

Extrapolations on
Deleuze, Groups,
and Power
—An
Interview
with
Sylvère Lotringer



Sylvère Lotringer is the General Editor of *Semiotext(e)*, Professor Emeritus in the Department of French and Romance Philology at Columbia University, and a Professor of Foreign Philosophy and Jean Baudrillard Chair at the European Graduate School. In both his work as editor and in his own writing, he has been a key voice in relaying the insights of French theory to America and developing their implications in the registers of culture, art, and philosophy. Following his lecture on the consequences of indebtedness for artists and the professionalization of the art world during the LA Art Book Fair in February 2013, *Scapegoat* met with Sylvère at his home to discuss theories of excess, group dynamics, and the legacy of Deleuze in architecture culture. What follows is an edited transcript of our conversation.¹

Scapegoat Says The question of excess is everywhere in evidence. I was just reading this morning about a wild monkey attack in South Sulawesi, Indonesia, where people—who are encroaching more and more on the habitat of the monkeys—were attacked during a serious rampage through the village.

Sylvère Lotringer That is where politics starts...

S^S Before we get to politics of this schizoiden, can we start with some history? There has been a lot of work on Deleuze lately, including some texts that have tried to historicize the project of *Semiotext(e)* as an intercessor of Deleuze, which is the claim made by Simone Brott.² While much of this work fails to address the depth of Deleuze's philosophical project, it nevertheless brings up the question of Deleuze's relationship to architecture and the broader forms of cultural production and discourse related to architecture today. Putting aside the philosophical questions for the moment, historically speaking, would you agree that *Semiotext(e)* was an intercessor for Deleuze in architecture?

S^L Well, it depends on what you mean by the term "intercessor." Obviously, I realized this yesterday, because when we did the Schizo-Culture conference, *Anti-Oedipus* had not yet been translated

into English.³ Foucault's books were not translated either, so we were intercessors in the sense that there were no texts available in English. We were short-circuiting the whole academic project. We just introduced the work to people who didn't really have the context and didn't know what it was about. So, in that sense, we were intercessors because we just allowed something to happen—but it didn't work!

S^S But the historical argument being made, at least by Brott, is that there is a clear connection from *Semiotext(e)* to Zone Books, Sanford Kwinter, Jonathan Crary, etc., people who, in her estimation, are well-known and read in the world of architecture.

S^L Of course there is this connection. Kwinter, as you know, was one of my students and I knew him well. Zone people are a bit more problematic because when I knew them, at first, they were more interested in Derrida. Zone was really the antithesis of *Semiotext(e)*; it was rich, beautiful, and full of money. I had a discussion with one of the founders who laughed at me because, he said at the time, Deleuze was of no importance. It was the same way that people from the Frankfurt School said that French thought was of no importance whatsoever. But Kwinter went back to France, took Deleuze's classes and became a total Deleuzian, which is okay. But, all these people, including

Sanford [Kwinter] and Jonathan [Crary], I had them in class and there was a connection there, but when I knew them they were not interested in architecture.

S^S Coming out of the deconstruction culture that focused so much on Derrida, it took some time before the material and political dimensions of Deleuze were really engaged. Did this happen through architecture?

S^L It took a long time. Derrida started in 1966, at Johns Hopkins, and it quickly became part of the golden triangle of deconstruction—Hopkins, Yale, Cornell. I participated in that, but I was never really a part of it. In 1972, I went to a conference at Cornell, and everyone was very excited there even though it was a relatively small group, but none of them were architects. They became disciples of Paul de Man, and this went up to the 1990s.

S^S Even now, with eco-deconstruction and eco-criticism, there is still a clear emphasis on Derrida and de Man.

S^L I think it was really an accident that ended it—the discovery of Paul de Man's anti-Semitic past; that really did it for him in America. As soon as there is something a little dangerous, academia says no, America says no, and that's that. But, it had nothing to do with deconstruction itself. We could have hoped that deconstruction would just deconstruct itself, but it didn't happen that way.

S^S In the context of the various lines of French theory, do you think *Semiotext(e)* had more influence on architecture than other areas or discourses? There was an architecture issue of the magazine...it was the biggest book *Semiotext(e)* ever did!

S^L That was a bit blind, maybe. But architecture was not connected to the other arts until the mid-1980s, or even the late-1980s. There was maybe a gallery or two who would show architecture as an art object, and then, like photography, architecture came into the art world. *Semiotext(e)* had a wide audience that was not limited to any one discourse. People who were interested in ideas were reading our

books. It is true that many people had no idea what they were about, but, still today, wherever I go I meet people who read this theory for the first time in the 1970s and 1980s. Obviously, I guess, architects were there too.

S^S You published *On the Line* and *Nomadology* before the translations by Minnesota Press came out.⁴

S^L *Rhizome* came out in France immediately after *Anti-Oedipus*. There was pressure to publish more, and they also wrote *Kafka*, which is an even better book.⁵ Still, there wasn't the same interest in architecture at the time as there is now.

S^S In 1989 you published *Foucault Live*, in which he says there is no such thing as liberation through architecture. It is a passage that is very important for architects to consider:

I do not think that there is anything that is functionally—by its very nature—absolutely liberating. Liberty is a *practise*. So there may, in fact, always be a certain number of projects whose aim is to modify some constraints, to loosen, or even to break them, but none of these projects can, simply by its nature, assure that people will have liberty automatically, that it will be established by the project itself. The liberty of men [sic] is never assured by the institutions and laws intended to guarantee them. This is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around—not because they are ambiguous, but simply because "liberty" is what must be exercised.⁶

S^L What he means is that everything is reversible. That is what capitalism is about—creating ambivalences.

S^S During your talk at the book fair, you said that when you had a good response from your readers to a particular issue of the magazine you would change your course, or the trajectory of the project, because you didn't want to maintain an authority. Was this a way, in the Foucauldian sense I just mentioned, of provoking practices of liberty?

^S_L Well, of course this is part of it, but our strategies came mostly from Deleuze. First of all, it is not about subjects—or *the Subject*. Semiotext(e) is about how to deal with culture, how can we create groups within a culture, and what is the formation process; I have always been very interested in the concept of the group. I was very close with Guattari at the time. But it was not just Guattari, because I have been involved in groups since I was 9 or 10 years old! I was in a youth movement, a Zionist political movement, then when I was at the Sorbonne I was among the “leaders” of the movement there; I have always been organizing and working in groups, but with a kind of ambivalent relationship to the group. The group is always something that gives ideas new potential and new energy, but it is also very dangerous and volatile. I was always very aware of this with Semiotext(e), so I was constantly trying to prevent the group from becoming a group.

^S_S By constantly reinventing it?

^S_L I wasn't thinking this so precisely at the time. But, for example, after *Schizo-Culture 1*, we were supposed to do another issue; it's announced on the back cover. I said, “No, if it works for the first one, we shouldn't make another because that is what people expect.” There was some arrogance in this, too, but because we knew that we were in New York, and people had their eyes on us, we would not give them what they wanted. In the United States, if you give people what they want they just spit on it!

^S_S So, then you did the issue on the Italian Autonomia?⁷

^S_L We did *Polysexuality*, then the Italian issue.⁸ The idea was to move the bigger group, the group of our readers, but also to make sure that we couldn't solidify, that we couldn't stratify inside our smaller group. Even the first issue of Semiotext(e) was actually the second issue. The first issue was stolen! Kidnapped, actually. It was just a mimeographed copy, so not really anything important, but I went to Mexico and left it. When I came back, the issue had been published—with a foreword—and that is when I realized

that we should not have introductions because people would fight over them. Because of that, there were no introductions for most of the books.

^S_S So that no one could be the intermediary?

^S_L No, the problem we had was that I was the highest ranking in the group because I was an Assistant Professor. The others were graduate students. At first, I had the idea that it didn't matter, because we were all equal—but we were not all equal. So, we needed a way to ensure that the black hole of power remained empty. I wanted to take care of this place of power; the constant problem was to make power something that was not, and is not, desirable. And, to make it impossible. After a while, I said, I will be the general editor—my idea was that I owed everything to everyone. I couldn't do the design, I couldn't do all the work of production; it wasn't about money, because no one had money. So we never had a problem with money.

But, to go back to *Schizo-Culture 1*, we were working with artists, some from uptown and some from downtown. The uptown artists started to get uptight because the issue wasn't accepted by Richard Serra. Kathryn Bigelow was part of this episode, too. Anyway, they came to the meeting and said that Serra didn't like it, so it was shit. I thought they wanted to work on it, but they also really wanted it to pay off somehow. When the payoff wasn't there, they walked out. But a friend of mine, the girlfriend of Sol LeWitt who introduced me to all the older artists, and who was older than the others in the group, sent me a note that said, “Don't worry, I'm with you!”

A few days later, Kathryn came back. Serra had apologized and said he liked the issue, but he didn't know why he hadn't been invited! So, the artists were happy and wanted to immediately work on the next issue. I decided to wait a bit, and we moved on to *Polysexuality* instead.

I was trying to make sure there was no concentration of power. Of course, I freaked out when I realized the art world was with me! And, the art world was even nice at the time—there were no threats and no luxury, like now. But, from

the beginning, I knew it was a bad idea to be indebted to someone or something that wants you to keep repeating yourself.

^S_S Moving to your more recent Intervention Series, I am curious if these publications, like those by Tiqqun, have found any place in the art world today?⁹

^S_L I met Tiqqun a long time ago and I was thrilled that there was something happening in France; intellectually, it had been a desert for a while. I liked their style, even though I didn't care for the conspiratorial, small-sect kind of thing they promoted. I also didn't like their direct references to Situationism. I discovered Situationism in the US. Everyone thinks it was so influential in France, in 1968...I was there, and I never heard of it. My teacher, Lucien Goldmann, was attacked by them and I didn't even know! No one read the Situationists in France. It is only through the art world, when they were aestheticized because there was no longer any hope for an avant-garde, that the Situationists were brought in as the avant-garde that might have been. So, when I realized that Tiqqun was using them, I was concerned because the whole political context the Situationists tried to develop isn't of much use!

But, to return to the question of the impact of Tiqqun, I think it had more of an impact on students. It was the repression of the group and the reactionary position of Fox News that made it political in the US. The public that read *The Coming Insurrection* was much broader than the art world. It is, interestingly, what we always wanted to have: a young, activist perspective.

You used to be able to find this perspective in academia—people who were part of the institution but not totally integrated—and this was something I found with my own students. I discouraged them from becoming academics, even though I was one myself! I love working with undergraduate students because they have an openness, inventiveness, and enthusiasm that they lose when they become grad students invested in the institution; they are then so careful, so manipulative, and so strategic. So, yes, there were the punks, the young activists and the young artists, and that was it; it was interesting to work with them.

^S_S The Intervention Series cultivates this as well. I'd like to talk about the relation of these texts as contemporary interventions to the broader project of Semiotext(e).

^S_L Tiqqun's are good books that sold well. I wasn't crazy about the Bloom book because it is heavily on the post-Situationist side of their work.¹⁰ I make a few concessions once in a while, and that was one. *The Femicide Machine* is another story. It is an amazing book, and the intellectual framework is careful and thorough. Sergio [González-Rodríguez] was there, in Mexico, and he risked his life for it, so it is important that he synthesized these experiences and that we could publish it.

^S_S Did *ATTA* receive any of the critical attention that came with *The Coming Insurrection*, given its discussion of America's war on terrorism?¹¹

^S_L No, not at all. But, to first answer another question you mentioned in our correspondence, about the “small series” of Intervention books, part of it has to do with Hedi El Kholti. We, Semiotext(e), are trapped with MIT. Hedi and I have tried to make something that could move, but MIT moves very slowly. This was something that started with Semiotext(e) early on. The *Man Boy Love* issue was done because François Peraldi was taking ages to finish *Polysexuality*; he was delaying the issue, and, in the meantime, I started another issue on polysexuality, *Man Boy Love*. We did it in two weeks! It was monumental, in a small way, and people took what they wanted from it.

^S_S Some of the books in the series suggest a strong connection to Jean Baudrillard. They are not just in a Deleuzian lineage; instead, they use fatal strategies!

^S_L We don't have a Deleuzian lineage; the Deleuzian lineage is in the organization and existence of Semiotext(e). But, that is why I can integrate Baudrillard and Negri, etc. I don't want Semiotext(e) to be a part of any lineage. So, the idea is to read theory and to keep the edges fuzzy. I don't want it to be part of *that* kind of theory group. I would say the more

theory the better, within a certain range, and we were never trying to be exclusive, except for the latest return of the Althusserians, and Badiou's work, which I just didn't like. Within a certain range, that doesn't mean we agree with everything we publish. I thought the last chapters of *The Coming Insurrection* were irresponsible, and I was hesitant about it—not that I wanted to censor it.

^{SS} Still, you did two of the three major collections of Deleuze's interviews and writings, and the film...

^{SL} I have said that Jean-Luc Godard makes films, but they are scripts. I wanted to have the Deleuze film, just like that, as a script. I was trying to get it, but it took 15 years. By the time we put it out, he was already everyone's love. But, I wanted to put it out because it shows how Deleuze was a philosopher even when he is not talking about philosophy. That is exactly the kind of philosophy I like, and the kind of philosophy he liked—philosophy for non-philosophers. When it finally arrived, the film didn't have the effect I had hoped for earlier on. I was trying to cut off the Deleuzian appropriation, I suppose, which was also why I published the book *French Theory*, with Sande Cohen.¹² I was for and against it.

^{SS} You were against the appropriation of Deleuze by academics and your own attempt to re-appropriate Deleuze from them?

^{SL} I don't think there is a possibility of not re-appropriating. You cannot avoid it. If there is *Schizo-Culture 1*, then no *Schizo-Culture 2*. You can't avoid it. I knew 15 years ago that Guattari would have his day, too, and it has been going on for five or six years. That is a nice thing about America—it is very predictable.

From the beginning, I have to say, I worked against the pace that is imposed. There is nothing you can do about the appropriation of Deleuze by academics, you have to let it pass. Some of the things I do now have taken over 20 years. I am not dead yet, but the film took almost 20 years. The return of the Italians took 30 years. I was always in favour of this, though, because time is not *the* essence; in America,

time is the essence of control.

Another thing I emphasized in my talk the other day was that the death of a magazine, the death of an enterprise, is not the death of you! I have been hoping this project would get off my back, so that gives me a lot of latitude. Similarly, I don't want to know what people think about it—it is not about opinions. Hedi is great because he has a sense of the covers, of design, of what should be done and what should not, but I am too lazy. I was a student of [Roland] Barthes, and he was very lazy too! I do my thing, but I don't want to compare it to what is being done at the time. I have an idea, and as long as the idea works, then it works.

^{SS} You have recently selected some very specific translations from Peter Sloterdijk that introduce his work to an English-speaking audience. Of course, as we know, there are many disagreements between Sloterdijk, Tiqqun, the Deleuzians, etc. So there's more to the story about breaking up the lineage, is there not?

^{SL} There are stories within stories, yes. I read about Sloterdijk in Italy. They were reading him there in pirated copies that were translated and they told me about him. It wasn't translated in French. I read some Italian, so I could read it and I was excited by his work. So, the situation is like that of Deleuze. I ask myself, "Why didn't I publish *Anti-Oedipus*?" I could have published it for a fee of \$750.00. Right? But, it was a huge translation. We weren't equipped to do that, or to even publish it, really. So, Deleuze was published by Les Éditions de Minuit. But, a few years later, all the presses that didn't want Deleuze were industrializing their production! So, I made a special effort and we published the last two books of Deleuze, not because we had just become interested in Deleuze, but I wanted to make sure that because we introduced him, we would also put out these works which are serious too.

So, to come back to Sloterdijk, we are going to do the rest of the *Spheres*, too. We thought, why not break the house? It is expensive!

^{SS} Architects love it...

Scapegoat

^{SL} I was hoping so!

^{SS} It is very spatial; it is almost too easy for architects. They are ready to appropriate it, and they have already started to use him, for example, to explain their love of spray foam.

^{SL} I think Sloterdijk is an original thinker. The Left in Germany hates him because of it, but he also makes these terrible goofs. You know? About taxes, all of that. We don't condone that, of course, but otherwise, it gets so stuffy with another book by Badiou, etc. We can feel good about this book by Sloterdijk because it is very creative and it makes you want to think. That is the important thing. We don't want to be in a lineage, but we want to publish people who allow us to think about how to change life, change politics, and he does that. So, I think it was a good idea, even though in France the whole series is entirely published already and it didn't make any impact.

^{SS} What about *Schizo-Culture*? Is it coming out again?

^{SL} It will be out in Fall 2013. It is a double volume: the issue itself, and then we collected, transcribed, and edited all of the other lectures that were given there, and reactions of people who attended. I was busy today because there is an artist in Chicago who is restaging the panel with R.D. Laing and Foucault, and we were just finishing it this week. I made a video introduction for it.

Hedi said it would only interest a few academics, but I have been wanting to do it for years. I wanted more! Not just the issue, but the context. So, it's coming out, and I have been working with a young English graduate who is going through the archive, even though there is no visual documentation.

But, if you look at the footnotes of *Foucault Live*, for example, you can see that I introduced some things to make people curious about it, even if it couldn't be found. You have to prepare a long time, 20 years is nothing. But, everyone wants it now, and it will be completely institutionalized.

261

^{SS} Do you think the re-issuing of the other magazines, such as the Italian issue, with a new preface, is part of this struggle for context?

^{SL} The preface for the Italian issue was written at the time of the original issue. I was desperately trying to attract attention to the issue, but no one wanted it. So, we published it as a context in the re-issue.

^{SS} Outside of *Semiotext(e)*, you have written quite a lot as well. What are you working on now?

^{SL} I am working on three books. One on Cioran, but in French, because no one reads him here!

^{SS} I have been reading Cioran myself over the last few years; I think people must be reading him in English, but he is so incredibly hard because he provokes such incredible doubt.

^{SL} Like Baudrillard plus! But, I am very interested in his fascist years, as a way of thinking about nationalism and how one becomes a fascist. Also, there is a piece he wrote in the 1970s about the Jews, called "In Praise of the Jews." That triggered my interest; of course, I knew Cioran, but that text is just so twisted. So I have been working in Romanian libraries, and doing so many other things. Unfortunately, when I start a book, there are a million things that are waiting. So, I publish an article, and I say I will get back to it, but I never have time. It is the same with the Foucault-Baudrillard essay, which I am working on as a book, including more on Deleuze. It is really a way of talking about Deleuze and Guattari, whom I have never written about! Did you know that?

^{SS} Maybe not directly.

^{SL} Sure, *Semiotext(e)* was enough, it was my Deleuzian project. But, it is not a commentary, or, perhaps it is a commentary, the kind Deleuze would have liked? Have you read Lazzarato's *The Making of the Indebted Man*?¹³

^{SS} Not yet, just *The Violence of Financial Capitalism* so far.¹⁴

...An Interview with...

^S_L You should read it! It is a good book. I mention him because he is of the new generation of Italians. Lazzarato takes hints from Deleuze, and he splits from Negri to open up a reading of the present. It is not commentary. He takes a central passage from *Anti-Oedipus* where they mention Nietzsche's concept of debt, and he opens it to the present debt-economy. It is interesting because he shows that debt precedes exchangeability, which is not so for Baudrillard, who thinks it is the reverse.

^S_S At the book fair, you said that the professionalization of art as competency is fine, but professionalization as debt is a serious problem because it ensures that your competencies can only be expressed to pay down your debt. This guarantees the present will reproduce itself in the future.

^S_L Exactly. When I met Negri, Bifo, and the others, they were against the trade unions. The unions represented power, and so they were against the unions. Instead they wanted cottage industries, self-valorization, smaller work that was specialized, and over the years, that is exactly what happened. They had announced post-Fordism! Their ideal was pre-post-capitalist. They think the General Intellect is great, but it is totally ambivalent. Virilio showed that, and, if you read Baudrillard, from the very beginning, he shows that this ambivalence is what capitalism produces; everything is reversible.

^S_S The early work of Baudrillard also gives us an important theory of excess.

^S_L Baudrillard is *the* thinker of excess. He knew that when you move from subsistence to industrial production, there is a surplus. He was from a peasant family and he knew that well, what the difference was. In *The System of Objects*, which I have been writing about again, he shows that when things become exchangeable, there is a surplus. He was thinking of Mauss and Bataille, obviously. There was a great article he wrote about Bataille that criticized the cosmic reach of the general economy, but he was the one who really worked on this problem!

If you start with debt, like Deleuze and Guattari, and Nietzsche, that is one direction; Baudrillard is also Nietzschean, but for him, debt is not given, it is created. The goal is to dissipate it or burn it out to make sure it doesn't infect everything else. There is a parallel between them, but it is the exact reversal of approach.

^S_S In your introduction to *The Agony of Power*, which is such an excellent reading of the problem of power, you discuss Étienne de la Boétie and explain how Baudrillard takes up his notion of servitude through an argument about the dissipation of power.

^S_L Thank you for saying so; not so many people read my work. I am not really known as a writer. But that text is only a beginning, an introduction to a book I wanted to write, but I had a death in my family and I could not go on writing it. Still, I am not known as a writer of philosophy.

^S_S When will you finally bring all your texts together, so we can read them in one place and see how persistently you have been writing about these questions?

^S_L I am working on it now, but it doesn't connect enough yet. I am editing it, adding some things, trying to make it connect. It will be called *Extrapolations*. It starts from architecture, then moves to Lefebvre, Baudrillard, and Virilio, as it tries to move through French Theory in some way.

^S_S In the introduction, you also give an important reading of Pierre Clastres when you say, "Contrary to the sovereign, the Indian Chiefs are remarkable for their complete lack of authority. The only power they own resides in the *palabra*, in their capacity to maintain by their speeches an equilibrium within the group."¹⁵

^S_L That's me, maybe?

^S_S Maybe *Palabra* should be the title of your book?

^S_L A good idea.

^S_S Clastres, in the *Society Against the State*, makes an argument about the dissipation of power; I think Semiotext(e) accomplishes this through publishing. That is what the project is about, at least in part, isn't it?

^S_L It's true. I met Pierre through Félix, but when he was very young he had a car accident and he died. But I thought his ideas were great. I thought to myself from the very beginning about how I could be a chief and have no power. I needed everyone for the project to work, and I had to help them in other ways, with fellowships, funding, references, and I tried to be an intercessor of the group itself.

Also, there is an idea that is very difficult for Americans to understand: it is the project that counts. I have made films, and at the time of the credits, there is no father, no mother, no brother—you kill! We co-made a film about sex, Chris and I, called *Too Sensitive to Touch*. It was for the Nova convention. I made it with Michael Oblowitz, who is a good friend of mine and Kathryn's. Even though he was a student of mine, a friend, and we had worked together, I was in France at the time when he did the credits, and he was going to junk me! I know, now, that there is always a problem with acknowledgements and credit.

So, I have to try constantly to make sure the question of competitiveness doesn't come in, even my own! I don't mind not

being mentioned because we know it doesn't matter, but I still notice. The point is to have a project, like an artwork. You don't make it in order to please people or to compete with someone. Everything else that comes in the way of the project you have to push out. Again, it is not because I want to impose authority, but because the project has to be there. You have to create walls to make sure you are not tempted by power. It is a matter of strategy, which is all from Deleuze and Guattari. In a way, it is also from Kafka, from "A Report to the Academy"...

^S_S "Esteemed Gentlemen of the Academy! You show me the honour of calling upon me to submit a report to the Academy concerning my previous life as an ape."¹⁶ The ape reports on his progress of becoming human to the academy not because he wants to be human but because it is his only means of escape! This is precisely why Deleuze is a philosopher of life, and why his work is so much more important than any academic or professional concerns and ambitions.

^S_L Yes, exactly. I am like that ape, I want a way out, I want a way out of academia, I want a way out of the art world, I want a way out of life. But, I don't want to be dead before I die—it is as simple as that. And, if *that* is the Deleuzian lineage, then that's fine...×

Endnotes

- 1 *Scapegoat* would like to thank Sylvère for his generosity and mentorship, both during this conversation in Los Angeles and over the last four years, during which time he has helped shape the project of this journal and the personal projects of its editors.
- 2 Simone Brott, "Deleuze and the 'Intercessors,'" in *Log 18* (Winter 2010): 135–151.
- 3 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* was first published in French in 1972, and in English in 1977.
- 4 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *On the Line*, trans. John Johnston (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Nomadology: The War Machine*, trans. Brian Massumi (New York: Semiotext(e), 1986); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).
- 5 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).
- 6 Michel Foucault, "Space, Knowledge, and Power," in *Foucault Live: Michel Foucault Collected Interviews, 1961–1984*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer (New York: Semiotext(e), 1989), 335–347.
- 7 Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, eds., *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics* (Semiotext(e): New York, 1980).
- 8 François Peraldi, ed., *Polysexuality* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1981).
- 9 Tiqqun, *The Coming Insurrection* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2010); Tiqqun, *This is Not a Program*, trans. Joshua David Jordan (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2011); Tiqqun, *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young Girl*, trans. Ariana Reines (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2012).
- 10 Tiqqun, *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young Girl*.
- 11 Jarett Kobek, *ATTA* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2011).
- 12 Sylvère Lotringer and Sande Cohen, *French Theory in America* (New York: Routledge, 2001).
- 13 Maurizio Lazzarato, *The Making of the Indebted Man: An Essay on the Neoliberal Condition*, trans. Joshua David Jordan (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2012).
- 14 Christian Marazzi, *The Violence of Financial Capitalism*, trans. Kristina Lebedeva (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2010).
- 15 Sylvère Lotringer, introduction to Jean Baudrillard, *The Agony of Power*, trans. Ames Hodges (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2010), 26. Pierre Clastres (1934–1977) was a French ethnographer and theorist who is best known for his field research among the Guayaki (known also as the Aché people) in eastern Paraguay. The concept of the "palabra" is based on his ethnographic study of how speeches are used as a mechanism to disseminate, rather than concentrate, power.
- 16 Franz Kafka, "A Report to the Academy" ["Ein Bericht für eine Akademie" (1917)] (New York: Schocken, 1995), 250–258.



Sam Leach, *Monkeys in Water*, 2013, oil and resin on wood, 50 x 40cm
Courtesy the artist and Sullivan+Strumpf.