Foucault Studies

ARTICLE

Toward a Theory of Transversal Politics: Deleuze and Foucault's Block of Becoming

Christopher Penfield, Purdue University

ABSTRACT: This paper charts the course of Deleuze and Foucault's philosophical friendship or 'block of becoming,' showing the series of reciprocal determinations through which each philosopher's thought develops in response to the other's. Specifically, I will argue that the concept of transversal resistance is fundamental for the political thought of both Foucault and Deleuze, allowing us to reconstruct the basis and trajectory of a shared political theory. This concept emerges in Deleuze and Guattari's schizo-politics, which advances the central aim of Foucault's earlier *History of Madness* (problematizing the exclusion of a certain intensive experience of madness; activating its potentially liberatory force) while accounting for why Foucault's particular politics of literary transgression had failed (the becoming-commodity of art). The question then becomes one of conceiving and creating transversal forms of struggle that would respond to the problem of capitalism—a question which Deleuze poses to Foucault, and which prompts and orients the latter's micro-political analytic of power. In turn, Foucault's analysis of the anti-transversal operation and economico-political function of power provides the critical groundwork for a theory of transversal politics. Such an affirmative project takes form in Foucault's late ethico-politics.

Keywords: Foucault, Deleuze, Transversal, Capitalism, Power, Resistance

"A line of becoming is not defined by points that it connects, or by points that compose it; on the contrary, it passes between points, it comes up through the middle, it runs perpendicular to the points first perceived, transversally to the localizable relation of distant or contiguous points. … If becoming is a block (a line-block), it is because it constitutes a zone of proximity and indiscernibility, a no-man's-land, a nonlocalizable relation sweeping up the two distant or contiguous points…."
–Deleuze and Guattari[1]

Between Foucault and Deleuze, cutting across three decades, there runs a transversal line whose trajectory impels both thinkers in a reciprocal process or block of becoming. This line, shaping the contours of an exceedingly rich philosophical friendship, issues into the concept of

---

[1] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, translated by Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 293-4, translation slightly modified.

transversal resistance, which, I will argue, is indispensable for understanding the political thought of both Deleuze and Foucault.

In what follows, this 'line-block' of becoming will be mapped according to three segments: the first, running from Foucault's *History of Madness* (1961) to Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* (1972), posits in incipient form the political project of transversal resistance as a response to the problem of capitalism; the second, running from *Anti-Oedipus* to Foucault's analytic of power (1970s)[2], prepares the critical ground necessary for the positive elaboration of such a political project; and the third, running from the analytic of power through Deleuze and Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) to Foucault's late ethico-politics (1981-1984)[3], begins this positive elaboration. More specifically, the first segment concerns unreason and schizophrenia as absolute exterior limits of the socius, intensive forms of experience and expression, which scramble the dominant codifications of social order; freeing and transversally connecting these lines of flight becomes the project of schizo-political struggle. The second segment, in turn, provides a micro-political theory that poses the problem of power and resistance in capitalist society in terms of the production of two different kinds of multiplicity: one that is denumerable and controllable, and another that is non-denumerable and subversive. Finally, while the second segment prepares and begins the conceptual articulation of transversal resistance, the third develops it further through a particular example of the collective creation of a transverse multiplicity, by which the operation of power would be thwarted: namely, the Foucauldian project of becoming-queer.

Taken in its full trajectory, what emerges over the course of this Foucault-Deleuze block of becoming is a theory of transversal political struggle, which it is my larger aim to help elucidate.

I. Between *History of Madness* and *Anti-Oedipus*
i. The Political Problem of the Two Regimes of Madness
Anti-Oedipus can be understood as the development and sophistication of the core project given in *History of Madness*, since both works pose and respond to a common problem as the key for a general social theory and political strategy of contestation: namely, the problem of the two regimes of madness.[4] The distinction between these two regimes is drawn as follows: the

---

[2] In particular, I have in mind Foucault's two major books from this period, *Discipline and Punish* (1975) and *History of Sexuality Volume 1* (1976), as well as his lecture courses at the Collège de France (especially those running from *Psychiatric Power* in 1974 through *The Birth of Biopolitics* in 1979) and numerous other essays and interviews (in *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, some of which are translated in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault Volume 3*), extending until "The Subject and Power" (1982).

[3] See Michel Foucault, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault Volume 1*, edited by Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 1997). In particular, I will focus on "Friendship as a Way of Life" (1981), "The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will" (1981), "Sex, Power, and the Politics of Identity" (1982), "On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Works in Progress" (1983), and "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations" (1984).

[4] In this regard, both thinkers are profoundly Artaudian. Artaud's thesis in his essay on Van Gogh is that the 'authentically insane' – those artists, such as Hölderlin, Nerval, Nietzsche and Van Gogh, who possess a form of 'superior lucidity' that psychiatry institutionalizes and treats as mental illness – become suicided by

first—the 'breakthrough'—is characterized as a kind of radical limit-experience, expressed through works of art, that ruptures or calls into question the order of social reality; the second—the 'breakdown'—is characterized as a catatonic collapse that follows the initial breakthrough.[5] The problem, then, is the seemingly inexorable slippage from the first regime to the second: why and how is it that the 'authentically insane,' as Artaud puts it—those schizophrenic artists who (as Deleuze says) "live in an almost unbearable proximity to the real"[6]— are deprived the support necessary to sustain their intensive mode of becoming, falling instead into the ravages of madness and suicide?[7]

For both Foucault and Deleuze, this question speaks to something fundamental about the way society functions. Indeed, the problem of the two regimes of madness has significant *political* stakes because the practices that reduce the first form of madness to the second are the very constitutive processes by which the social formation is organized and reproduced; that is, something about the intensive experience of the schizophrenic breakthrough poses a grave danger to the social order, and the expulsion of this threat is formative for the foundation and development of society. I will refer to this claim, which bears the unmistakable stamp of Artaud's essay on Van Gogh, as the *Artaud thesis*. The problem of the two regimes of madness thus opens onto a more general theory of the constitutive exclusions by which the socius is formed, and it suggests a possible strategy of resistance that would privilege the schizoid 'line of the outside' as a site for political contestation.

Now, proceeding somewhat schematically, the problem of the two regimes of madness is first posed by Foucault in terms of an opposition between unreason and mental illness: unreason is a tragic form of limit-experience expressed through works of art and literature, whereas mental illness is an object of positivist scientific knowledge and medico-juridical discourse, undergirded by institutional structures of confinement and subjection. Taken as a

---

society because the dangerous, subversive force their works express would undermine the foundation of social institutions. See Antonin Artaud, "Van Gogh, the Man Suicided by Society," in *Antonin Artaud: Selected Writings*, edited by Susan Sontag, translated by Helen Weaver (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 483-512.

[5] Deleuze borrows the terminology of 'breakthrough' and 'breakdown' from R.D. Laing's *The Politics of Experience*; he also notes the close connection with Foucault's account in *History of Madness* of the historical separation of madness as unreason (breakthrough) from madness as mental illness (breakdown). See Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 131-2.

[6] Deleuze, "Schizophrenia and Society," in *Two Regimes of Madness*, edited by David Lapoujade, translated by Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2006), 27.

[7] That is, why and how does the schizophrenic 'visionary' (Artaud) become consigned to break down into "the autistic schizophrenic, who no longer moves, and who can remain motionless for years." (Deleuze, "Capitalism and Schizophrenia," in *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1975*, edited by Lapoujade (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004), 240. As Deleuze puts it, "What can we do so the break-through does not become a break-down?" (Deleuze, "Schizophrenia and Society," 28)

whole, the trajectory of *History of Madness* tells the story of the fracture and divergence within the experience of madness of these two regimes.[8]

The work begins with a version of the Artaud thesis articulated in Nietzschean terms: the tragic limit-experience of unreason is unsustainable because it is excluded by and from western reason and culture; it is excluded because tragic expression threatens to undermine the basic social order by disclosing the intrinsic groundlessness and contingency of not only human being, but of the structure, foundation, and intelligibility of reality (and with it, reason, morality, religion, etc.). This expulsion of unreason as an exterior limit of the socius, in turn, plays a constitutive role in the organization of the modern social formation. The *History of Madness*, then, is a 'history of limits': not a history of mental illnesses as told by reason, which would be the positivist account of the evolution of psychiatry; but a counter-history of constitutive exclusions, of the dividing practices that produce those outside limits by which a culture takes form.[9]

By virtue of their exteriority, then, and coupled with their expressive force, the tragic lineage of unreason's artists, from Goya and Sade to Nietzsche and Artaud, constitutes a privileged site for political subversion, "a point from which all contestation becomes possible, as well as the contestation of all things [*contestation totale*]."[10] Because the exclusion and silencing of the tragic institutes the historical unfolding of reason, which is to say, because this violent division between reason and unreason is constitutive for western culture, founding and cleaving its modes of being, the expression of unreason becomes a condition of possibility for radical resistance. The problem is of course precisely that the painters and poets of unreason collapse into madness. Though unreason is a kind of breakthrough, an intensive experience, by which one crosses over the exterior limit of the socius and establishes a relation to the outside, the artists are deprived the support necessary to sustain their process of becoming-intensive. They are 'suicided' (Artaud) by the very forces through which the social formation expels the tragic from itself. And if the expression of unreason is a condition of possibility for 'total con-

---

[8] The cleft between these two regimes emerges during the early Renaissance in the disparity between the moralizing humanist discourse on folly (e.g., Erasmus) and the apocalyptic phantasmagoria of tragic painting (e.g., Bosch). For Foucault's historical overview of the division and opposed trajectories of these two regimes, see Foucault, *History of Madness*, translated by Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa (London: Routledge, 2006), 26-8.

[9] See Foucault's original preface to *History of Madness*: "We could write a history of limits—of those obscure gestures, necessarily forgotten as soon as they are accomplished, through which a culture rejects something which for it will be the Exterior …. This is the originary thickness in which a culture takes shape. To interrogate a culture about its limit-experiences is to question it at the confines of history about a tear that is something like the birth of its history. … At the center of these limit-experiences of the Western world is the explosion, of course, of the tragic itself—Nietzsche having shown that the tragic structure from which the history of the Western world is made is nothing other than the refusal, the forgetting, and the silent collapse of tragedy." (Ibid., xxix-xxx)

[10] Ibid., 532. Cf. The triumphant ruse of madness with which Foucault closes the book: "That ruse is a new triumph for madness. The world believes that madness can be measured, and justified by means of psychology, and yet it must justify itself when confronted by madness, for its efforts and discussions have to measure up to the excess of the oeuvres of men like Nietzsche, Van Gogh and Artaud." (Ibid., 538)

testation' against the dominant structures of western culture, an analysis of the conditions of impossibility for sustaining this expression will pose a problem of power that is central to the very "essence of the modern world."[11]

The political task that follows from this problematic of the two regimes of madness is to provide the conditions of material expression that would support and sustain the limit-experience of unreason. Thus, throughout the 1960s Foucault pursues a kind of politics of literary transgression, where the subversive force of unreason is housed in modern literature[12] by virtue of two traits of the latter: 1) the new form of thought such writing makes possible, the 'thought of the outside' opened through reflection on the mode of being of literary language[13]; and 2) the radical exteriority of such writing as "an act placed outside the socio-economic system" of the capitalist formation and in opposition to its production of value, existing "independently of all consumption, all readership, all pleasure and all utility."[14] However, by the beginning of the 1970s, Foucault largely abandons this strategy of resistance: whereas the activity of literary writing could still be said to have subversive force in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the becoming-commodity of art has defused and re-appropriated this force.[15] For this reason, Foucault directs his conception of political resistance away from unreason and literature, turning instead toward an analytic of power.

---

[11] Ibid., 352. Naming Hölderlin, Nerval, Nietzsche, Van Gogh, Roussel, and Artaud, all of whom pursued the experience of unreason to the tragic breaking point, Foucault writes: "And each of those existences, each of the words that made up those existences repeats with the insistence of time the same question, which probably concerns the essence of the modern world: why is it not possible to remain in the difference that is unreason? Why is it that unreason always has to separate from itself, fascinated in the delirium of the sensible and trapped in the retreat that is madness? How was it at this point deprived of language? What is this power that petrifies all those who dare look upon its face, condemning to madness all those who have tried the test [*l'épreuve*] of Unreason?" (Ibid., translation slightly modified)

[12] "We now find the reason-unreason problem – in any case, the violence of the reason-unreason problem – at the interior of language…. In the field … of language, what is fully at stake is most likely the possibility of contestation of our culture." (Foucault, "Débat sur la poésie," in *Dits et écrits I, 1954-1975*, edited by Daniel Defert (Paris: Gallimard, 2001), 426, my translation)

[13] See, e.g., Foucault's homage to Maurice Blanchot, "The Thought of the Outside": "[T]he event that gave rise to what we call 'literature' in the strict sense is … a passage to the 'outside': language escapes the mode of being of discourse – in other words, the dynasty of representation – and literary speech develops from itself, forming a network in which each point is distinct, distanced even from its closest neighbors, and has a position in relation to every other point in a space that simultaneously holds and separates them all." (Foucault, "The Thought of the Outside," in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault Volume 2*, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Massumi (New York: The New Press, 1998), 148-9) Cf. "It is no longer possible to think in our day other than in the void left by man's disappearance. For this void … is nothing more, and nothing less, than the unfolding of a space in which it is once more possible to think." (Foucault, *The Order of Things* (New York: Vintage, 1973), 342)

[14] Foucault, "Folie, littérature, société," in *Dits et écrits I*, 982, my translation.

[15] "Does the subversive function of writing still remain? Hasn't the time already past when the sole act of writing … sufficed for expressing a form of contestation against modern society? Hasn't the time now come to move on to truly revolutionary actions? Now that the bourgeoisie and capitalist society have totally dispossessed writing of these actions, doesn't the fact of writing serve only to re-enforce the repressive system of the bourgeoisie?" (Ibid.)

ii. Schizo-Politics: a Transversal Response to the Problem of Capitalism

Foucault's analytic of power, however, is first made possible by the work of Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus*. On the one hand, *Anti-Oedipus* is profoundly continuous with *History of Madness*, for unreason and schizophrenia are analogous in at least three ways: *phenomenologically*, as radical limit-experiences or modes of intensive becoming, which stand in direct relation to the outside,[16] breakthroughs always in danger of breaking down into mental illness;[17] *historically*, as absolute exterior limits of the socius, the exclusion of which is constitutive to the functioning of society; and *politically*, as the basis for conceiving a strategy of resistance to the violence of this social production. However, what Deleuze and Guattari add is an analysis of schizophrenia done specifically in relation to capitalism, which allows them to go beyond Foucault's literary politics of transgression toward a transversal politics of connection.

 Anti-Oedipus articulates the two regimes of madness as two forms of schizophrenia: 1) "the schizo-as-entity," the broken down or catatonic schizophrenic subject corresponding to mental illness; and 2) schizophrenia as process, that is, the pure, universal process of production, or decoded flows of desire. In turn, Deleuze and Guattari formulate their version of the Artaud thesis: these decoded flows or lines of flight of the schizophrenic process threaten to scramble the social codes and thus subvert the functioning of the socius, since social formations organize and reproduce themselves on the basis of ordering, coding, or reterritorializing flows of desire.[18] Thus, schizophrenia—as a pure process of desiring-production—is exorcised from the socius, forming its absolute exterior limit. This movement of exclusion is integral to the very formation of society.

 Like Foucault then, Deleuze and Guattari offer a general social theory and history of limits based on the Artaud thesis. Further, they distinguish three social formations on the basis of how they order decoded flows of desire. 'Primitive' societies ward off the threat of schizoid deterritorialization by coding their flows, operating on the basis of mobile and finite blocks of debt that weave together an open system of alliances and filiations. 'Imperial' socie-

---

[16] "There is a schizophrenic experience of intensive quantities in their pure state, to a point that is almost unbearable – a celibate misery and glory experienced to the fullest, like a cry suspended between life and death, an intense feeling of transition, states of pure, naked intensity stripped of all shape and form. … A harrowing, emotionally overwhelming experience, which brings the schizo as close as possible to matter, to a burning, living center of matter…." (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 19)

[17] Echoing Foucault's questions in *History of Madness* concerning why those who attempted the test of unreason are consigned to fall into madness or suicide, Deleuze and Guattari write: "How is it possible that the schizo was conceived of as the autistic rag – separated from the real and cut off from life – that he is so often thought to be? Worse still: how can psychiatric practice have made him this sort of rag, how can it have reduced him to this state of a body without organs that has become a dead thing – this schizo who sought to remain at that unbearable point where the mind touches matter and lives every intensity, consumes it?" (Ibid., 19-20)

[18] "The prime function incumbent upon the socius, has always been to codify the flows of desire, to inscribe them, to record them, to see to it that no flow exists that is not properly dammed up, channeled, regulated." (Ibid., 33)

ties, in turn, over-code these flows, raising them into a new alliance and direct filiation with an eminent transcendent unity (the despotic State).

'Capitalist' societies, however, have a fundamentally different relation to the threat of schizoid decoding, since like the process of schizophrenia, capitalism operates on the basis of decoded flows (e.g., decoded flows of money and decoded flows of labor).[19] The crucial difference between capitalism and schizophrenia is that the former axiomatizes the flows it decodes and thus subjects desiring-production to an ever more rigorous form of control. The deterritorializing "process is continually interrupted, or the tendency counteracted, or the limit displaced."[20] Rather than expelling the schizoid decoded flows as an exterior limit in the manner of primitive and imperial societies, capitalism displaces them by interiorizing them at the heart of social production, harnessing their force by converting them into capital. And this is just how the capitalist machine operates, by "directly apprehending" decoded flows "in a codeless axiomatic"[21]: for any deterritorialized flow, such as that produced by a tragic work of unreason, an axiom can be added that absorbs it into a flow of capital.[22] Indeed, this is precisely why Foucault's literary politics of transgression failed.

This function of capitalism, in turn, is how Deleuze and Guattari account for the problem of the two regimes of madness.[23] The sick schizo is an effect of the double process of production by which capitalism "axiomatizes with the one hand what it decodes with the other."[24] It is through this process that capitalism re-territorializes the flows it decodes so as to keep them from "escaping the system."[25] As a result, it falls to the lot of schizophrenic subjects alone to express the force of an absolute de-territorialization, and "a flow of madness … is defined thus because it is charged with representing whatever escapes the axiomatic and the ap-

---

[19] In this way, capitalism and schizophrenia are "one and the same economy, one and the same production process," (Ibid., 245) for "the decoding and the deterritorialization of flows define the very process of capitalism." (Ibid., 320)

[20] Ibid. Thus, capitalism is the *relative* limit of all pre-capitalist societies – "it effects relative breaks, because it substitutes for the codes an extremely rigorous axiomatic that maintains the energy of the flows in a bound state on the body of capital" – whereas schizophrenia is the *absolute* limit of every social formation, capitalism included. (Ibid., 246)

[21] Ibid., 337.

[22] "Then what becomes of the 'truly' schizophrenic language and the 'truly' decoded and unbound flows that manage to break through the wall or absolute limit? The capitalist axiomatic is so rich that one more axiom is added – for the books of a great writer whose lexical and stylistic characteristics can always be computed by means of an electronic machine, or for the discourse of madmen that can always be heard within the framework of a hospital, administrative, and psychiatric axiomatic." (Ibid., 246)

[23] Deleuze and Guattari pose this problem in strikingly Foucauldian terms: "Why does [capitalist production] confine its madmen and madwomen instead of seeing in them its own heroes and heroines, its own fulfillment? And where it can no longer recognize the figure of a simple illness, why does it keep its artists and even its scientists under such close surveillance – as though they risked unleashing flows that would be dangerous for capitalist production and charged with a revolutionary potential, so long as these flows are not co-opted or absorbed by the laws of the market?" (Ibid., 245)

[24] Ibid., 246.

[25] Thus, for example, the decoded flow of labor is maintained "in the axiomatic framework of property," and decoded libidinal flows are maintained "in the applied framework of the family." (Ibid., 320)

plications of reterritorialization in other flows."[26] Because this charge is too great to sustain, lacking the conditions of material expression that would support it, the schizoid breakthrough is consigned to a catatonic breakdown.

The schizo-political strategy of resistance that follows from this theory of society has two objectives. The first extends Foucault's project in *History of Madness*: namely, "undoing all the reterritorializations that transform madness into mental illness,"[27] and thus contesting the normalizing techniques of subjection and division that organize social reality. It is the second objective, however, that opens for the first time onto the thought of transversal resistance, namely, "liberating the schizoid movement of deterritorialization in all the flows, in such a way that this characteristic can no longer qualify a particular residue as a flow of madness, but affects just as well the flows of labor and desire, of production, knowledge, and creation in their most profound tendency."[28] Given that the capitalist social formation produces a multiplicity of social flows and functions on the basis of their decoding and axiomatization, schizo-political resistance aims to undo the re-territorialization of these flows by freeing the deterritorializing tendency proper to each. Here it is essential that these lines of deterritorialization be interconnected, such that they "become parts and cogs of one another in the flow that feeds one and the same desiring-machine, so many local fires patiently kindled for a generalized explosion."[29] In other words, the transversal connections between deterritorialized flows are what produce revolutionary force, since desire becomes productive (a desiring-machine) through the connection of decoded flows.[30] Importantly—for this will hold for transversal politics more generally—this also means that, however inchoate its formulation, schizo-analysis is already a constructivism.[31]

---

[26] Ibid., 320.

[27] Ibid., 321.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., 137.

[30] See ibid., 224. Cf.: "Desire is revolutionary because it always wants more connections and assemblages." (Deleuze, *Dialogues*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 79)

[31] Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari themselves stress the continuity of their transversal-constructivist project across the two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, likening schizoanalysis to their later rhizomatic micropolitics in *A Thousand Plateaus* through their well-known formulation "RHIZOMATICS = SCHIZO-ANALYSIS = STRATOANALYSIS = PRAGMATICS = MICROPOLITICS." (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 22) Nor is this just a conveniently leveling retrospective self-reading. Guattari first developed the concept of transversality as a means of constructing alternative, non-hierarchical institutional arrangements for analyzing schizophrenics (see Janell Watson, *Guattari's Diagrammatic Thought* (London: Continuum, 2009), 22-31; see also Gary Genosko, *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2002), 66-121) – demonstrating that schizoanalysis, in a very practical sense, was a project of transversal construction from the beginning. Further, the commitment of Deleuze and Guattari to schizoanalysis as a political constructivism is evidenced by their critique of Wilhelm Reich on the grounds that his notion of the nature and task of psychoanalysis remained insufficiently constructivist, lacking a fully productive conception of desire: "But since [Reich] had not sufficiently formulated the concept of desiring-production, he did not succeed in determining the insertion of desire into the economic infrastructure itself…; as to the reactionary mass investments, they seemed to him to derive from ideology, so that psychoanalysis merely had the role of ex-

Thus, to the capitalist, axiomatic conjugation of decoded flows, schizo-politics would oppose a transversal connection of decoded flows, one that propels their collective becoming-revolutionary.[32] Through this transversal weave of lines of flight, the form of intensive limit-experience proper to the schizoid breakthrough would receive its conditions of material expression:

> Here, madness would no longer exist as madness, not because it would have been transformed into 'mental illness,' but on the contrary *because it would receive the support of all the other flows, including science and art*—once it is said that madness is called madness and appears as such only because it is deprived of this support, and finds itself reduced to testifying all alone for deterritorialization as a universal process. It is merely its unwarranted privilege, a privilege beyond its capacities, that renders it mad.[33]

plaining the subjective, the negative, and the inhibited, without participating directly as psychoanalysis in the positivity of the revolutionary movement or in the desiring-creativity." (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 118-9; cf. ibid., 29-30) Moreover, precisely because desire, for Deleuze and Guattari, is always desiring-production, i.e., is always constitutive in relation to social production, it would be inaccurate to think of their concept of 'lines of flight' or decoded flows of desire, and so any politics based upon it, as being negative. And this remains true despite (or better: because of) the fact that lines of flight, or deterritorialization, or the outside, risk collapsing into lines of abolition or death: indeed, this is the very problem of the two regimes of madness, of how to prevent the breakthrough from collapsing into a breakdown, to which schizoanalysis serves as a response insofar as lines of flight find support through their transversal connection (see ibid., 321). In short, desire is always assembled and assembling, just as any Guattaro-Deleuzian politics of resistance will always be constructivist. Thus, I would argue that readings of Deleuze and Guattari that posit their politics, whether in *Anti-Oedipus* or elsewhere, as being negative, or 'spontaneist,' or both (notably, Alain Badiou's critique in "The Flux and Party: In the Margins of Anti-Oedipus," *Polygraph*, no. 15/16 (2004), 75-92), miss the mark. In a similar vein, I would argue that in effect, *Anti-Oedipus* already draws the distinction later articulated in *A Thousand Plateaus* in terms of 'absolute negative de-territorialization' (*breakdown*) and 'absolute positive de-territorialization' (*breakthrough*); and I would therefore tend to disagree with Eugene Holland's influential claim that by contrast to the second volume of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, the first valorizes de-territorialization in general as 'good' and re-territorialization in general as 'bad' (see Holland, "Deterritorializing 'Deterritorialization': From the 'Anti-Oedipus' to 'A Thousand Plateaus,'" *SubStance*, vol. 20, no. 3, issue 66: special issue: Deleuze & Guattari, (1991)). Rather, the question, both for schizoanalysis and for rhizomatics, would be how the conditions of transversal connection can be created such that the 'good' kind of de-territorialization can be sustained and prevented from collapsing into the 'bad' kind of de-territorialization.

[32] Deleuze and Guattari elaborate on the distinction between connection and conjugation in *A Thousand Plateaus*: "At this point, we must introduce a distinction between the two notions of connection and conjugation of flows. 'Connection' indicates the way in which decoded and deterritorialized flows boost one another, accelerate their shared escape, and augment or stoke their quanta; the 'conjugation' of these same flows, on the other hand, indicates their relative stoppage, like a point of accumulation that plugs or seals the lines of flight, performs a general reterritorialization, and brings the flows under the dominance of a single flow capable of overcoding them." (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 220) I would emphasize that while this distinction between connection and conjugation is sharpened in *A Thousand Plateaus*, the concept of 'transversal connection' is already operative in *Anti-Oedipus*, particularly in regard to 'subject-groups' constructed as 'transverse multiplicities': see, e.g., *Anti-Oedipus*, 280, 287, 309, 319, and 349.

[33] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 321, my emphasis.

II. Between *Anti-Oedipus* and *Discipline and Punish*

i. Foucault's Debt to Deleuze: the Question of Transversal Resistance and the Micropolitical Problem of Power

The schizo-political concept of resistance as the de-territorialization and transversal connection of flows therefore provides a response to both the problem of the two regimes of madness and the challenges of contesting capitalist social production more generally. If the re-territorializing and integrative operations of capitalism function on the basis of totalizing axiomatization,[34] then the appropriate form for contestation to take will be a de-territorializing and de-totalizing revolutionary movement, the force of which is generated through proliferating and connecting lateral lines of alliance.

However, the key problem remains how exactly to conceive and create this kind of transversal political project. This is precisely how Deleuze poses the question to Foucault in their exchange, "Intellectuals and Power," from 1972:

> We must set up lateral affiliations and an entire system of networks and popular bases; and this is especially difficult. …[T]he present revolutionary movement has created multiple centers, and not as the result of weakness or insufficiency, since a certain kind of totalization pertains to power and the forces of reaction. … But how are we to define the networks, the *transversal links* between these active and discontinuous points, from one country to another or within a single country?[35]

Foucault's response to Deleuze indicates to what extent his analytic of power is made possible by *Anti-Oedipus*, for the question of how to connect lateral lines of struggle bespeaks a more basic problem of how to understand the nature and operations of power:

> Isn't this difficulty in finding adequate forms of struggle a result of the fact that we continue to ignore the problem of power? … If the reading of your books (from *Nietzsche* to what I anticipate in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*) has been essential for me, it is because they seem to go very far in exploring this problem: under the ancient theme of meaning, of the signifier and the signified, etc., you have developed the question of power, of the inequality of powers and their struggles.[36]

---

[34] On the "co-opting power of capitalism" that derives from the totalizing function of the capitalist axiomatic, see ibid., 236.

[35] Deleuze, "Intellectuals and Power," in Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, edited by Donald Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 212-6, my emphasis.

[36] Foucault, ibid., 212-4. It is notable that in crediting Deleuze with developing the problematic of power, Foucault refers to *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and *Anti-Oedipus*, for both works articulate a view of resistance as the active-affirmative force by which a "new form of life" (Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, translated by Janis Tomlinson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 185) or mode of existence is produced. In other words, whether conceived through Nietzsche's figure of the overman or the connective de-territorializing process of schizophrenia, political struggle is an intrinsically creative project, one that breaks with the forces of reaction (*ressentiment*, micro-fascism, totalization) by enabling an intensification and en-

Most fundamentally then, what *Anti-Oedipus* enables for Foucault is the development of a micro-political conception of power, anticipating his subsequent formulation, in *History of Sexuality Volume 1*, of power "as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization…."[37] Indeed, Foucault credits Deleuze with casting the problem of power (and thus of resistance) in terms of the thousand tiny points of its exercise.[38] That is, rather than deriving from a central, unitary position, such as the State or ruling class, power must be grasped as an immanent multiplicity: one which constitutes the material basis for the 'molar' organization of a society's institutional arrangements, but which functions by directly investing bodies and acting upon their forces, operating at what Deleuze and Guattari refer to as the 'molecular' level.[39] Thus, for instance, *Anti-Oedipus* poses the question of power in terms of the political problem of desire and its direct investment of the socio-historical field, which requires a functionalist, microphysical analysis of 'desiring-machines' and their constitutive role in social production.[40] In this way, Deleuze displaces a transcendent, hierarchical or representational conception of power in favor of one that is immanent, decentralized, and direct.

---

richment of what (and how) we may become. This will remain a fundamental tenet of both Deleuze and Foucault's political philosophy.

[37] Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*: *An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990), 92.

[38] "Each struggle develops around a particular source of power (any of the countless, tiny sources…)." (Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power," 214)

[39] See, for example, Deleuze and Guattari's discussion of paranoia and schizophrenia as the two poles of social libidinal investment: "It might be said that, of the two directions in *physics* – the molar direction that goes toward the large numbers and the mass phenomena, and the molecular direction that on the contrary penetrates into singularities, their interactions and connections at a distance or between different orders – the paranoiac has chosen the first: he practices macrophysics. And it could be said that by contrast the schizo goes in the other direction, that of microphysics, of molecules insofar as they no longer obey the statistical laws: waves and corpuscles, flows and partial objects that are no longer dependent upon the large numbers; infinitesimal lines of escape [*fuite*], instead of the perspectives of the large aggregates." (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 280) In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari will explicitly draw the connection between their notion of the molecular and Foucault's notion of discipline: "It requires a whole organization articulating formations of power and regimes of signs, and operating on the molecular level (societies characterized by what Foucault calls disciplinary power)." (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 67)

[40] On the "molecular, micrological, or microphysical" analysis of desiring-production – which is conducted in terms of "the molecular elements that form the parts and wheels of desiring-machines," and which "searches for the way in which these machines *function*, for how they invest and underdetermine the social machines they constitute on a large scale" – by contrast to a representational, Oedipalizing analysis – which frames desiring-machines in terms of "*what they mean*" by referring them to "large molar aggregates," e.g., the family – see *Anti-Oedipus*, 182-3. In addition to anticipating Foucault's 'microphysics of power,' this passage illustrates Foucault's comment, cited above, that 'under the ancient theme of meaning,' Deleuze has 'developed the question of power, of the inequality of powers and their struggles.'

This micro-political theory of bodies and forces in turn enables a properly transversal conception of resistance in terms of a multiply-centered revolutionary[41] movement. The key to answering Deleuze's question about how to define the lateral alliances between various political struggles is to first develop an adequate understanding of the common mode of power they are allied against, for the "generality of the struggle specifically derives from the system of power itself, from all the forms in which power is exercised and applied."[42] If this mode of power is grasped as an immanent multiplicity, then different resistance struggles will be both singular, with respect to the immediate conditions in which power is exercised over them, and connectable, insofar as they stand in immanent relation to one another by virtue of suffering the same regime of power. Speaking of all those who are subjected to the exercise of a power they find intolerable, and still by way of response to Deleuze, Foucault writes:

> In engaging in a struggle that is properly their own, whose objectives they clearly understand and whose methods only they can determine, they *enter into a revolutionary process. They naturally act as allies of the proletariat, because power is exercised the way it is in order to maintain capitalist exploitation.* They genuinely serve the cause of the proletariat by fighting in those places where they find themselves oppressed. Women, prisoners, conscripted soldiers, hospital patients, and homosexuals have now begun a specific struggle against the particularized power, the constraints and controls, that are exerted over them. … And *these movements are linked to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat to the extent that they fight against the controls and constraints which serve the same system of power.*[43]

---

[41] While a developed account of Foucault's evolving views on revolution would exceed the bounds of this discussion, it should be noted that the term is not uncommonly used by Foucault during the early 1970s, as here in "Intellectuals and Power." In fact, Foucault defines the aims of the political activist group that he helped to organize, the GIP (*Groupe d'information sur les prisons*, or Prison Information Group), precisely in terms of "revolutionary action": see Foucault, "Par delà le bien et le mal," *Dits et écrits I*: 1099; cf. Foucault's remarks on the "truly revolutionary forces" of minoritarian struggle in "Michel Foucault on Attica: an Interview," *Social Justice*, vol. 18, no. 3 (45), Attica: 1971-1975 A Commemorative Issue (Fall 1991), 34. By the time of 1976, Foucault will have modified his view on what constitutes revolution, defining it in general as a transformation in the codification of the multiplicity of power relations, with the consequence that "there are as many types of revolutions as there are possible subversive codifications of power relations." (Foucault, "Entretien avec Michel Foucault," *Dits et écrits II, 1976-1988*, 151, my translation) In the year or two that follow, confronted by the increasingly bleak fate of revolutionary leftist politics (whether China, the USSR, the Soviet satellite countries, Cuba, Vietnam and Cambodia, etc.), Foucault's view will darken on the concept of revolution: see Foucault, "La torture, c'est le raison," *Dits et écrits II*, 397-8; cf. "Non au sexe roi," *Dits et écrits II*, 266-7. By 1978, he will have essentially stopped using the concept of revolutionary politics, associating it with a hierarchical, centralized and totalizing strategy, and advocating instead the "immediacy" and "anarchic" quality of transversal, minoritarian struggles: see "La philosophie analytique de la politique," *Dits et écrits II*, 542-7. In this regard, however, the distinction that Foucault draws between revolution and minoritarian struggle is consistent with the distinction Deleuze and Guattari make between revolutions and becoming-revolutionary; thus, there will be no inconsistency between Foucault's transversal minoritarian politics and Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the revolutionary war machine.

[42] Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power," 217.

[43] Ibid., 216, my emphasis, translation slightly modified.

It is often thought that unlike that of Deleuze and Guattari, Foucault's political philosophy does not deal with the problem of capitalism per se. Yet seen in light of this dialogue with Deleuze, all of Foucault's critical histories—from *History of Madness* and *Birth of the Clinic* to *Discipline and Punish* and *History of Sexuality Volume 1*—take as their object a common system of power the strategic function of which, in Foucault's view, is to 'maintain capitalist exploitation.' Thus, the localized forms of resistance that Foucault supports, and for which his intellectual work is intended to provide arms, are transversally connectable precisely insofar as they find common cause against the functioning of the capitalist formation. To the extent that these oppositional movements singularize their proper modes of struggle, they 'enter into a revolutionary process' or, to use Deleuze's later terminology, effect their own becoming-revolutionary; and to the extent that they form a lateral network 'linked to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat,' these struggles constitute a collective becoming-revolutionary that traverses the socius and contests the relations of power that reproduce capitalist social production.

It is likely in terms of this shared view on minoritarian political resistance, then, that Deleuze will later speak of the "common cause,"[44] more profound than any methodological difference, that connects his work with Foucault's. Perhaps we can also begin to see why Foucault, in a footnote at the beginning of *Discipline and Punish*, writes that he "could give no notion by reference or quotations what this book owes to Gilles Deleuze and the work he is undertaking with Felix Guattari."[45] Though Foucault does not detail this debt, to which he had already alluded in "Intellectuals and Power," another indication of its import can be gleaned from a passage in *Psychiatric Power*, where Foucault distinguishes between "two absolutely distinct types of power corresponding to two systems, two different ways of functioning: the *macrophysics of sovereignty*, the power that could be put to work in a post-feudal, pre-industrial government, and then the *microphysics of disciplinary power*…."[46]

Foucault here combines two sets of distinctions established by *Anti-Oedipus*: that between a macro- and microphysics of power, on the one hand, and the despotic and capitalist social formations, on the other. Historically, sovereign power is exercised in the societies that precede industrial capitalism—those which Deleuze and Guattari term "barbarian" and analyze in terms of "the 'megamachine' of the State," which over-codes primitive social flows and extracts surplus value from them[47] –, and this form of power functions by imposing levies, whether on the products, stores or services of its subjects.[48] By contrast, disciplinary power, which emerges alongside early industrial capitalism, more insidiously invests the social field,

[44] Deleuze, "Breaking Things Open, Breaking Words Open," in *Negotiations*, translated by Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 85.

[45] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, translated by Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1995), 309.

[46] Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*: *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973-1974*, edited by Jacques Lagrange, translated by Graham Burchell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 27, my emphasis.

[47] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 195-6.

[48] In other words, levying is the overcoding activity of surplus value extraction proper to the sovereign or despot. For Foucault's analysis of the basic levying-deductive function of sovereign power, see Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*, 42.

for it functions through the "exhaustive capture of the individual's body, actions, time, and behavior. It is a seizure of the body, and not of the product...."[49] Disciplinary institutions, such as prisons, schools, factories, and asylums, are thus so many apparatuses of capture,[50] by which power apprehends "bodies themselves with their materiality and their forces."[51]

In other words, to borrow from Deleuze's later terminology, sovereign power is the diagram of force relations that corresponds to the despotic social formation; and insofar as these relations are juridically organized and centralized through the State, sovereign power is macro-physical in its functioning. By contrast, disciplinary power is the diagram proper to the industrial capitalist social formation; and it constitutes "a micro-physics of power" insofar as it does not merely impose a system of levies upon the products of a populace, but takes hold directly as an "infinitesimal power over the active body"[52] and thus as "a specific mode of subjection … in which the body itself is invested by power relations."[53] Therefore, if the global thesis of *Discipline and Punish* is that the widespread changes in the techniques, apparatuses, and legal coding of punishment, contemporary with the historical shift from the classical to the modern period, reflect a more fundamental transformation in the regime of power by which Western societies are organized and governed; then it will be Deleuze and Guattari's

---

[49] Ibid., 46.

[50] In *Psychiatric Power* (six years before the publication of Deleuze and Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*), Foucault in fact uses the term 'apparatus of capture' twice to refer to the institution of the asylum: specifically, with regard to "neurology's clinical apparatus of capture," (Ibid., 307) which was the neuropathological technique developed in response to the widespread problem of simulation among psychiatric patients, and which made possible "a clinical analysis, an analysis in terms of physical ascription, of the individual's intentional attitude. Consequently, a capture of the subject's attitude, of the subject's consciousness, of the will itself within his body, becomes possible. … It was the will, in fact, on which and to which disciplinary power had to be applied; it really was the vis-à-vis of disciplinary power…. Neuropathology now provides the clinical instrument by which it is thought the individual can be captured at the level of the will itself." (Ibid., 302) It is notable that Foucault refers to the "untruthfulness of simulation, madness simulating madness," as "the anti-power of the mad confronted with psychiatric power" (Ibid., 136) and "the militant underside of psychiatric power …[,] the insidious way for the mad to pose the question of truth forcibly on a psychiatric power that only wanted to impose reality on them." (Ibid., 138) With respect to the historical regime of power, the neuropathlogical apparatus of capture is thus the strategic response to the collective resistance struggles among the mad themselves, which is to say, the operation of disciplinary power by which so many lines of flight are reterritorialized. By genealogically analyzing the exercise of power in strategic terms, Foucault gives primacy (both historically and, as it were, logically) to collective forms of resistance (lines of flight) in relation to apparatuses of capture (see Foucault's final lecture in *Psychiatric Power* (February 6, 1974), pp. 297-323). This important point is often missed in interpretations of Foucault's analytic of power, including Deleuze's in "Desire and Pleasure" (see Deleuze, *Two Regimes of Madness*, 122-134) and *A Thousand Plateaus* (see 530-1, fn. 39). By the time of his more considered view in *Foucault*, however, Deleuze will emphasize that Foucault's "final word on power is that *resistance comes first*" (Deleuze, *Foucault*, translated by Seán Hand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), 89). I would simply note that this had been Foucault's 'first word' all along, as early as the tragic expression of unreason in *History of Madness*.

[51] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 26.

[52] Ibid., 137.

[53] Ibid., 24.

micro-political conception of power and analysis of social formations that enable Foucault to map this mutation from sovereign to disciplinary power.[54]

Moreover, the debt can be specified further, for between Deleuze and Foucault there emerges a concept of power as productive, operating through the double technique of 1) individualizing subjection and 2) the denumeration of human multiplicities. In contradistinction to sovereign power, the "chief function of the disciplinary power is to 'train', rather than to select and to levy…. *It 'trains' the moving, confused, useless multitudes of bodies and forces into a multiplicity of individual elements* …. Discipline 'makes' individuals, it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise."[55] By shaping a disorderly mass into a multiplicity of "necessary and sufficient single units,"[56] discipline produces the very form of the modern individual; and by directly investing the body to capture and control its forces, discipline fabricates this individual as "the obedient subject, the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him."[57] Insofar as it thus "allows both the characterization of the individual as individual and the ordering of a given multiplicity,"[58] disciplinary power performs a simultaneously individualizing and totalizing productive function: it constitutes a "political technology of the body",[59] by which the movements, activities, and forces of bodies are controlled and developed, and by which an

---

[54] It is worth noting that despite the discussion of psychic and social repression throughout *Anti-Oedipus*, neither the conception of desire nor that of power at work there are susceptible to (or, I would suggest, targets of) Foucault's critique of the 'repressive hypothesis' in *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*. In the first case, and by contrast to certain Freudo-Marxist accounts of sexual liberation (notably, Herbert Marcuse's in *Eros and Civilization*), Deleuze and Guattari do not conceive of desire as a natural drive or essence that would precede its own repression. Rather, as remarked in footnote 31 above, *Anti-Oedipus* posits desire as desiring-production, as a constitutive force in social production (i.e., both constitutive *of* social production and constituted in and through social production) that is always assembled and assembling; thus, according to Deleuze and Guattari, it is because, for example, Reich – whom Foucault *will* critique as invoking the repressive hypothesis – fails to develop such a productive conception of desire that he cannot think "the coextension of the social field and desire." (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 30) In other words, on the one hand, Deleuze and Guattari's critique of Reich already anticipates Foucault's, and on the other, the repressive hypothesis does not apply to desiring-production. Similarly, power does not function in *Anti-Oedipus* according to the repressive hypothesis either: even if it is true that, e.g., coding and over-coding are negative or deductive operations of power in territorial and despotic formations – just as, according to Foucault, 'levying-violence' is the principle of sovereign power – this is not the case for the capitalist social formation, which operates on the basis of the productive principle of decoding and axiomatizing flows of desire. Indeed, it is no coincidence that the properly productive forms of power that Foucault analyzes – namely, discipline and biopower – are those which are exercised in capitalist society. We will return to this point at length below.

[55] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 170, my emphasis.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., 128-9.

[58] Ibid., 149.

[59] Ibid., 24.

unruly, unproductive or dangerous multitude is transformed into an organized, useful, governable multiplicity.

The relational arrangements by which the modern social formation is hierarchically segmented and the mode of self-relation by which the obedient subject is constituted, thus result from and reproduce the same regime of power. Indeed, Foucault credits Deleuze with the general form of this fundamental insight in the preface to the English translation of *Anti-Oedipus*, framing that work as an ethico-political project contesting the individualizing and totalizing effects of power through the creation of new kinds of multiplicity and practices of subjectivation.[60] Anticipating his own declaration five years later in "The Subject and Power" that "the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days" is "to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality that has been imposed on us for several centuries,"[61] Foucault lists as one of *Anti-Oedipus*'s "essential principles" that "[t]he individual is the product of power. What is needed is to 'de-individualize' by means of multiplication and displacement, diverse combinations. The group must not be the organic bond uniting hierarchized individuals, but a constant generator of de-individualization."[62]

If *Discipline and Punish* is so indebted to Deleuze, then it is because *Anti-Oedipus* enables the problem of power to be posed in terms of an immanent microphysics of bodies and forces: one, which emerges historically with industrial capitalism and ultimately functions to maintain capitalist exploitation by producing individuals as normalized subjects within hierarchically ordered multiplicities, thereby investing, capturing, and controlling bodies' powers of activity. Further, we have seen that such an analytic of power is necessary to address the question of transversal resistance insofar as the connectivity of struggles against power is derived from the commonality of the system they contest. Whence the double task of *Discipline and Punish*: 1) to analyze the historical exercise of disciplinary power as a political technology

---

[60] Foucault's preface was published in 1977, just as he was developing his focus on ethics as a critical political activity. Compare, for example, his characterization of *Anti-Oedipus* as "a book of ethics, the first book of ethics to be written in France in quite a long time" (Foucault, "Preface," *Anti-Oedipus*, xiii), with his description from the same year of the ethos of critical thought as a form of virtue: "There is something in critique which is akin to virtue. And in a certain way, what I wanted to speak to you about is this critical attitude as virtue in general." (Foucault, "What is Critique?", in *The Politics of Truth*, edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Lisa Hochroth, translated by Hochroth (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007), 43)

[61] Foucault, "The Subject and Power," in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, Volume 3*, edited by Faubion (New York: The New Press, 2000), 336.

[62] Foucault, "Preface," *Anti-Oedipus*, xiv. Deleuze and Guattari refer to this qualitatively different mode of multiplicity as a 'subject-group' (by contrast to a 'subjugated-group'), and its relational composition is transversal in nature: "A *subject-group*, on the contrary, is a group whose libidinal investments are themselves revolutionary; it causes desire to penetrate into the social field, and subordinates the socius or the form of power to desiring-production; …it opposes real coefficients of transversality to the symbolic determinations of subjugation, coefficients without a hierarchy or a group superego." (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 348-9) It is notable that for Deleuze and Guattari, this distinction between 'subjugated-groups' and 'subject-groups' – that is, between hierarchical, denumerable multiplicities and transversal, non-denumerable multiplicities – tracks with the distinction between macro- and microphysics, or between the molar and the molecular; see *Anti-Oedipus*, 280.

for the production and administration of denumerable and controllable human multiplicities; and 2) to diagram the reciprocally conditioning relations between this micro-political regime of power and capitalism. Such a genealogical project will provide the critical propaedeutics for conceiving and creating a transversal form of struggle better suited than Foucault's earlier politics of literary transgression to resist the exercise of power in capitalist society.

ii. Assembling Denumerable Multiplicities: the Anti-Transversal Function of Disciplinary Power

Foucault's first task, the analysis of disciplinary practices, illuminates the tactical importance of transversality from the sides of both power and resistance. In order to minimize the economic inefficiencies and political dangers of mass phenomena, discipline operates as "an anti-nomadic technique"[63] that fixes and distributes somatic singularities, "arrests or regulates movements."[64] In turn, in order to further defuse the threats of resistance intrinsic to any collection of bodies and forces—"agitations, revolts, spontaneous organizations, coalitions[,] anything that may establish horizontal conjunctions"[65]—discipline constructs a striated space, one arranged according to "hierarchical networks" and structured by inserting "as solid separations as possible … between the different elements at the same level."[66] This double operation of discipline as anti-nomadic and striating is achieved through the technique of "partitioning," which functions according to the "principle of elementary location" to "break up collective dispositions" and "analyse confused, massive or transient pluralities": "Each individual has his own place, and each place, its individual."[67]

It is thus by means of the partitioning of space that discipline is exercised as a "cellular" power, satisfying "the first condition for the control and use of an ensemble of distinct elements":[68] namely, the individualizing and totalizing distribution of bodies into a grid of separated cells that abolishes all collective effects of transversal group interaction. Within such an arrangement, which terminates "any relation that is not supervised by authority,"[69] individuals are both isolated and assembled "in a strict hierarchical framework, *with no lateral relation*, communication being possible only in a vertical direction."[70] Whether the disciplinary apparatus of capture be a school, factory[71], hospital, or prison, each individual (the student, worker,

---

[63] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 218.

[64] Ibid., 220.

[65] Ibid., 219.

[66] Ibid., 220.

[67] Ibid., 143. Foucault continues: "Disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed. One must eliminate the effects of imprecise distributions, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals, their diffuse circulation, their unusable and dangerous coagulation; it was a tactic of anti-desertion, anti-vagabondage, anti-concentration."

[68] Ibid., 149.

[69] Ibid., 239.

[70] Ibid., 238.

[71] The factory in particular develops a more complex system of partitioning, one which is specifically suited for dividing and distributing labor power so as to control and maximize its production; see ibid., 145.

patient, or prisoner) is only ever set into relation with a centralized source of power, be it a teacher, overseer, doctor, or warden.[72]

Indeed, it is precisely the blockage of transversal relations between the distinct elements of a disciplinary multiplicity that secures both the individualization of the former and the denumerability of the latter. Nowhere is this as clear as in Foucault's discussion of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon, which, as "the diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form," provides the "generalizable model of functioning" for the mode of power exercised in disciplinary society.[73] Within a panoptic arrangement, which consists architecturally of a central watchtower surrounded by rings of partitioned cells, each individual is confined and isolated in his own cell, the front of which is subject to continual surveillance from without, and the side walls of which prevent the individual "from coming into contact with his companions. He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication. The arrangement of his room, opposite the central tower, imposes on him an axial visibility; but the divisions of the ring, those separated cells, *imply a lateral invisibility. And this invisibility is a guarantee of order*."[74]

While the political effect by which individuals, as objects of a constant 'axial visibility,' internalize and reproduce the operation of power may be best known in Foucault's analysis of panopticism, it is in fact the structure of 'lateral invisibility' that makes this system of subjection possible. If discipline is a technique for producing a certain order and functioning of human collectivities, then what 'guarantees' this order—that is, what secures the use and control of a disciplinary multiplicity—will be the series of lateral blockages between subjected individuals:

> The crowd, a compact mass, *a locus of multiple exchanges, individualities merging together*, a collective effect, is abolished and replaced by a collection of separated individualities. From the point of view of the guardian, it is replaced by *a multiplicity that can be numbered and supervised* [*une multiplicité dénombrable et contrôlable*]; from the point of view of the inmates, by a sequestered and observed solitude. Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power.[75]

---

[72] See Foucault's discussion of this anti-transversal function, by which panopticism minimizes any collective effect, in *Psychiatric Power*, 75.

[73] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 205. Cf.: "…panopticism could, I think, appear and function within our society as a general form; we could speak equally of a disciplinary society or of a panoptic society. We live within generalized panopticism by virtue of the fact that we live within a disciplinary system." (Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*, 79)

[74] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 200, my emphasis.

[75] Ibid., 201, my emphasis. Notice here that the non-denumerable multiplicity precedes the denumerable multiplicity, both in the sense of historical priority (e.g., the 'floating populations' that had to be transformed into an ordered accumulation of human beings) and logical priority (a denumerable multiplicity is the result of a technique of capture, which organizes itself by reacting upon, blocking and integrating lines of flight or deterritorializing processes of de-individuation). Foucault and Deleuze are thus in agreement here regarding the primacy of resistance. A more historically developed example of this primacy is given in the first section of *Discipline and Punish*, where the popular 'disturbances around the scaffold' erupt as so many de-

A primary operation of panoptic arrangements, and thus a first condition for the exercise of power, is to block transversal connections and thereby defuse the economic and political dangers of inefficiency and revolt. This basic diagrammatic feature of panopticism is the key to the smooth functioning of any disciplinary apparatus: in factories, the severance of transversal ties prevents worker theft, coalitions, distractions, and accidents; in schools, cheating, talking, and time-wasting amongst students; in asylums, the danger of madmen harming each other or creating collective disturbances; in hospitals, the risk of contagion among patients; and in prisons, the threat of complots to escape or hatch future crimes.[76]

Foucault's micro-analytic of power thus allows the political problem of transversality to be framed in terms of two different forms of multiplicity. We have seen that by Foucault's own lights, *Anti-Oedipus* had already posited a basic theoretical opposition between the group as 'a constant generator of de-individualization' and the group as 'the organic bond uniting hierarchized individuals.'[77] The relation between these two modes of collectivity is now given historical precision: the essential operation of disciplinary power is to transform a non-denumerable multiplicity, a plexus of 'multiple exchanges' where 'individualities merge together,' into 'a denumerable and controllable multiplicity.' In other words, in order for panoptic processes of individualizing subjection to achieve 'the automatic functioning of power,' a transient multitude that generates effects of de-individualization through the multiplication of lateral relations must be reassembled into a hierarchically segmented 'collection of separated individualities.' And this is achieved in the first instance by debarring transversal connections through the partitioning of disciplinary space.

It is therefore through the concept of the transversal, its blockage or proliferating connections, that power and resistance in disciplinary society can be grasped in their most fundamental operations. In both cases, what is at issue is the construction of multiplicities: on the side of power and the segmented space of its apparatuses of capture, the formation of denumerable multiplicities that individualize obedient subjects; and on the side of resistance, the creation of transverse or non-denumerable multiplicities that give rise to de-individualizing processes of collective subjectivation.

iii. Foucault's Economico-Political Thesis: Capitalism, Modern Power, and the Divided Plebe
In order to understand how this incipient transversal politics of connection would respond specifically to the problem of capitalism, we must consider the second task of *Discipline and Punish*, the analysis of the relations between power and the capitalist social formation. We have seen that disciplinary power arises concurrently with the industrialization of economic production and includes the factory among its set of institutions. Far from being merely his-

---

territorializing points the emergence of which threatens to disrupt and reverse the sovereign exercise of punitive power in public executions; the political resistance of these lines of flight, in turn, prompts as a strategic response the emergence of disciplinary punitive power. See *Discipline and Punish*, 59-65.

[76] Ibid, 200-1.

[77] This is the distinction between what Deleuze and Guattari term 'subject-groups' and 'subjugated-groups'; see footnote 62 above.

torically overlapping processes, however, a biconditional relation obtains between 1) the development of capitalism and 2) the great mutation in the technology of power through which the 'macrophysics of sovereignty' was supplanted by the 'microphysics of disciplinary power.'

The very development of discipline as a set of individualizing techniques for organizing and controlling human multiplicities must be grasped in relation to "the well-known historical conjuncture" at the origins of industrial capitalism. This would be the conjuncture between, on the one hand, the "increase in the floating population" resulting from "the large demographic thrust of the eighteenth century," and on the other, "the growth in the apparatus of production," the increasing extension and complexity of which had driven up costs and required greater profitability.[78] The administrative methods over the first process, the accumulation of displaced human populations, "made possible a political take-off" of "a subtle, calculated technology of subjection" that superseded traditional forms of sovereign power.[79] The techniques for developing the second process, capital accumulation,[80] precipitated "the economic take-off of the West."[81] Between these two processes, in turn, there obtained a relation of historical interdependency and reciprocal determination: "it would not have been possible to solve the problem of the accumulation of men without the growth of an apparatus of production capable of both sustaining them and using them; conversely, the techniques that made the cumulative multiplicity of men useful accelerated the accumulation of capital."[82]

However inseparable these processes turned out to be, the double accumulation of human beings and capital still had to be actively brought into conjunction. Hence the importance of discipline: the "primary, massive, overall function" of "the disciplinary systems," arising in the 18th century, was "to adjust the multiplicity of individuals to the apparatuses of production, or to the State apparatuses which control them, or again, to adjust the combination of men to the accumulation of capital."[83] That is, as an emergent 'technology of subjection,' disciplinary power was necessary to help bring about the 'well-known historical conjuncture' that made the development of capitalism possible, operating, in the language of Deleuze and Guattari, a "conjunction of deterritorialized flows"[84] (population flows and flows of capital) and thereby playing a constitutive role in the capitalist formation.

We can begin then, to better understand Foucault's perhaps surprising claim in "Intellectuals and Power" that 'power is exercised the way it is in order to maintain capitalist exploitation.' Indeed, it is important to stress just how central this claim is to Foucault's analytic of power, which advances what I will term the *economico-political thesis*: if, in capitalist society, the *political* refers to the problem of the accumulation of human beings and the *economic* refers to

---

[78] Foucault: *Discipline and Punish*, 218.

[79] Ibid., 220-1.

[80] By 'capital accumulation,' I mean, generally speaking, the investment and increased returns of money-capital through the processes of industrial production and market exchange.

[81] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 220.

[82] Ibid., 220-1.

[83] Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*, 110.

[84] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 224.

the problem of capital accumulation, then the fundamental operation of modern power[85] will be economico-political insofar as its 'primary function' is to adjust the 'accumulation of men' to the 'accumulation of capital.'[86]

---

[85] I say 'modern power,' for while our immediate discussion concerns disciplinary power, this economico-political thesis will also hold for biopower, as we will see below.

[86] Disciplinary power can thus be understood as an *efficient cause* of the development of capitalism insofar as it organized the floating population and integrated it into the economic apparatus in order to expand aggregate productive force. According to Foucault, this causal relation is suggested by Marx's analysis of how the division of labor was established through the disciplinary organization of factories and workshops (see "Les mailles du pouvoir" in *Dits et écrits II*: 1001-1020; translated into English, though without the discussion following Foucault's remarks, as "The Meshes of Power" in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, edited by Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden, translated by Gerald Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 153-162). Discipline structures and mobilizes the work force according to a hierarchical and cellular system of partitioning and surveillance, aiming to maximize the composite forces of production (see *Discipline and Punish*, 221; cf. ibid., 145). Yet if the disciplinary formation of the space and process of production made possible the division of labor that is integral to capitalism, conversely, the expansion of industrial production and capital accumulation are what rendered a division of labor, and hence the techniques to achieve it, necessary in the first place: "The division of labour was, at the same time, the reason for which this new workshop discipline had to be invented; but inversely we can say that this workshop discipline was the condition for the division of labour being able to take hold. Without this workshop discipline, which is to say without the hierarchy, without the overseeing, without the supervisors, without the chronometric control of movements, it would not have been possible to obtain the division of labour." (Foucault, "The Meshes of Power," 157) Thus, a relation of reciprocal causation obtains between disciplinary power and the division of labor: if discipline is an efficient cause in the development of the industrial division of labor, this division of labor, in turn, as 'the reason for which this new workshop discipline had to be invented,' serves as a *final cause* in the development of disciplinary power. That is, discipline is the means by which the industrial division of labor could take hold, and this division of labor is that for the sake of which these disciplinary means were 'invented.' This relation can also be posed in terms of mutual conditioning: discipline made the realization of the division of labor possible, in the strong sense that there could have been no industrial division of labor without disciplinary power; and this division of labor made discipline necessary, in the equally strong sense that the development of capitalism historically determined the rise of this modality of disciplinary power (see *Discipline and Punish*: 221). This is not to say that all disciplinary techniques are historically determined *only* by the capitalist requirement of the division of labor, for they first emerged in the Christian tradition of pastoral power in the 15th and 16th centuries (see Foucault, "La philosophie analytique de la politique," in *Dits et écrits II*, 549-50; cf. "Le pouvoir, une bête magnifique," in *Dits et écrits II*, 375-6); nor is it to slip into economism and reduce micropolitical power in the autonomy of its exercise and subsequent proliferation to a base of economic production 'in the final analysis.' Rather, the claim is that the exigencies of capitalist production explain the emergence of disciplinary power *as the dominant form of political power and social control in the 18th and 19th centuries*. In other words, discipline may have existed in pockets independently of capitalism, but the major transformation in the exercise of power by which discipline supplanted sovereignty was both enabled and required by the development of industrial capitalism. As Foucault puts it, "this mutation in the technology of power is absolutely part of the development of capitalism … insofar as, on the one hand, the development of capitalism rendered this technological mutation necessary, yet on the other, this mutation rendered possible the development of capitalism: in brief, a permanent implication of the two movements, which are in a way enmeshed in one another." (Foucault, "Les mailles du pouvoir," 1019, my translation)

The economico-political function of disciplinary power operates at the microphysical level of bodies and their forces. In order to assemble the floating population into a well-organized workforce, individuals must be transformed into useful laborers and fitted to the apparatus of production, which in turn requires that they first be rendered controllable. As "the unitary technique by which the body is reduced as a 'political' force at the least cost and maximized as a useful force,"[87] discipline thus produces and trains individuals as politically docile, but economically productive agents.[88] Through the chronometric control of bodies' actions and forces, which makes possible the "maximal extraction of time" and maximal development of aptitudes, discipline transforms the time of human existence into labor time and the somatic force of individuals into labor power,[89] integrating the two in production and thereby satisfying "a condition of possibility of hyperprofit"[90]: "in order for there to be hyperprofit, …[a] web of microscopic, capillary political power had to be established at the level of man's very existence, attaching men to the production apparatus, while making them into agents of production, into workers."[91]

Thus, through this micro-politics of disciplinary power, which realizes the becoming-commodity of the time and corporeality of human life, capitalism penetrates ever "more deeply into our existence"[92]; and this process is necessary for the accelerated accumulation of capital and its attendant forms of exploitation. Conversely, the expanding scale of capital accumulation provided the impetus for the multiplication of disciplinary forms of subjection. If the requirements of industrial capitalism had determined the emergence of factory discipline historically, this particular disciplinary form, once established as a technique for producing, con-

---

[87] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 221.

[88] See Foucault: "it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination; but, on the other hand, its constitution as labour power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection …; the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body." (Ibid., 26) This relation of mutual conditioning can also be put in terms of the reciprocal causation we saw at work in the industrial division of labor (footnote 86 above): political subjection is the efficient cause for producing an economically useful agent of production; and economic production is the final cause for developing a generalizable system of political subjection.

[89] Foucault, "Truth and Juridical Forms", in *Power*, 81-2.

[90] The word 'hyperprofit' translates Foucault's term *sur-profit*, which he takes to be equivalent to surplus value, i.e., profit that allows for expanded investment. See ibid., 86.

[91] Ibid., 86-7.

[92] Ibid., 86. Indeed, according to Foucault, this disciplinary micro-politics is what, in fact, makes it possible for labor to appear to be the concrete essence of human being. Foucault's argument here suggests that, at least as regards the early Marx (and much of the Marxist tradition), the critique of political economy has not been carried far enough, for it retains a naturalized ontology of labor. That is, the very category of labor, which Marx takes to be constitutive of human being, must itself be called into question, since this purported concrete essence, taken to be universal, is in fact the historically contingent product of the power relations proper to capitalist society. "In order for men to be brought into labor, tied to labor, an operation is necessary, or a complex series of operations, by which men are effectively – not analytically but synthetically – bound to the production apparatus for which they labor. It takes this operation, or this synthesis effected by a political power, for man's essence to appear as being labor. … I'm referring not to a state apparatus, or to the class in power, but to the whole set of little powers, of little institutions at the lowest level." (Ibid., 86-7)

trolling, and using denumerable human multiplicities, could then be abstracted as a general technology of power and applied to any number of domains: "The growth of a capitalist economy gave rise to the specific modality of disciplinary power, whose general formulas, techniques of submitting forces and bodies, in short, 'political anatomy,' could be operated in the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions."[93] Thus, in effect, the process of capitalist economic production enabled the individualizing techniques of disciplinary power to proliferate throughout the social field, constituting a general mechanism of continuous political control and operating in a variety of governmental regimes (e.g., liberalism, communism) and extra-economic institutions (e.g., schools, hospitals, prisons, asylums, families).

Moreover, the dispersal of disciplinary techniques outside workhouses and factories not only enabled an intensification of social controls, but also in turn re-enforced the capitalist system of economic production. A particularly pertinent example of this is the modern police. According to Foucault, what distinguished industrial capitalism from other economic forms (e.g., feudalism and mercantilism) was the emergence of a new kind of wealth, one which was no longer chiefly monetary, but rather invested in the industrial apparatus of production itself.[94] However, since this widespread investment of wealth in constant capital came into daily contact with the increasingly pauperized masses, it became more vulnerable, continually subject to the threats of theft and sabotage. Thus, as the potential for economico-politically subversive action increased, so did the need for more sophisticated mechanisms of subjection, which is to say, for the development of a "continuous, atomistic and individualizing power" that would function more effectively than the "lacunary, global power" of sovereignty.[95] The various popular illegalisms to which sovereign power had turned a blind eye had to be brought under closer scrutiny: whence the emergence of the police as an organ for the exercise of power, as in the case of the London police, which "was born of the need to protect the docks, wharves, warehouses, and stocks."[96]

In this way, the economic exigency to safeguard the productive apparatus gave rise to the development of an entire system of political power: namely, "panopticism," which placed the "plebeian, popular, working, peasant population" under "general, continuous surveillance,"[97] and which was therefore crucial for protecting and strengthening not only the wealth but the "social hegemony"[98] of the bourgeoisie. Such hegemony required, as a means of con-

---

[93] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 221.

[94] Foucault, "Truth and Juridical Forms," 68-9. As examples of feudal and mercantile forms of monetary wealth, Foucault mentions land fortunes, cash money, and bills of exchange; his examples of industrial wealth invested in constant capital include "stocks of goods, raw materials, imported objects, machines, and workshops." (Ibid., 68)

[95] Foucault, "The Meshes of Power," 158-9.

[96] Foucault, "Truth and Juridical Forms," 69.

[97] Foucault, "À propos de l'enfermement pénitentiaire," in *Dits et écrits I*, 1305, my translation.

[98] Foucault, "The Eye of Power," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Gordon et al (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 156. For Foucault, it is, indeed, the micropolitical technology of disciplinary power that enabled the bourgeoisie to remain the socially (and economically) dominant class following the French Revolution: "The bourgeoisie is perfectly well aware that a new constitution or legislature will not suffice to assure its hegemony; it realises that it has to

trolling the potentially dangerous underclasses, a socio-economic, political and cultural partition to be instituted between: 1) the proletariat; and 2) what Foucault variously refers to as "the non-integrated part of the marginal population,"[99] the "marginal plebeian,"[100] and "the non-proletarianized plebe."[101] In effect, this diction stresses that proletarianization—as a process—is both productive and exclusionary, generating and exacerbating a division within the greater plebeian population that is necessary for the functioning of capitalism: "there is within the global mass of the plebe a divide between the proletariat and the non-proletarianized plebe, and I believe institutions like the police, the justice system, and the penal system, are one of the means used for endlessly deepening this divide, which capitalism requires."[102]

In addition to protecting the extensive investment of wealth in industrial capital, the triple panoptic system of "courts-police-prison"[103] performs three political functions in service of bourgeois social hegemony. First, "it is a factor in 'proletarianisation': its role is to force the people to accept their status as proletarians and the conditions for the exploitation of the proletariat."[104] Thus, for example, the criminalization, policing, and confinement of those parts of the population who remain unproductive (e.g., the unemployed, vagabonds, mendicants) enforced and normalized the general moral and economic imperative to work. In turn, by granting to workers a limited set of political rights, "the bourgeoisie obtained from the proletariat the promise of good political conduct and the renunciation of open rebellion."[105] In this way, panopticism facilitated the process of proletarianization, by which a docile and useful labor force was constituted and attached to the apparatus of economic production.

Second, the reverse side of this process, the criminalization of the unproductive, produces marginalized or non-proletarianized groups, some of which can themselves be formed

---

invent a new technology ensuring the irrigation by effects of power of the whole social body down to its smallest particles. And it was by such means that the bourgeoisie not only made a revolution but succeeded in establishing a social hegemony which it has never relinquished." (Ibid)

[99] Foucault, "Le grande enfermement," in *Dits et écrits I*, 1171, my translation.

[100] Ibid, 1174, my translation.

[101] Foucault, "Table ronde," in *Dits et écrits I:* 1202, my translation. Cf. Foucault, "Sur la justice populaire: Débat avec les maos," *Dits et écrits I*, 1219, 1220; the phrase is rendered by its English translator, John Mepham, as "non-proletarianised common people" and "non-proletarianised people" in "On Popular Justice: A Discussion with Maoists," *Power/Knowledge*, 14, 16.

[102] Foucault, "Table ronde," 1202, my translation. Foucault continues: "Because, at bottom, what capitalism is afraid of, rightly or wrongly, since 1789, since 1848, since 1870, is sedition, insurrection." This claim about sedition, which also appears in "On Popular Justice," will be attenuated one year later, when Foucault comes to the view that protecting the wealth invested in industrial production was a more fundamental concern than sedition for the bourgeoisie in maintaining the divide between the proletarianized and non-proletarianized plebe. See "À propos de l'enfermement pénitentiaire," *Dits et écrits I*, 1303-5. Nevertheless, the danger of seditious force will remain for Foucault an important strategic determinant in the development of panopticism and the exercise of disciplinary power. See, for example, the discussion of peasant and urban revolts in "The Birth of Social Medicine," in *Power*, 143-4, 152; see also the discussion of the 'disturbances around the scaffold' in *Discipline and Punish*, 59-65.

[103] Foucault, "On Popular Justice," 14.

[104] Ibid.

[105] Foucault, "Le grande renfermement," 1171, my translation.

by means of the courts-police-prison system into artificial populations of use to capitalism. The panoptic exercise of political controls enables the isolation of the 'violent' and 'dangerous' elements of the plebeian population,[106] those who pose a threat similar to that of an unruly crowd or non-denumerable multitude, that is, "widespread plotting, a whole network of communications, within which individuals exchanged different roles."[107] Historically, the three major ways of excluding the non-proletarianized plebe, all of which support the dominant economico-political system, were expulsion through colonization, conscription into the army, or confinement in prison. The prison, in particular, serves as an effective method of marginalization, insofar as it manufactures a delinquent population, which can then be "mobilize[d]" by the bourgeoisie "as soldiers, policemen, racketeers and thugs, and use[d] … for the surveillance and repression of the proletariat."[108] Further, this delinquent segment of the non-proletarianized plebe can be employed as scabs or temporary workers in the event of strikes or fluctuating economic demands, forming a particularly manipulable component of the 'reserve army of labor' required by capitalism.[109] Thus, with regard to the new penal system at the beginning of the 19th century, "the real aim was to create a specific criminalized sphere, a sector that must be isolated from the rest of the population. … [T]he capitalist system claims to combat criminality …by means of this carceral system that precisely produces criminality. … [T]he criminal produced by the prison is a useful criminal, useful for the system."[110]

Third, and consequently, by deploying these various "means for setting into opposition the plebe which is proletarianized and that which is not,"[111] the courts-police-prison system cleaves the common masses and defuses any potentially subversive forces of popular resistance: "Thus, the divide is ceaselessly reproduced and reintroduced between the proletariat and the non-proletarianized world because contact between the two was thought to be a dangerous ferment of insurrection."[112] The plebeian population, taken in its rent entirety, "find[s] itself disarmed," no longer "dangerous as ferment, as hotbed of insurrection and possible sedition for the bourgeoisie."[113] In such a manner—the popular masses partitioned and the accu-

---

[106] Foucault names as examples "farmers who were forced by debts to leave their land, peasants on the run from tax authorities, workers banished for theft, vagabonds or beggars who refused to clear the ditches, those who lived by plundering the fields, the small-time thieves and the highwaymen, those who, in armed groups, attacked the tax authorities and, more generally, agents of the state, and finally those who – on days of rioting in the towns or in the villages – carried weapons." ("On Popular Justice," 15)

[107] Ibid., translation slightly modified.

[108] Ibid., 16.

[109] See Foucault, "Michel Foucault on Attica," 30-1. For more on the constitution of a 'reserve army of labor' and its role in the history of confinement practices – specifically, in the transformation from the Great Confinement of the classical period to the rise of modern prisons and asylums – see Foucault, "La folie et la société," in *Dits et écrits II*, 497-9.

[110] Foucault, "La torture, c'est la raison," *Dits et écrits II*, 392-4, my translation.

[111] Foucault, "On Popular Justice," 16, translation modified. Cf.: "ways of creating antagonism between the proletarianised and the non-proletarianised people".

[112] Foucault, "Table ronde," 1202, my translation.

[113] Ibid, 1203, my translation.

mulation of human beings, controlled—the dividing practices instituted through the panoptic system of political power secure the social hegemony of the bourgeoisie.

iv. Connecting the Non/Proletarianized Plebe: Transversal Struggle and the Prison Movement
We can therefore see the battle lines drawn for the earliest formulation of transversal resistance: since the opposition between the non-proletarianized and proletarianized plebe is fundamental to the economico-political operation of power in capitalist society, a transformative politics will seek to undermine this division by crossing over it, creating points of contact as so many bonds of potentially insurrectionary ferment between the marginalized and proletarianized segments of the underclasses. Such is already the project suggested in "Intellectuals and Power," where the problem is one of constructing lateral lines of alliance, and where the aim is for the non-proletarianized ('women, prisoners, conscripted soldiers, hospital patients, and homosexuals') to 'enter into a revolutionary process' that can be 'linked to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat' insofar as the controls they resist 'serve the same system of power.'

Such, in turn, will be the project of the Prison Information Group, an activist group organized by Foucault and joined by Deleuze, which took as its "prime objective" the "reintegration into political struggles" of "that fringe of the lower class," thereby seeking to connect the revolts of the non-proletarianized plebe to a greater strategy of popular resistance so as to help enable "different strata of the people … to overcome conflicts and oppositions that had been established and maintained between them by the capitalist system."[114] If, at least for a time, Foucault places particular emphasis on prison revolts around the world as a form of minoritarian struggle—such revolts orienting both his political activism in the early 1970s and his genealogy of disciplinary power[115] –, this will be precisely to the extent that the prison is the chief remaining mechanism for marginalizing and making use of the non-proletarianized population.[116] Thus, what the prison revolts "call into question" is "the status of the marginal plebeian in capitalist society."[117] And therefore, in turn, the historico-critical function of Foucault's analytic of power, aiming to "give direction to this incipient political struggle," will be to map out the contingent political operations by which the marginal plebe has been produced, offering "a critique of the system that explains the process by which contemporary society marginalizes a part of the population."[118]

In sum: the strategy of this early transversal politics, informed by a genealogical critique of the economico-political operation of power by which the popular masses are set against each other, will be to resist these dividing practices by allying different minoritarian struggles and the workers' movement, establishing the basis of solidarity for creating such

[114] Foucault, "Michel Foucault on Attica," 31.
[115] On the role of the "prison revolts [that] have occurred throughout the world" as the contemporary anchor for Foucault's "history of the present," see *Discipline and Punish*, 30-1.
[116] The overthrow of colonialism and the changing function of the modern military eliminated direct colonization and the army as methods of mass expulsion; see Foucault, "On Popular Justice," 17-8.
[117] Foucault, "Le grand enfermement," 1174, my translation.
[118] Ibid., my translation.

lateral linkages through the critical diagnosis of the common system of power they all struggle against. Thus, insofar as the individualizing and normalizing techniques of subjection proper to the modern microphysics of power—which irrigate "the whole social body down to its smallest particles,"[119] and which deepen the division between the marginalized and proletarianized—function to adjust the double accumulation of human beings and capital, the myriad forms of resistance to the thousand tiny points of power's exercise will be aligned with the proletarianized plebe. As Deleuze puts it to Foucault, "Every revolutionary attack or defense, however partial, is linked in this way to the workers' struggle."[120]

However, to see what is specifically *transversal* about these connective relations among and between the minoritarian and proletarianized plebe, we must distinguish this political strategy from the traditional form of class struggle posed in terms of 'exploitation': "as soon as we struggle against exploitation, the proletariat not only leads the struggle but also defines its targets, its methods, and the places and instruments for confrontation…. This means total identification."[121] The 'reintegration' of the marginal plebe 'into political struggles' does therefore not mean assimilation to the proletariat. On the contrary, insofar as proletarianization itself effectively consolidates the dominant social order, what is needed is not the becoming-proletariat of the non-proletarianized plebe, but rather the becoming-minor of the proletariat. To create transversal connections between the marginalized and proletarianized plebe would thus be to enable the radicalization of the latter, for the "truly revolutionary forces" that "exist in our society today" are "made up of just those strata who are poorly integrated into society, those strata who are perpetually rejected, and who, in turn, reject the bourgeois moral system."[122]

Indeed, as Foucault will later point out, it was the events of May 1968 that had demonstrated the practical and theoretical deficiencies of the assimilative tendency of Marxist thought to re-territorialize the multitude of resistance movements within the province of class conflict. What was singular in these events is that the exercise of power itself was called into question on a host of fronts that fall outside the traditional political domain, thereby problematizing the diffuse and variegated operation of power; Foucault gives as examples "questions about women, about relations between the sexes, about medicine, about mental illness, about the environment, about minorities, about delinquency."[123] In other words, minoritarian struggles generate their political force precisely from the immediacy and specificity of the relations of power they call into question: hence Foucault's claim that it is by singularizing their proper forms of resistance that the marginalized 'enter into a revolutionary process.' The failed attempt to re-inscribe these questions within the vocabulary of class exploitation thus demonstrated the "manifest powerlessness on the part of Marxism to confront these problems."[124]

---

[119] Foucault, "The Eye of Power," 156.

[120] Deleuze, "Intellectuals and Power," 217.

[121] Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power," 216.

[122] Foucault, "Michel Foucault on Attica," 34.

[123] Foucault, "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 115.

[124] Ibid. Foucault continues: "So that one found oneself faced with interrogations that were addressed to politics but had not themselves sprung from a political doctrine."

What emerges, then, from this new kind of political problematization are precisely the forms of struggle that Foucault will champion as modes of resistance to the techniques of subjection by which the exercise of modern power traverses the social field: "opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, of administration over the ways people live."[125] Because the same immanent microphysics of power functions in 'the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions'—or, to speak with Deleuze, because these various concrete assemblages effectuate the same diagram of force relations—the first defining trait of minoritarian forms of oppositional struggle is that they are "'*transversal*' struggles, that is, …they are not confined to a particular political or economic form of government"[126] but, rather, find common strategic cause more generally as "struggles against the 'government of individualization.'"[127] Since, whatever the singular conditions of its domain of exercise, this 'government of individualization' operates by blocking lateral relations, the counter-tactics of political struggle will have a double task: negatively, to "attack everything that separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way"[128]; and positively, to create non-denumerable multiplicities constituted through the 'multiplication' and 'diverse combinations' of transversal connections, giving rise to new relational forms and modes of collective subjectivation.

III. Toward a Transversal Ethico-Politics: the Case of Becoming-Queer

"*For example, no 'gay liberation movement' is possible as long as homosexuality is caught up in a relation of exclusive disjunction with heterosexuality … instead of bringing to light their reciprocal inclusion and their transverse communication in the decoded flows of desire….*"
–Deleuze and Guattari[129]

i. Sexuality and Bio-Power: New Terrain for Minoritarian Resistance

---

[125] Foucault, "The Subject and Power," 329. I again use this term 'modern power' because the examples Foucault gives relate both to discipline (e.g., psychiatric power) and to the bio-political regulation of the population. On the complementary relation between discipline and bio-politics, see the discussion of biopower below.

[126] Ibid, 329-30, my emphasis. Foucault here initially states that 'transversal' refers to not being limited to one country. However, transversality is not merely synonymous with transnationality since the point is that these struggles are not simply opposed to a particular form of government, and thus are not derivable from a given political or economic doctrine, such as traditional Marxism. Moreover, we have already seen Deleuze suggest the distinction between transversality and transnationality when he states in "Intellectuals and Power" that 'the transversal links between these active and discontinuous points' form a network 'from one country to another *or within a single country*.'

[127] Ibid, 330.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 350-1.

Foucault's analytic of power thus provides the critical propaedeutics necessary for developing a transversal politics of connection. Indeed, I would suggest that this form of resistance to the exercise of power in capitalist society receives its most systematic political theoretic treatment through Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomatic concept of the revolutionary war machine in *A Thousand Plateaus*.[130] However, since pursuing this line would exceed the bounds of this essay, it must suffice to consider in some detail, using the theoretical tools developed thus far, one specific example of a transversal ethico-politics—namely, what may be termed the Foucauldian project of *becoming-queer*. This project serves as Foucault's effort to singularize a form of minoritarian struggle, and thus as a further response to the question of transversal resistance posed to him by Deleuze a decade earlier.

To understand how an ethical practice of queer subjectivation constitutes a mode of resistance, and hence a politics, it must first be situated in relation to Foucault's analysis of biopower in the introductory volume of *History of Sexuality*. The concept of biopower designates the mode of power which takes life, whether that of the individual or the population, as its object of production and control. Drawing again from the distinction in *Anti-Oedipus* between micro- and macrophysics, Foucault characterizes modern biopower as a "bi-polar technology" that develops historically along two axes: 1) the micropolitical axis of discipline, which Foucault now refers to as "an *anatomo-politics of the human body*," by which the "body as a machine" is rendered docile and useful; and 2) the macropolitical axis of administrative regulation, of "*a bio-politics of the population*," by which the "species body" as a statistical aggregate is managed and governed with respect to the conditions of its basic biological processes.[131]

---

[130] In other words, the concept of a non-denumerable or transverse multiplicity which is composed through the connection of de-territorializing lines of flight and the nomadic production of smooth or non-striated space; which contests and remains exterior to the re-territorializing operations of the State and its apparatuses of capture; and which gives rise to potentially liberatory processes of collective becoming (becoming-minor, becoming-intensive, becoming-revolutionary). Though the argument cannot be developed here, I would suggest that *A Thousand Plateaus* is greatly indebted to Foucault's analytic of power, just as the latter is to *Anti-Oedipus*, thus forming an important segment of the Foucault-Deleuze block of becoming. Seen from this perspective, if it is true, as is often said, that Deleuze's *Foucault* reflects Deleuze's thought as much as Foucault's, this would not be because Deleuze assimilates Foucault's philosophy to his own, but because Deleuze's philosophy is already deeply inflected by his reading of Foucault.

[131] Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*, 139; Foucault lists as examples of these biological processes "propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity." Following Foucault's terminology here, strictly speaking, we must distinguish between 'biopower' and 'bio-politics,' the latter being subordinate to the former as one of its axes, which is to say, as one set of techniques and corresponding domain of application through which the general political technology of biopower is exercised. Moreover, it should be emphasized that to characterize anatomo-politics and bio-politics, respectively, as the micro- and macropolitical poles of biopower is not simply to reduce the difference between them to a quantitative matter of size. Rather, the qualitative difference between discipline and what Foucault will later call 'security power' (notably, in *Security, Territory, Population*) is maintained to the extent that each domain has its proper set of laws by which phenomena are governed: the macro-physical with its statistical aggregates governed according to the regulation of probabilistic tendencies, and the microphysical with its "somatic singularities" (Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*, 44) governed according to individualizing techniques of control. It is also worth noting that Foucault retains this 'bi-polar' schema of the macro- and micro-political six years later in "The

Like disciplinary power, which in fact constitutes one of its two poles, biopower serves historically as a necessary condition for capitalism insofar as it makes possible the "adjustment of the accumulation of men to that of capital, the joining of the growth of human groups to the expansion of productive forces and the differential allocation of profit…."[132] In other words, as with discipline, the basic operation of biopower is economico-political. This is the reason for the claim above: that Foucault's economico-political thesis holds for modern power generally, whether the disciplining of individuals in panoptic assemblages, or the bio-political regulation of the population. As Deleuze will later point out, at issue in both cases is a form of power exercised upon human multiplicities: on the one hand, an anatomo-politics that functions to impose a certain conduct on a particular multiplicity of individuals, where that multiplicity is limited in number and space;[133] and on the other, a bio-politics that functions to administer the conditions of life processes in a particular multiplicity, where that multiplicity is a more expansive and open population.[134] Accordingly, rather than being opposed to one another, discipline and bio-politics are distinct but complementary strategies, through which power oper-

---

Subject and Power," when he writes of pastoral power that "the multiplication of the aims and agents of pastoral power focused the development of knowledge of man around two poles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual." (Foucault, "Subject and Power," 335, translation modified. The English translation has "roles" rather than "poles," but this is an error, as is both clear from the context and confirmed by the French text, "*pôles*"; cf. *Dits et écrits II*, 1050)

[132] Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*, 141. For more detail on this point, it is worth quoting in full the passage that precedes the phrase just cited: "This bio-power was without question an indispensable element in the development of capitalism; the latter would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes. But this was not all it required; it also needed the growth of both these factors, their reinforcement as well as their availability and docility; it had to have methods of power capable of optimizing forces, aptitudes, and life in general without at the same time making them more difficult to govern. If the development of the great instruments of the state, as institutions of power, ensured the maintenance of production relations, the rudiments of anatomo- and bio-politics, created in the eighteenth century as techniques of power present at every level of the social body and utilized by very diverse institutions (the family and the army, schools and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies), operated in the sphere of economic processes, their development, and the forces working to sustain them. They also acted as factors of segregation and social hierarchization, exerting their influence on the respective forces of both these movements, guaranteeing relations of domination and effects of hegemony." (Ibid., 140-1)

[133] I would point out that although discipline as a cellular form of power is developed and exercised in enclosed spaces (factories, schools, prisons, hospitals, asylums, barracks, etc.), panopticism – as an abstract function and disciplinary technique for controlling the conduct of individuals through a system of hierarchical division and surveillance – ultimately becomes dispersed throughout the socius: "The panoptic schema, without disappearing as such or losing any of its properties, was destined to spread throughout the social body; its vocation was to become a generalized function." (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 207) For more on the generalized diffusion of panoptic techniques and 'swarming of disciplinary mechanisms' throughout the social field, see ibid., 205-9, 211-2, and 215-6. For Foucault's discussion of how the police were a central means for relaying this disciplinary or panoptic mode of power to a more open form of human multiplicity or population, see ibid., 213-4.

[134] See Deleuze, *Foucault*, 72.

ates in capitalist society.[135] Their convergent points of reciprocal support or mutual articulation will be crucial nodes in the modern diagram of force relations.

Now, if the apparatus of sexuality is of especial importance to Foucault's analytic of biopower, it is because the category of sex/sexuality serves as just such a site of convergence between anatomo- and bio-politics, located "at the pivot of the two axes along which developed the entire political technology of life. On the one hand it was tied to the disciplines of the body: the harnessing, intensification, and distribution of forces, the adjustment and economy of energies. On the other hand, it was applied to the regulation of populations, through all the far-reaching effects of its activity."[136] Insofar as it thus constitutes a vital tactical conjuncture through which biopower controls and governs the conduct of individuals and groups, sexuality also becomes privileged strategic terrain for forms of counter-conduct that would contest this exercise of power.

ii. The Problem of Friendship as Ethico-Cultural Creation of Transversal Connections
Foucault's transversal ethico-politics therefore intervenes at precisely this pivot point of biopower. As resistance to the 'government of individualization,' such a politics challenges the techniques of subjection by which the apparatus of sexuality binds the individual to herself and divides her from others through a normalizing form of identity. Since, as we have seen Foucault suggest in his preface to *Anti-Oedipus*, such a process of de-individualization takes shape through a mode of collective subjectivation that is itself made possible by the construction of non-hierarchical group formations, it follows that any politics of de-subjection will require the production of new relational forms—an open network of "polymorphic, varied, and individually modulated relationships."[137]

Accordingly, when Foucault champions something like a queer cultural movement as a shared form of ethico-political practice, he emphasizes precisely this task of creating new modes of social relation:

> Another thing to distrust is the tendency to relate the question of homosexuality to the problem of 'Who am I?' and 'What is the secret of my desire?' Perhaps it would be better to ask oneself, 'What relations, through homosexuality, can be established, invented, multiplied, and modulated?' The problem is not to discover in oneself the truth of one's sex, but, rather, to use one's sexuality henceforth *to arrive at a multiplicity of relationships*. … Therefore, we have to work at *becoming homosexuals* and not be obstinate in recognizing that we

---

[135] Cf. Deleuze: "In brief, the two pure functions in modern societies will be 'anatomo-politics' and 'bio-politics,' and the two bare matters those of a particular body and a particular population." (Ibid., 72)

[136] Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*, 145. Foucault continues: "It fitted in both categories at once, giving rise to infinitesimal surveillances, permanent controls, extremely meticulous orderings of space, indeterminate medical or psychological examinations, to an entire micro-power concerned with the body. But it gave rise as well to comprehensive measures, statistical assessments, and interventions aimed at the entire social body or at groups taken as a whole." (Ibid., 145-6)

[137] Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 139.

are. The development toward which the problem of homosexuality tends is the one of friendship.[138]

The 'question of homosexuality,' then, does not refer to an inherent property, much less a substantive nature, of being homosexual. The problem posed by homosexuality, which Foucault names 'friendship,' is not to discover an essential self-relation but, rather, to facilitate the production, transformation, and proliferation of a 'multiplicity of relationships,' the schema for which cannot be given in advance.

Indeed, far from constituting the kind of identity politics for which it is sometimes mistaken, which would be centered in molar forms of social identification and their corresponding group interests, the Foucauldian question of homosexuality and its philial project concern an active task of becoming, a collective process of subjectivation that I am calling 'becoming-queer.'[139] This practice of becoming takes shape through the construction of friendship, understood as a mode of relation with two fundamental features: 1) as a "relationship that is still formless," friendship must be "invent[ed] from A to Z," for its structure is unmoored from institutional supports and its meaning, ungoverned by dominant social codes; and 2) with regard to its positive content, this relation between friends encompasses "the sum of everything through which they can give each other pleasure,"[140] which is to say, the shared creation of a reciprocal circuit of care.[141]

Foucault gives as an example of the formlessness of friendship the relation between two men of "noticeably different ages" who, without a "code [that] would allow them to communicate… [and] with nothing to assure them about the meaning of the movement that carries them toward each other,"[142] must together invent the very terms of that relation—which is to say, must invent themselves as friends who are constituted through the movement

---

[138] Ibid., 135-6, my emphasis.

[139] Cf.: "We have to understand that with our desires, through our desires, go new forms of relationships, new forms of love, new forms of creation. … We don't have to discover that we are homosexuals. … Rather, we have to create a gay life. To *become*." (Foucault, "Sex, Power, and the Politics of Identity," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 163)

[140] Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 136. The last phrase reads in the original French: "*la somme de toutes les chose à travers lesquelles, l'un à l'autre, on peut se faire plaisir*." What the English translation cannot quite preserve is the reflexive sense in which both participants in the relation experience pleasure in and through the other, but in such a way that the distinction between self and other becomes blurred. It is not so much that *I* experience pleasure that *you* give to *me,* and vice versa – as though friendship were an exchange relation – but that *there is* the experience of a shared pleasure in the conduit that courses between us. (Note that the impersonal *on* in '*on peut se faire plaisir*' is the same grammatical subject that Foucault, following Blanchot, uses with reference to the thought of the outside.) The inventive formation of the relation transforms both terms of the relation.

[141] With respect to a collective ethos of co-constitutive care and pleasure, cf. "On the Genealogy of Ethics: an Overview of Work in Progress": "What I want to ask is: Are we able to have an ethics of acts and their pleasures which would be able to take into account the pleasure of the other? Is the pleasure of the other something that can be integrated in our pleasure, without reference either to law, to marriage, to I don't know what?" (Foucault, "On the Genealogy of Ethics," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 258)

[142] Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 136.

arising between them. Indeed, the space of this in-between is precisely akin to that of the transversal relation described by Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus*, where "*Between* things does not designate a localizable relation going from one thing to the other and back again, but a perpendicular direction, a transversal movement that sweeps one and the other away…."[143] Friendship should not be conceived as a line running back and forth from one fixed point to another but, rather, as a perpendicular vector passing between the friends and impelling their co-becoming. By contrast to a relation that would obtain between pre-existing terms, such as a contractual relation independent parties enter into, the friendship relation is itself dynamically constitutive of its proper terms. That is, friendship is an auto-poetic relation, which is de-individualizing, insofar as the subject-position of an original self in relation to the other is displaced in favor of a constituent movement of joint becoming.

Of course, just as with the marginal and proletarianized plebe, this movement does not mean 'total identification,' which would collapse the betweenness of the friends' transversal trajectory.[144] Rather, their co-becoming defines the coordinates of a shared mode of life for which differentiation serves as a genetic principle. In contradistinction to institutional or oppositional forms of social difference, philial differentiation affirms difference in its positivity as transversal connection. Thus, to return to Foucault's example, the age differential between friends, precisely because it deprives them of a socially coded way of relating, makes the invention of a new relational form possible, which propels both friends outside their age-based subject-positions. In this way, the mode of life proper to collective processes of becoming-queer constitutes a decoded flow of desire, a deterritorializing line of creative mutation that cuts across the striated space of the social field:

> Is it possible to create a homosexual mode of life? This notion of mode of life seems important to me. Will it require the introduction of a diversification different from the ones due to social class, differences in profession and culture, *a diversification that would also be a form of relationship and would be a 'way of life'*? A way of life can be shared among individuals of different age, status, and social activity. It can yield *intense relations not resembling those that are institutionalized*. It seems to me that a way of life can yield a culture and an ethics.[145]

If the project of becoming-queer generates an ethics, it will be the very kind that Foucault attributes to *Anti-Oedipus*: namely, an ethics of immanence, which realizes the affective intensification of relationships 'by means of multiplication and displacement, diverse combinations.' If this project generates a culture, it will be in the expansive sense of "a culture that invents ways of relating, types of existence, types of values, types of exchanges between individuals which are really new and are neither the same as, nor superimposed on, existing cultural forms."[146] To displace prevailing cultural forms through a radical production of the new, entails a crea-

---

[143] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 25.

[144] Indeed, Foucault is specifically critical of the erotic model of the "lovers' fusion of identities." (Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 137)

[145] Ibid, 137-8, my emphasis.

[146] Foucault, "The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 159-60.

tive collective practice that crosses over the historical lines of division between stratified group identities and interests. Thus, echoing Deleuze and Guattari's claim in the epigraph above regarding the inclusive disjunction and 'transverse communication' between homo- and heterosexuality, Foucault argues that if such a movement of cultural invention is to fundamentally transform collective modes of life throughout the social formation, "then gay culture will not only be a choice of homosexuals for homosexuals—it would create relations that are, at certain points, transferable to heterosexuals. …[N]onhomosexual people can enrich their lives by changing their own schema of relations."[147]

Indeed, independently of any molar structure of identification, it is the transversal form of the friendship relation, its perpendicular movement as a line of deterritorialization, that enables the process of becoming-queer to enrich the relational fabric or, in the language of Deleuze and Guattari, to effect a collective becoming-intensive of the socius. As Foucault puts it, "Homosexuality is a historic occasion to reopen affective and relational virtualities, not so much through the intrinsic qualities of the homosexual but because the 'slantwise' ['*en biais*'] position of the latter, as it were, *the diagonal lines he can lay out in the social fabric* allow these virtualities to come to light."[148] The agential force of this queer mode of collective subjectivation stems from its slanting trajectory, its position '*en biais*'—a term which, following the meaning of *biais* in sewing, suggests the threading of a diagonal direction across the gridded texture of a fabric.

For Foucault, then, the problem of friendship articulated through the question of homosexuality can be put as follows: how, by virtue of the transversal movement of becoming-queer, can 'diagonal lines' be woven into the 'social fabric,' such that they create the conditions of material expression for a multiplicity of 'affective and relational virtualities' to be realized? This indeed echoes the two problems previously posed in the 1960s and 1970s. We have seen how, in *History of Madness*, the central issue at the heart of the modern world concerned the insupportability and constitutive division of the intensive experience of unreason, the expression of which becomes the charge of modern literature. We have also seen how, in the analytic of power, the critical question regarded how to construct lateral lines of alliance as a counter-network of resistance to the relations of power exercised in capitalist society. Now, connecting and extending aspects of both projects, the problem of Foucault's immanent ethico-politics becomes that of creating transversal lines of alliance that would contest the functioning of power by providing a system of supports for the production of previously excluded modes of relation and intensive experience.

iii. The Transversal Politics of Becoming-Queer: Contesting the Bio-Political Strategy of Liberal Governmentality

The problem of friendship and the project of becoming-queer to which it gives rise, thus provide a Foucauldian response to the question of how to construct a non-denumerable multiplic-

---

[147] Ibid, 160. In this way, becoming-queer exemplifies a 'becoming-minor of the major' in the sense that characterizes minoritarian becoming for Deleuze and Guattari. See, e.g., *A Thousand Plateaus*, 291-298.

[148] Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 138, my emphasis.

ity constituted through the transversal connection of decoded flows that would both disrupt the operation of power and make possible radically new forms of existence. For indeed, "what makes homosexuality 'disturbing'" is precisely what makes Foucault's ethics of immanence a politics of resistance: namely, the decoded form and deterritorializing force of "the homosexual mode of life," including

> …everything that can be troubling in affection, tenderness, friendship, fidelity, camaraderie, and companionship, things that our rather sanitized society can't allow a place for without fearing *the formation of new alliances and the tying together of unforeseen lines of force*. … Institutional codes can't validate these relations with multiple intensities, variable colors, imperceptible movements and changing forms.[149]

Just as the extra-institutional formlessness of friendship and its genetic principle of affirmative differentiation make possible the creative movement of co-becoming between friends; so too the transformative political force of becoming-queer derives from its position of exteriority with respect to the institutionalized set of relations that structure the striated space of the social formation. In this regard, the problem of friendship poses a response specifically to the problem of biopower. As we have seen, biopower's function is to govern the population by normalizing and controlling the conduct of individuals and groups, and it does so through the denumeration and regulation of human multiplicities and the dispersion of techniques of subjection. On both fronts—that is, the macro-level of social institutions and the micro-level of subjection—the project of becoming-queer functions as a form of resistance. At the micro-level this is because the invention of intensive modes of co-becoming constitutes a de-individualizing process of collective subjectivation, while at the macro-level this is because the creation of these new forms of relation challenges the institutional relational framework, through which the conditions of a population are administered.

This latter point, moreover, must be emphasized, for modern power's techniques of administration over the population operate by limiting and simplifying the field of possible social relations:

> In effect, we live in a legal, social, and institutional world where the only relations possible are extremely few, extremely simplified, and extremely poor. There is, of course, the relation of marriage, and the relation of family, but how many other relations should exist, should be able *to find their codes not in institutions but in possible supports*, which is not at all the case! … We live in a relational world that institutions have considerably impoverished. *Society and the institutions which frame it have limited the possibility of relationships because a rich relational world would be very complex to manage* [*gérer*]. We should fight against the impoverishment of the relational fabric.[150]

It is no coincidence that the verb Foucault uses in reference to this governmental function of power, '*gérer*' (to manage or administer), is the same he reserves to depict biopower's "func-

---

[149] Ibid, 136-7, my emphasis.
[150] Foucault, "The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will," 158, my emphasis.

tion of administering life,"[151] since the 'impoverishment of the relational fabric' is a bio-political strategy for rendering the population a governmentalizable object of regulation and control.

Indeed, as Foucault had pointed out two years earlier, the very institutionalization of the social domain, the historical formation of "civil society," is "absolutely correlative" to "the technology of liberal governmentality,"[152] which is itself the "framework of political rationality"[153] for the exercise of biopower. The constitution of 'civil society' in the second half of the 18th century responds to a central political problem for the liberal art of governing: given that economic subjects of interest are irreducible to juridical subjects of right, how can the governability of "these individuals, who inhabit the space of sovereignty as subjects of right and, at the same time, as economic men, …be assured" in order for "governmentality to preserve its global character over the whole space of sovereignty"[154]? The answer, Foucault argues, is that civil society—as "the emergence of a new object, a new domain," which will also be called "society" and "the nation"[155]—functions as a field of political unity that integrates the economic and juridical aspects of the subject, making possible the governmentalization of *homo economicus* and the intensification of power's exercise by way of its extension through social institutions: "An omnipresent government, a government which nothing escapes, a government which conforms to the rules of right, and a government which nevertheless respects the specificity of the economy, will be a government that manages civil society, the nation, society, the social."[156]

It is therefore this mode of liberal governmentality that impoverishes the relational fabric so as to render the population and the individuals composing it governable, operating at both the micro- and macro-political levels: that is, 1) by means of individualizing techniques of subjection, producing *homo economicus* as the form of a self-corporatizing individual whose "life itself … must make him into a sort of permanent and multiple enterprise"[157]; and 2)

---

[151] Foucault, *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*, 138; see also, ibid., 139. In both cases, the French phrase "*gérer la vie*" is translated as "administering life." Cf. Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité I: La volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), 181, 182.

[152] Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*: *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, edited by Michel Senellart, translated by Burchell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 296-7.

[153] Ibid., 317.

[154] Ibid., 294-5.

[155] Ibid., 295-6.

[156] Ibid., 296. Foucault continues: "*Homo economicus* and civil society are therefore two inseparable elements. *Homo economicus* is, if you like, the abstract, ideal, purely economic point that inhabits the dense, full, and complex reality of civil society. Or alternatively, civil society is the concrete ensemble within which these ideal points, economic men, must be placed so that they can be appropriately managed. So, *homo economicus* and civil society belong to the same ensemble of the technology of liberal governmentality."

[157] Ibid., 241. For more on *homo economicus* as the liberal mode of subjection that produces the form of the modern individual as "someone who is eminently governable," see ibid., 270-1. Foucault does suggest that there is a certain strain of American neoliberalism, exemplified by Gary Becker's analysis of drug policy, that gives rise to "the image, idea, or theme-program of a society … in which there is an environmental type of intervention instead of the internal subjugation of individuals." (Ibid., 259-60) In this case, *homo economicus* is

through the institutionalization of a set of social relations that can be administered and controlled, i.e., the production of civil society, which "generaliz[es] the 'enterprise' form within the social body or social fabric," "extending the economic model of supply and demand and of investment-costs-profit so as to make it a model of social relations and of existence itself, a form of relationship of the individual to himself, time, those around him, the group, and the family."[158] In this way, moreover, biopower performs its economico-political function, integrating the double accumulation of human populations and capital, while consolidating relations of social hegemony and stratification.[159]

The tendency of this liberal logic of socio-relational vitiation, which leaves the institution of the restrictive nuclear family with a totalizing hold on the field of social relations, receives perhaps its starkest articulation in Margaret Thatcher's famous statement that "there is no such thing as society: there are individual men and women, and there are families."[160] But of course, what appears here as a claim about social ontology, in fact describes the contingent effect of a political operation proper to liberal governmentality—one which has only been accelerated by neoliberalism's 'ethos of privatization,'[161] and which constitutes exactly the kind of government of individualization ('separating the individual, breaking his links with others, splitting up community life') that transversal struggles are allied against. Indeed, just as we saw with disciplinary power (e.g., the lateral invisibility foundational to panoptic arrange-

---

still the form of individual subject who is governmentalizable, in the sense that "power gets a hold on him to the extent, and only to the extent, that he is a *homo economicus*," (Ibid., 252) but the point of power's exercise is at the environmental level of the conditions of action, rather than at a microphysical level of the disciplined body (as in the case of classical liberal governmentality). Though the argument cannot be developed here, I would suggest that Foucault reads Becker as a critical virtuality of neoliberal thought, rather than endorsing neoliberalism in general, especially its actual economico-political forms. For an excellent discussion of this distinction between economic or political liberalism and critical liberalism in Foucault, see Frédéric Gros, "Y a-t-il un sujet biopolitique?", *Nóema* (4-1), 2013.

[158] Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 241-2.

[159] For Foucault's discussion of the bio-political exercise by means of which liberal governmentality "takes on the task of continuously and effectively taking charge of individuals and their well-being, health, and work, their way of being, behaving, and even dying, etc.", see ibid., 62. See also Foucault's discussion of noso-politics, which operates through the "*medicalization of the family*" to adjust the subjection of individuals to the apparatus of social and economic production: "The biological traits of a population become relevant factors for economic management, and it becomes necessary to organize around them an apparatus that will ensure not only their subjection but the constant increase of their utility." (Foucault, "The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century," in *Power*, 96) Cf. "The Birth of Social Medicine," especially on modern medicine as a "biopolitical strategy" which accomplishes "[s]ociety's control over individuals." (Foucault, "The Birth of Social Medicine," in *Power*, 137)

[160] Margaret Thatcher, "Interview for *Woman's Own*," Sept. 23, 1987.

[161] I borrow this term from Jason Read: "Privatization is not just neoliberalism's strategy for dealing with the public sector, what David Harvey calls accumulation by dispossession, but a consistent element of its particular form of governmentality, its ethos, everything becomes privatized, institutions, structures, issues, and problems that used to constitute the public. It is privatization all the way down." (Jason Read, "A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity," *Foucault Studies*, no. 6 (February 2009), 35)

ments, or the prevention by the courts-police-prison system of points of contact between the proletarianized and non-proletarianized plebe), so too with biopower, it is by means of blocking transversal connections that the relational networks of the social field are delimited, codified, and controlled. Accordingly, the call for a collective, transversal project of queer subjectivation—for the creation of 'a culture and an ethics' that would multiply lateral, extra-institutional connections, as so many 'diagonal lines' of minoritarian becoming traversing and intensifying the 'social fabric'—is a call to resist the bio-political exercise of liberal governmentality.

In sum: if power operates through the impoverishment of the social fabric so as to more effectively manage a population, then contestation will take the form of enriching the relational fabric of society, creating 'new alliances and tying together unforeseen lines of force.' The Foucauldian project of becoming-queer can thus be understood as a transversal ethico-politics aiming to establish, through the creation of a non-institutionalized network of supports, the conditions of material expression for new modes of existence and culture, "new forms of community"[162] that challenge the liberal techniques of control (individualizing subjection, relational vitiation), through which biopower manages the conduct and conditions of the population.[163]

---

[162] Deleuze, *Foucault*, 151, n. 45, translation modified. Deleuze's phrase, *nouvelles formes de communauté*, is rendered by its English translator as "new forms of subjectivity."

[163] A larger argument for Foucauldian becoming-queer as a politics of resistance can be advanced in brief: To the extent that this philial project enables the development of intensive relational forms outside the institutions of marriage and the family, collective processes of becoming-queer would undo the totalizing and thus impoverishing effects that such institutions have had on the social fabric; therefore, by contesting the hegemony of the nuclear family as a social institution, Foucault's transversal ethico-politics constitutes a form of resistance to the economico-political operation of modern power. First, regarding the problem of the accumulation of human beings: if it is true, as Lee Edelman has argued, that the ethico-political value of queerness resides in its radical challenge to "reproductive futurism" – that is, to the procreative imperative instituted through the nuclear family that serves as the "organizing principle of communal relations" and secures "the absolute privilege of heteronormativity," structuring the politico-cultural field of social meaning and "authenticat[ing] social order" itself in the demand to bequeath this order to future generations (Lee Edelman, *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 2-3) –; then the practice of becoming-queer would undermine not only the normalizing relational arrangements, but also the very production of value proper to the social formation. Edelman argues that the value of queer resistance "resides in its challenge to value as defined by the social, and thus in its radical challenge to the very value of the social itself." (Ibid., 6) Especially in light of the neoliberal dimension of reproductive futurism – that is, the valuation of children insofar as they represent an investment of "humanized 'capital'" (Ibid., 112) for society – Edelman's theory of queerness can be understood as a response to the problem of radically transforming the capitalist production of social value. In turn, regarding the problem of capital accumulation, the nuclear form of the family functions as an institutional site of relay and support for both capitalism and biopower: as Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate, the Oedipalizing techniques of individualization exercised by the nuclear family are born of and reproduce capitalist social production (see, e.g., *Anti-Oedipus*, 264-5); and as Foucault shows, the nuclear form of the family itself, re-defined by the civil code "around this micro-cell of married couple and parents and children," is historically deployed through the "re-familialization" practices of the 19th century in order to discipline the emergent proletarian population and divide them from the marginal plebe. (Foucault, *Psychiatric Power*, 83; cf. "Michel Foucault on Attica," 33) Thus, by virtue of their

IV. Conclusion

Proceeding by way of a series of problematizations, the block of becoming formed through the philosophical friendship of Deleuze and Foucault is transversal in two senses: 1) with respect to its content, as the conceptualization of a transversal politics of connection; and 2) with respect to its form, as a 'line of becoming' that 'passes *between*' and propels the two thinkers. To schematically retrace this movement, the problem of the two regimes of madness, articulated through the Artaud thesis, first prompts Foucault's literary politics of transgression, which fails because of the problem of capitalism. Deleuze and Guattari's schizo-politics then both extends Foucault's early project and diagnoses its failure, calling instead for a transversal form of contestation. The question of how to conceive and create such transversal struggle, posed by Deleuze to Foucault, in turn raises the more basic problem of power and its anti-transversal, economico-political function. Finally, Foucault's critical analytic of power, itself made possible by a Deleuzian microphysics of bodies and forces, informs both his theoretical elaboration and experimental practice of transversal resistance, issuing into the problem of friendship as a collective project of becoming-queer.

Of course, our present discussion of the Foucault-Deleuze block of becoming, and of the theory of transversal politics to which it gives rise, is not comprehensive. We have seen the relations of reciprocal determination running from Foucault through Deleuze back to Foucault: that is, how *Anti-Oedipus*, which is itself a response to (and thus in part made possible by) *History of Madness*, in turn enables Foucault's micro-political analyses of power and resistance. A more complete account would include another segment, showing how Foucault's analytic of power informs the second volume of Deleuze and Guattari's *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (e.g., in the concepts of apparatus of capture, collective subject of enunciation, denumerable multiplicity, striated space, etc.), and how in turn Foucault's late ethico-politics exemplifies concepts from *A Thousand Plateaus* (e.g., minoritarian becoming and the revolutionary war machine). What I hope to have demonstrated here is how the political thought of both Deleuze and Foucault, finding common cause through the concept of transversal resistance, cannot be properly understood independently of the line of co-becoming that passes between them.

Christopher Penfield
Purdue University
Department of Philosophy
400 Santa Clara Ave. #32
Oakland, CA 94610

---

exteriority and challenge to the restrictive form of the nuclear family, the social order it institutes, and the economico-political function it performs, queer modes of collective becoming would contest the exercise of power in capitalist society.