante-capitalist (money, money commerce) and post-capitalist (the credit circuit being a higher circulation...).* Adapted to the needs of capitalism, credit is never really contemporary with capital. The system of financing born of the capitalist mode of production remains a bastard." (de Brunhoff, *La monnaie in Marx*, p. 147, quoted in AE, 206) It is clear that the system of credit financing will survive to the agony of industry and to the disappearance of labour, because historically it existed before capitalism, and in some of its aspects it has been anticipating the future override of the system. The self-organisation in planetary platforms and the independence reached by the political and institutional order has made credit - *accumulated, distributed, rapid, liquid and abstract money* - and finance - *fluxions, cybernetics, reticulated, dromological and metamatic money* - autonomous circulations, in great part estranged from the circulation of capitals in the real economy. In the lecture he gave on 16th November 1971 at Vincennes, Deleuze went beyond the elaboration that he would have soon presented in the *Anti-Oedipus* (February 1972) and introduced a definition of money - *infinite reproduction of a flow of abstract quantities* - very relevant, even more today than at the time: "*With money which itself can no longer be coded, within a certain framework, we begin with money and we end with money. M[oney]-C[ommodity]-M[oney], there is absolutely no means of coding this thing here because the qualified flows are replaced by a flow of abstract quantity whose proper essence is the infinite reproduction for which the formula is M-C-M. No code can support infinite reproduction. What is formidable in so-called primitive societies is how debt exists, but exists in the form of a finite block, debt is finite.*" (Webdeleuze, lecture of 16th November 1971).

Infinite reproduction of money and credit

If money is the infinite reproduction of a flow of abstract quantities, we can then conceive it as a *software* related to a *hardware*, i.e. the digital chrematistics, which has already introjected in our age the *metamatic* nature, and swiftly travels within digital networks, inside a superior, artificial and over-human circulation. Money, in the *Anti-Oedipus* and even more today, is a decoded abstraction that sums up value, order, number, calculus, distribution and speed. For a Left, and a revolutionary movement, that, still in 1972, in disconnected and confused ways, take as reference the field of «Marxist humanism», the shift of the axis of critical theory from the world of production and industry to the domain of flows and of money-credit has been opposed for a long time, if not openly rejected. The shift in paradigm, though, released certain effects and reached an unstoppable critical mass of its own. The infinite reproduction of money in the global circuit has reached its accelerated peak thanks to the role played by the global network of Central Banks of constant injection and coordinated punctual inflating. Infinite money, thus, has circuits of commercial perpetual reproduction, which we will term '*relative*', and circuits of perpetual financial reproduction, which we will term '*absolute*', managed by supranational global institutional networks. It will be necessary to restart from here, from this Nietzsche-Klossowski-Deleuze axis and, generally, from the French revolutionary Rhizosphere, in order to perfect the tools and analyses capable of dig into real information of gregarious sovereignty formations. Certainly the aggressive and polemical work of Deleuze and Guattari in the phase of the *Anti-Oedipus* had the great merit of identifying the growing systemic fault line that was about to shift, to deteriorate and to rupture - the great historical asymmetry between infinite and money, mobility and credit, stability and capital - which brought market economies, with deep and abrupt transitional

crises, from the planned quantitative industrial world to the post-productive cybernetic-credit-financial world. Additionally, one of the most relevant merits of the *Anti-OEdipus* is having theorised, starting from the considerations of Nietzsche and Foucault, the monetary and credit infinite. If the “infinite creditor” was to be traced back “new collective memory” conceived by Nietzsche in *The Genealogy of Morals*, and concerning “a debt system: [...] a voice that speaks or intones, a sign marked in bare flesh, an eye that extracts enjoyment from the pain”, “infinite money” is then to be related to Foucault’s *Lectures on the Will to Know* that he gave in February 1971. The “infinite creditor” is certainly according to Nietzsche the Christian God, while the debt, in ancient societies as well as in commercial ones, fulfils the task “to breed man, [...] to form him within the debtor-creditor relation, which on both sides turns out to be a matter of memory – a memory straining toward the future.” (AE, 180) “Infinite money”, according to Foucault in 1971, is born instead from a chrematistics in the strict sense, artificial, “which seeks only the acquisition of money itself and consequently in unlimited quantities. This rests on exchange.” (LKW, 145) Deleuze and Guattari return to the topic of the infinite in the *Anti-OEdipus*, adopting the thesis of the philosopher of Poitiers: “The abolition of debts, when it takes place – they refer to Solon, the Athenian legislator – is a means of maintaining the distribution of land, and a means of preventing the entry on stage of a new territorial machine, possibly revolutionary and capable of raising and dealing with the agrarian problem in a comprehensive way.” (AE, 197)

Immediately after, they refer to Cypselus, tyrant of Korinthos: “in other cases where a redistribution occurs, the cycle of credits is maintained, in the new form established by the State, money.” (AE, 196) However, in greater depth, Deleuze and Guattari, returning to Foucault’s studies on Greek tyrants, affirm that “money – the circulation of money – is the means for rendering the debt infinite. [...] The infinite creditor and infinite credit have replaced the blocks of mobile and finite debts. There is always a monotheism on the horizon of despotism: the debt becomes a debt of existence, a debt of the existence of the subjects themselves.” (AE, 197) Money in the *Anti-OEdipus* is, thus, turned into THE “systemic dispositif” of power aimed at perpetuating infinitely the credit cycle, similarly as the tyrant of Korinthos taught us; however, even more distinctively, contemporary money created *ex-nihilo* by the coordinated action of central and commercial banks, and therefore infinite, is the prerequisite and the supporting structure of more *subjecting infinities*, which, under the *double-face* umbrella of credit/debit, result as refund/existence, duty/guilt, crisis/resource, catastrophe/bifurcation. Money is, hence, the fulcrum and the pivot on which the contemporary power system rests for all its policies: money is its main weapon, due to its synthetic credit-debit relation which becomes the “transmission belt” of the commercial and institutional credit world. This monetary paradigm of power that Foucault traces back to the VII century B.C. in Ancient Greece, has been overlooked by Marxists, but not by the intellectuals of the Rhizosphere. Until today, the demystifying and incendiary work of anti-oedipic and rhizomatic authors has not reached in our culture the «masterpiece» status that it deserves, because obscure and gregarious forces – the braking powers – are still operating, with the aim of keeping society under the conforming and homogeneous pressure of perpetual slavery, *gregariousness* that Nietzsche so appropriately defined in the accelerationist fragment on the strong of the future. The *Anti-OEdipus*, far from resting on innocuous ‘irenisms’, continues to generate hybrid processes of affirmative and transforming energy thanks to its deep analytical capacity. Everything is made clear: “There we no longer have any secrets, we no longer have anything to hide. It is we who have become a secret, it is we who are hidden, even though we do all openly, in broad light.” (DI, 46)

How to escape from axiomatics and make break the modern immanent machine?

Here we finally return to the plot of money and revolution, under the sign of the oedipic contrast. If, in our modern empirical experience, our societies are pervaded with economic optimism – descending from the eighteenth-century positivism thoroughly analysed by Marx at the socio-productive level and by Nietzsche at the impulsive-energetic level – and with cybernetic processual evolution of monetary and credit circuits far-sightedly described by Deleuze and Guattari, what strategies could be adopted to escape from commercial axiomatics and to make the modern immanent machine break down? Which relation exists between money and revolution? Shall we switch to a detailed and bureaucratic plan descending from a totalising “keys-in-hand” theory that explains and foresees everything, according to fixed relations between the forms of the Earth and of human set theory, or shall we adopt a plan of impulsive consistency corresponding to the always productive swinging energy of desire, of the real and of imbalance? Between organisation-administration and chaos-creation, what levels of synthesis and innovation should we choose in order to “search and destroy” and to then rebuild? Shall we build revolutionary subjects and identities within class or economic determinations, or shall we de-construct forms, to discover the “hollowness” of subjects and to increase the speed of activation of the revolutionary “process” of the

irregular *idle*, of the *non-exchangeable* group and of the community of *singularity*? Nonetheless, from a different perspective, as Ewald seemed to argue, if the seventies history has handed over to us a “fact” in all its tragic evidence, that is the disappearance of the social revolutionary horizon, that is, the sinking of the concept of insurrection as *magnet* for political action from the Enlightenment onwards. Are we assisting to the Death of Revolution as palingenetic event and qualified creative rupture, mother of *modern politics* – as Foucault seems to foresee after 1978 and after the Rhizosphere period, or are we facing the *perpetual revolutionary becoming as human condition* at the times of post-revolution and post-capitalist control-based neo-societies – as Deleuze and Guattari argued in the multi-stratum desert of *A Thousand Plateaus*? Something has changed after 1978, revolutionaries become spectres like *beautiful losers*, as if the sedition and the overturning of desire on the carpet of Reality were symmetrical to the decline of industry and to the erosion of the historically fixed capital. The productive practices of industry and the concept of cathartic revolution decay together with the West, in a miserable and stagnant dusk. To us, authors of this volume, the intersection between “money and revolution” suggested by Klossowski and Deleuze, and by the whole anti-oedipic Rhizosphere, seems still profoundly relevant, no longer in the westerly vulgate but instead on a global scale, the only possible one today. In the wildest present circumstances, the reproduction of money and liquidity has not stopped, neither have the attempts to become revolutionaries and pathologically seditious, in every single planetary background. Daily events speak for themselves. As Foucault consciously wrote, the triangle of “*desire, value and simulacrum*” still dominates us, and we seem unable to grasp it nor to understand it in its horrific geometrical effectiveness. How to escape from axiomatics and to make the modern immanent machine break down: the question of the *Anti-OEdipus* is still relevant in the present, as it has been in the past. Part of the answer, within the context of the evolution of the relation between *technology* and *liberation*, can certainly be generated and developed by the conflation of three specific fields of our age: *cyberpunk*, *blockchain technology* in its *Ethereum* variation, and the heterarchical P2P movement. The new alliance between *peer to peer* – a digital evolution of anarchic and self-organised reticular logics of *autonomist* philosophy of existentialist punk dis-intermediation – and DIY – the *do-it-yourself* already post-capitalist in its very own nature. The fourth pillar, which has to escort the three fields indicated above, could be the philosophy of the Rhizosphere, or *philosophy of the future*. The philosophy of the future, in order to return joyful and dangerous, must abandon the collusive position that has occupied in the industry of knowledge and of wisdom, and return to being an informal peripatetic wayfarer – a «gypsy scholarship». With great awareness it must experiment, fail, create: study, deconstruct and reconstruct, even itself. The gypsy scholarship, though, conceived as pedagogy of freedom and insurrection, cannot become science, absorbed by institutions: it is like a gust of *The Fixer*, or the glow of a moment lasting for a century.

Desire with no aim, future with no purpose

As many have noted, perhaps, the renown passage on the acceleration of the process and on the revolutionary path is placed in the last part of the paragraph *The Civilised Capitalist Machine* (AE, 222), but most importantly it returns persistently in the *Introduction to Schizoanalysis*, conclusive chapter of the *Anti-OEdipus*, embellishing the final page of the volume. The focus is always on the conflictual relation between desire, formations of sovereignty and the possibility of an overturning of sovereignty by the power of singularity. Deleuze and Guattari wrote: “*only desire that lives from having no aim. Molecular desiring-production would regain its liberty to master in its turn the molar aggregate under an overturned form of power or Sovereignty. That is why Klossowski, who has taken the theory of the two poles of investment the furthest, but still within the category of an active Utopia, is able to write: “Every sovereign formation would thus have to foresee the destined moment of its disintegration... No formation of sovereignty, in order to crystalize, will ever endure this prise de conscience: for as soon as this formation becomes conscious of its immanent disintegration in the individuals who compose it, these same individuals decompose it.”* (AE, 367- 368; LCV, [II], 162) What does it mean that “*desire lives from having no aim*”? It means that desire is without aim nor sense precisely because it is a natural force always regenerating itself, energetic and wild, never quieted by the achievement of an aim and, thus, never subjected to a goal or to the accomplishment of a perpetual state of equilibrium. Previously we have recalled that, for Deleuze and Guattari, the primordial impulse is “*desire*”, while, for Nietzsche, is the “*will to power*.” (DI, 91) According to the German philosopher, “*as soon as we act practically, we have to follow the prejudices of our sentiments.*” (NCV, 122) Klossowski maintains the same line: “*nature has no goal and realizes something. We others have a “goal” but obtain something other than this goal.*” (NCV, 122) If, thanks to his sharp sarcasm, Nietzsche affirmed that “*if no goal resides in the whole history of human destinies, then one must be inserted into it*” (quoted in NCV, 123), Klossowski, then, can remark: “*This means: we are aware of our mechanism; we must dismantle it. But to*

dismantle it is also to make use of its parts in order to reconstruct it, and thus to lead 'nature' toward our own 'goal'. But whenever we reason in this manner, we are once again masking the impulse that is driving us: it is true that we obtain something we have interpreted as willed, but this is simply 'nature' which, without willing anything, has realized itself for other 'ends.' (NCV, 123) It is, hence, the disguised action of individuals to decompose the institutions of the formations of sovereignty as soon as the conscience of the absurd lack of end and sense of the society in which they live will be clear to them. And it will exactly be the chaotic power of Nature to act through them. In this “*station of thought*” it strongly emerges the radical Spinozism of the Rhizosphere, or in the words of Deleuze a “*Spinozism of the subconscious*”.

Towards a new land: dismantling and reconstructing the mechanism

It follows that the greatest mistake for a revolutionary is to think that revolution will coincide with himself, with his own *name in History*. Indeed, those who make revolution fail are individuals that attribute ends to it, that perform sudden stops or that allow it to continue in a vacuum – “*betrayals don't wait their turn, but are there from the very start.*” (AE, 379) Conversely, the lucid revolutionaries, who notice the presence of groups which overtake the goals chosen by their closed set, with that level of awareness have either to prevent the formation of negative sovereignties – by creating a sort of new revolutionary anthropology – subtracting from developing sovereign nuclei the stability and the point of equilibrium through the creation of insurgent obliquely un-centred communities. This is the sense of the “*overturned sovereignty*” claimed by Deleuze and Guattari. Drift/bifurcation or subtraction/imbalance, these are the two insurrectional tasks that have to be prepared for revolution, rather than opposing and resisting to the point of equilibrium of sedition, that is, a blind idea of return. Alternatively, if we conceive the seditious as an individual that stands outside his ego, we have to regard him as a hollow object, whose purpose is to connect himself to revolutionary processes pre-existent to his effort and his thought. As for other coeval behaviours, this connection could function as a positive, accelerating and non-inhibiting catalysation. The reaction and the subsequent fusion, though, do not induce the individual to remain unaltered in his stability, but instead the accelerating catalytic process radically transforms it. The accelerating factor of the catalytic reaction, then, affects both fields: the collective revolutionary process and the individual de-subjecting process – in this regard, Foucault remarks that “*one has to dispense with the constituent subject, to get rid of the subject itself.*” (PK, 117) If desire lives because it does not have an aim, returning to Deleuze and Guattari, it generates effects of acceleration of the revolutionary process in a materialistic sense and not in an ideological one, where ‘*ideology*’ means the political process driven by party officials who are revolution professionals. There cannot be *creation* if we repeat the same ideological rituals of previous revolutions, of which we still preserve the idle forms lacking any propulsive dynamism. We ought to prevent the serialization of insurrection and its “*mono and macro*” form. Indeed, as Klossowski writes, “*if the meaning of all eminent creation is to break the gregarious habits that always direct existing beings toward ends that are useful exclusively to the oppressive regime of mediocrity - then in the experimental domain to create is to do violence to what exists, and thus to the integrity of beings. Every creation of a new type must provoke a state of insecurity: creation ceases to be a game at the margins of reality; henceforth, the creator will not reproduce, but will itself produce the real.*” (NVC, 129) Deleuze and Guattari hold a similar stance – “*we are claiming the famous rights to laziness, to non-productivity, to dream and fantasy production, once again we are quite pleased, since we haven't stopped saying the opposite, and that desiring-production produces the real.*” (AE, 380) Every production of reality is in fact a crack, a breach into the social body, but such fracture happens only “*by means of a desire without aim or cause that charted it and sided with it. While the schiz is possible without the order of causes, it becomes real only by means of something of another order: Desire, the desert-desire, the revolutionary investment of desire. And that is indeed what undermines capitalism: where will the revolution come from, and in what form within the exploited masses? It is like death—where, when? It will be a decoded flow, a de-territorialized flow that runs too far and cuts too sharply, thereby escaping from the axiomatic of capitalism.*” (AE, 378) Not only this production of Reality in the desert of the sub-reality of monetary circuiting undermines capitalism, but it also nullifies, as a primary target, the theory of state or any theory of institutions deriving from revolutionary struggles, because schizo-analysis – as the thought of Nietzsche, Klossowski and Foucault – does not rigorously offer “*any political programme*”, not for a group, nor for a party, nor for masses, because this would be all unfair and irrational. (AE 437) The authors of the *Anti-Oedipus*, as well as the sappers of the Rhizosphere are all aware of the negative, violent and brutal of schizo-analysis – as they are aware of the genealogy, of the archive, of the philosophy of the future and of the Vicious Circle: “*de-familiarizing, de-oedipalizing, de-castrating; undoing theater, dream, and fantasy; decoding, de-territorializing – a terrible curettage, a malevolent activity.*” (AE, 381) All this “*Destroy, Destroy*” primarily and

essentially indicates to free from any obstacle the process, to accelerate the process, *to accelerate and to destroy*, since the process to be accelerated is, as we have mentioned, “*the process of desiring-production, following its molecular lines of escape.*” (AE, 381) And we can overlook if someone more or less recently has confused the “*molecular escape*” with the “*molar production*”, or if he has interpreted going “[...] *still further, that is, in the movement of the market...*” as following in a conformist way the commercial strategy of disarticulation of existing entities since the process is unique in nature, or if someone has believed that we ought to accelerate the rush of *turbo-capitalism* so that it would crash at the first bifurcation, or – even worse – if someone exchanged the desire for goods consumption and for self-repression, with the impulsive desire of production of Reality, aimed at modifying what exists and at liberating the *differences*. Let us say it here, once and for all: the capitalist process of decoding produces infinite abstract quantities – money and its pair of repetitive and spectral syntheses, credit and debit, driven and controlled by the systemic Axiomatics of immanence; the schizo-revolutionary *process* of decoding produces, instead, *particles of power* that are non-evident, radiating and immeasurable – desire, manipulated by impulses, that is, by desiring-machines. These are nothing but differences in regime, *not in nature*: indeed the two aspects of the process have contact but do not confuse one with the other. The schizo-nomad remains always at the boundary of capitalism: it represents “*its inherent tendency brought to fulfillment as well as its exterminating angel.*” (AE, 35) However, desiring production – impulsive or concealed – and social production – monetarized and abstract – are the two differences that have been the object of study of the materialist psychiatry of Deleuze and Guattari. They represent the “*way of life*” or the “*Reality*” that we desire: Feasible Reality vs. Artificial Reality.

Against the Black Death: good health and new hope

All we have written is the result of a research project that involved three main cores, heterogeneous but still tied and unified by a subversive thinking. The first core is represented by the posthumous fragments on the will to power, where the heart of this research lies, *The Strong of the Future*, that is, the Nietzsche that wrote in 1887-1888; the second core can be identified in the essay on conspiracy and the community of singularities generated by the Eternal Return, that is, the Klossowski of *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (1969); the third core is constituted by the present accelerationist passage in *The Civilised Capitalist Machine* where the nomad multiplicities appear, that is, the *Anti-Oedipus* of Deleuze and Guattari (1972). Three cores for three books of the Adversary – a *lawless, anarchic and antichrist Adversary* – whose task is “*completing the process and not arresting it, not making it turn about in the void, not assigning it a goal.*” (AO 382) If, for what concerns industrial capital or digital post-capitalism, “*we really haven’t seen anything yet*” because with its de-territorializations “*it may dispatch us straight to the moon*” (AE, 34) and conquer new planets or galaxies with its *Black Deaths*, according to Deleuze and Guattari the non-identitary nomad “*will never go too far with the deterritorialization, the decoding of flows.*” (AE, 382) Zarathustra, in one of its most visionary speeches, *The Bestowing Virtue*, prophesied: “*Truly, a place of healing shall the earth become! And already is a new odor diffused around it, a salvation-bringing odor - and a new hope!*” (Z, 65) Thus, the masterpiece written by Deleuze and Guattari – which, as we have demonstrated, is not only an authorial work but a rhizomatic gem – finishes with a morning song to accelerate the momentum of the Eternal Return: “*For the new earth is not to be found in the neurotic or perverse re-territorializations that arrest the process or assign it goals; it is no more behind than ahead, it coincides with the completion of the process of desiring-production, this process that is always and already complete as it proceeds, and as long as it proceeds.*” (AE, 382) The appearance of those who walk the revolutionary path may change, whether they be the strong of the future, or the non-homogeneous singularities, or the nomad multiplicities. The imperative of the *micro-communism of the unequal* however remains the same: *Accelerate and Destroy*. The inhuman Kingdom is already among us.

December 2015