

# European Journal of Political Theory

<http://ept.sagepub.com>

---

## **Assemblages and the Multitude: Deleuze, Hardt, Negri, and the Postmodern Left**

Nicholas Tampio

*European Journal of Political Theory* 2009; 8; 383

DOI: 10.1177/1474885109103850

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://ept.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/8/3/383>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *European Journal of Political Theory* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://ept.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ept.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

# Assemblages and the Multitude

## Deleuze, Hardt, Negri, and the Postmodern Left

Nicholas Tampio *Fordham University*

*European Journal of Political Theory*

8(3) 383–400

© The Author(s), 2009

Reprints and permission: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

[DOI: 10.1177/1474885109103850]

<http://ejpt.sagepub.com>



**ABSTRACT:** The article enters a heated debate about the ideals and organization of the postmodern left. Hardt and Negri, two key figures in this debate, claim that their concept of the multitude – a revolutionary, proletarian body that organizes singularities – integrates the insights of Deleuze and Lenin. I argue, however, that Deleuze anticipated and resisted a Leninist appropriation of his political theory. This essay challenges the widely accepted assumption that Hardt and Negri carry forth Deleuze’s legacy. At the same time, the essay advocates Deleuze’s concept of left assemblages – protean political bodies working for freedom and equality – as a valuable but underappreciated contribution to the liberal-democratic tradition.

**KEY WORDS:** *assemblage, Deleuze, Hardt, left, Lenin, multitude, Negri, postmodern*

The idea of the left, Norberto Bobbio explains in his classic study, is both invaluable and problematic.<sup>1</sup> The left–right political distinction, originating in the French Revolution and persisting today, enables us to contrast sides in political conflicts, to evaluate the merits of each side, and to differentiate historical epochs in which one side or the other predominates. The left, generally speaking, prizes equality, and the right valorizes hierarchy. This distinction, however, raises complications even as it clarifies the political universe. How should the left describe the persons that are political equals, the benefits or obligations to be shared, and the criteria of sharing? How can the left balance the ideal of equality with the good of freedom? And how should the left actualize its ideals? The challenge for the left in the ‘postmodern’ era – after the 20th century’s experience of rapid industrialization, world wars, fascism, communism, and decolonization – is to address these questions without the confidence in progress that imbued modern political thinkers such as Kant, Hegel, Comte, and Marx.<sup>2</sup>

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire* and *Multitude* are among the most prominent recent attempts to conceptualize the ideals, agents, and tactics of the

Contact address: Nicholas Tampio, Department of Political Science, Fordham University, Faber Hall (6th Floor), 441 East Fordham Road, Bronx, NY 10458, USA.  
Email: [nicholas.tampio@gmail.com](mailto:nicholas.tampio@gmail.com)

postmodern left.<sup>3</sup> In a prolonged era of rightist ascendancy, according to Hardt and Negri, the left's resurrection requires 'new practices, new forms of organization, and new concepts'.<sup>4</sup> Hardt and Negri assign themselves the task of redefining key terms of left political discourse such as freedom, equality, and democracy, and employing new terms – such as singularities, deterritorialization, lines of flight, bodies without organs, and war machines – to address the unique conditions of our age. Hardt and Negri explicitly draw many of these terms, and the deeper insights they express, from the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze. Hardt states:

We inquire into his thought in order to investigate the proposals of a new problematic for research after the poststructuralist rupture, to test our footing on a terrain where new grounds of philosophical and political thought are possible. What we ask of Deleuze, above all, is to teach us the contemporary possibilities of philosophy.<sup>5</sup>

For Hardt and Negri, Deleuze's work provides an invaluable prism through which to read the history of philosophy, the contemporary intellectual landscape, and the machinery of present-day society.

Yet Hardt and Negri perceive a gap in Deleuze's philosophy: an adequate concept of political subjectivity. In *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy*, Hardt traces how Deleuze combats old visions of the left, premised upon Hegelian dialectics, using Bergson's ontology of the actual and the virtual, Nietzsche's ethics of affirmation, and Spinoza's vision of practice as the formation of joyful common notions – themes that reappear in *Empire* and *Multitude*. For all Deleuze's accomplishments, however, he fails to identify the social subject capable of organizing society. Deleuze's work offers 'only the hint of a democratic politics', a 'general orientation that can suggest the paths of future research' into democratic political practice.<sup>6</sup> Hardt and Negri's major contribution to Deleuzian political theory is an attempt to name the social body capable of actualizing Deleuze's vision. The concept of the *multitude* rephrases Deleuze's intuition of a war machine combating the state apparatus, the composition of a joyful political body, and the full social body without organs. Just as Hardt and Negri seek to go 'beyond' Marx in their renovation of Marx's method for contemporary circumstances, they seek to go 'beyond' Deleuze by fabricating a concept of political subjectivity for postmodernity.

This article challenges Hardt and Negri's assessment of Deleuze's political theory. Though Deleuze appreciated Negri's work on Spinoza and sought his colleague's freedom from Italian incarceration in the 1970s, Deleuze anticipated Negri's use of his philosophy and tried to ward it off.<sup>7</sup> From his 1970s writings collected in *Books for Burning* to his collaborative work with Hardt, Negri has maintained certain Marxist-Leninist assumptions: that the agent of political change is the proletariat; the means of political transformation is revolution; and the *telos* of politics is the end of sovereignty. For Deleuze, on the other hand, the left should organize itself in assemblages, or 'constellations of singularities', the

means of political transformation should be exercised cautiously and experimentally, and the end of politics is a more free and egalitarian political order. Initially, this article presents Hardt and Negri's interpretation and critique of Deleuze's politics; then it considers Deleuze's response to Negri's demands for left unity and Deleuze's construction of a new political arrangement. This article aims to rescue Deleuze's political theory from arguably his most famous advocates (and critics) and to explicate Deleuze's contribution to the postmodern left.

This intervention is necessary, in part, because many commentators see only a 'zone of indistinction' between the political theories of Hardt, Negri, Deleuze, and Guattari.<sup>8</sup> In *Deleuze, Marx, and Politics*, for example, Nicholas Thoburn employs Hardt and Negri's work to flesh out the 'virtual Marx circulating throughout Deleuze's political theory'.<sup>9</sup> Each chapter in his book starts off with a suggestive idea in Deleuze's corpus – say, that of a 'minor literature' in Deleuze and Guattari's *Kafka* – and amplifies it with ideas and examples from the Italian traditions of *operaismo* and *autonomia*, of which Negri was a preeminent theorist. For Thoburn, there is a direct link between Deleuze's project and Hardt and Negri's in *Empire*.<sup>10</sup> Philippe Mengue, though much less sympathetic to Hardt and Negri than Thoburn, agrees that they are 'privileged interpreters' of Deleuze's politics.<sup>11</sup> According to Mengue, Deleuze, Hardt, and Negri share contempt for liberalism, democracy, capitalism, culture, the nation state, and civilization. They are romantics yearning for a 'people to come' rather than liberal-democrats striving to intervene effectively in politics.<sup>12</sup> Thoburn and Mengue disagree in their aims: Thoburn produces a 'minor politics' that draws equally from Marx and Deleuze, and Mengue envisions a 'doxological plane of immanence' that relies as much upon Jürgen Habermas as Deleuze. Thoburn and Mengue concur, however, that Deleuze and Guattari's disparaging remarks about capitalism and democracy in *What is Philosophy?* are unremitting, and that Deleuze's political thought finds its fullest expression today in the work of Hardt and Negri. For many commentators on postmodern political theory, Deleuze must be read through the mediators of Hardt and Negri.<sup>13</sup>

Hardt and Negri's overcoding of Deleuze's political theory, I think, risks obscuring Deleuze's distinct contribution to the contemporary left. Deleuze profoundly valued and recast the liberal-democratic concepts of freedom and equality.<sup>14</sup> He also invented a concept of political subjectivity – assemblage – capable of actualizing those ideals. A left assemblage can take the form of a political party, a non-governmental organization, an anti-war rally, a school environmental club, a punk rock collective, a campaign to legalize gay marriage, or any loose and provisional material and expressive body that works for freedom and equality. Deleuze envisioned the left as a network of intersecting and conflicting assemblages – a garden rather than a tree. This article aims to recover Deleuze's vision from Hardt and Negri's presentation and criticism of it.

## Negri on *A Thousand Plateaus*

In an early footnote to *Empire*, Hardt and Negri identify *A Thousand Plateaus* as a model for their own work.<sup>15</sup> In a 1995 essay, Negri expresses his debt to Deleuze and Guattari and unfurls a blueprint for his future work with Hardt. This essay casts light on the Deleuzian themes in *Empire* and *Multitude* and raises a question about political subjectivity that Hardt and Negri ultimately think that Deleuze and Guattari cannot answer.<sup>16</sup>

Negri begins by describing the sad state of present-day philosophy. Hegel and his descendants have prevailed. Historicism – the ideology that all social and cultural phenomena are relative to time and place and thus historically determined<sup>17</sup> – dominates the philosophical terrain. According to historicists such as Richard Rorty and Gianni Vattimo, the philosophical task is to understand and reconcile us to the liberal, democratic, capitalist consensus in Western Europe. Negri expresses only contempt for the ‘relativism and skepticism’ of this branch of post-Hegelian philosophy: ‘History is ended, the hermeneuticians and the post-moderns whisper, and the historicity of being, separated from the constitutivity of being, changes into a syrupy and melancholic *pietas*.’<sup>18</sup> In a refrain that appears throughout Negri’s intellectual histories, certain philosophers debase the constituent power (*potentia*) of human beings in order to appease the constituted Power (*potestas*) of established classes and institutions.<sup>19</sup>

*A Thousand Plateaus*, according to Negri, reenergizes the *Geisteswissenschaften*, or the sciences of spirit or brain. Tracing its lineage back to Machiavelli, Spinoza, Marx, and Nietzsche, this tradition believes that ‘being is constituted by human praxis that organizes itself in universal disunion’.<sup>20</sup> Deleuze and Guattari share with their predecessors a belief that human beings make their own history through labor and conflict. The philosophical task, accordingly, is not simply to understand the world but rather to imagine another one. Deleuze and Guattari revitalize the sciences of spirit by dipping into the ‘alternative, immanentistic, and materialist option of modernity’ in order to grasp the singular possibilities of postmodernity.<sup>21</sup>

Negri expresses admiration for the ability of *A Thousand Plateaus* to conceptualize developments in the material world. The text impressively anticipates and makes sense of technological developments in media, communication, electronics, biology, and ecology.<sup>22</sup> Negri dedicates several pages to examining analytic concepts – such as rhizomatic networks, nomadology, and war machines – that resurface in *Empire* and *Multitude*.

The greatness of *A Thousand Plateaus*, however, resides in its ability to chart a political line for the left. In his essay, Negri tracks how *A Thousand Plateaus* updates at least four Marxist themes.<sup>23</sup> Deleuze and Guattari confront the *historical tendency* of postmodern capitalism. The driving force of capitalism today is no longer industrial labor, but intellectual, affective, symbolic labor. The virtual social presence that Marx designated in the *Grundrisse* as ‘The General Intellect’ has become an actual ‘plane of immanence’ before Deleuze and Guattari’s eyes.<sup>24</sup>

Deleuze and Guattari recognize that the *form of capitalist appropriation* transforms alongside the mode of production. Postmodern capitalism achieves what Marx called the ‘real subsumption’ of society, penetrating the very lives of its members, exercising what Hardt and Negri will later call biopower.<sup>25</sup> *A Thousand Plateaus* sharpens the *antagonism* between the new productive forces and the capitalist state. This is how Negri interprets Deleuze and Guattari’s distinction between war machines and the state: ‘The State cannot be reformed or destroyed: the only possible way of destroying it is to flee it.’<sup>26</sup> Finally, *A Thousand Plateaus* produces a *revolutionary subject* capable of overthrowing capitalism. Can the conceptual persona of *A Thousand Plateaus* ‘be anything else than the new figure of the proletariat, the “General Intellect” as subversion . . . ?’<sup>27</sup> Unfortunately for Negri, Deleuze and Guattari are not as clear on this last point as they could be.

In his essay on *A Thousand Plateaus*, Negri voices gratitude for Deleuze and Guattari’s recharging of the history of philosophy, their conceptual renovation of historical materialism, and their analyses of immaterial capitalism and its control mechanisms. Virtually every page of *Empire* and *Multitude* bears traces of Hardt and Negri’s encounter with Deleuze. Yet Deleuze and Guattari seem to equivocate on naming a revolutionary subject.<sup>28</sup> Hardt and Negri take on the task, we shall see, of hammering out this kink in Deleuze and Guattari’s political theory.

## The Multitude

Negri announced his project with Hardt in a 1990 interview with Deleuze published in *Futur Antérieur*. Here, Negri directly poses to Deleuze the problem of left political subjectivity:

How can minority becoming be powerful? How can resistance become an insurrection? . . . Is there . . . some way for the resistance of the oppressed to become effective, and for what’s intolerable to be definitively removed? Is there some way for the mass of singularities and atoms that we all are to come forward as a constitutive power . . . ?<sup>29</sup>

In the next section, I consider Deleuze’s response to these questions. Now, we may piece together how *Empire* and *Multitude* address these questions by combining elements from the ideas of Deleuze and Lenin.

The multitude designates a social body in which singularities are not required to shed their differences in order to form a common notion.<sup>30</sup> The multitude may be described using numerous concepts from Deleuze’s oeuvre. The multitude, in the terminology of Deleuze’s work on Spinoza, is ‘singularities that act in common’.<sup>31</sup> The multitude is a social body that moves in concert without a transcendent organizing agent, such as capital or the state; in this case, it instantiates *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*’s notion of a body without organs. The multitude combats the state apparatus that seeks to control its movements and capture its innovative force; thus, the multitude embodies the concept of a nomadic war machine. The multitude links a ‘thousand rhizomes’ to constitute an economic,

cultural, and political body – an allusion to Plateau #1 of *A Thousand Plateaus*.<sup>32</sup> The multitude envelops minorities and minoritarian becomings that do not conform to the Marxist ideal of an urban, male, heterosexual, industrial worker; Hardt and Negri accept Deleuze's critique of the mid-20th-century European Marxist left. Hardt and Negri, in sum, use the concept of the multitude to name a political body that diverges from other left subjectivities – such as the people, the masses, or the working class – in its Deleuzian respect for difference in itself.

The concept of the multitude also condenses several of Lenin's insights from *The State and Revolution*.<sup>33</sup> The *agent* of left politics is the proletariat widely conceived as all laboring and exploited people. One of Lenin's persistent themes is that a left political body must be coherent in order to effect real-world change. 'The overthrow of the bourgeoisie can be achieved only by the proletariat becoming transformed into a ruling class'.<sup>34</sup> The *means* of political transformation is revolution, violent if needs be. One of Lenin's purposes in writing the book is precisely to challenge 'opportunists' such as Karl Kautsky who try to blunt Marxism's revolutionary edge. Reformists who think that capitalists will simply give back what they have robbed from the workers want a revolutionary end without revolutionary means. According to Lenin, 'The replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution'.<sup>35</sup> Finally, the *telos* of communist politics is the abolition of sovereignty. For Lenin, the left political party must first seize controls of the bourgeois state, replace it with a proletariat state, and then begin the process of dismantling the state itself. In communism, 'the need for violence against people in general, for the subordination of one person to another, of one section of the population to another, will vanish altogether'.<sup>36</sup> Hardt and Negri, however, reject Lenin's thesis that a vanguard is necessary to lead the proletariat to socialism and then to communism.<sup>37</sup>

Is the multitude really a Leninist concept?<sup>38</sup> It is worth reviewing how *Empire* and *Multitude* repeat Lenin's account of the agent, means, and end of politics. The multitude designates the postmodern proletariat, 'all those whose labor is directly or indirectly exploited by and subjected to capitalist norms of production and reproduction'.<sup>39</sup> In early 20th-century Russia, Lenin privileged the professional factory worker as the model proletarian; today, we see how a wider swath of the population contributes to immaterial production. 'What we should adopt from Lenin is a project of reading the real and present composition of the working class and interpreting its subjectivity, its needs for organized expression'.<sup>40</sup> It is perfectly congruous with Leninism to conceptualize the proletariat differently a century after Lenin. Next, Hardt and Negri share Lenin's belief that revolutionary politics must grasp 'the moment of rupture or *clinamen* that can create a new world'.<sup>41</sup> *Empire* and *Multitude* propose rights and reforms that have struck many commentators as mild, and Hardt and Negri diverge from Lenin on military tactics (the mobilization of swarm intelligence rather than of a hierarchical army) and principles (defensive rather than offensive). Once again, Hardt and Negri distinguish Lenin's principles from his historically contingent judgments. For both

sets of theorists, the proletariat's task is to smash the bourgeois state and create a new society. Lastly, Hardt and Negri aspire to surpass the era of sovereignty. The concept of the multitude forges a path between sovereignty and anarchy by naming a horizontal political force capable of making decisions without a transcendent ruler. 'The multitude banishes sovereignty from politics'.<sup>42</sup> Hardt and Negri consistently emphasize that a communist insurrection today must be led by the entire multitude, not by an elite vanguard. So, Hardt and Negri do not present themselves as orthodox Leninists. But they do take up his project of producing a 'coherent revolutionary subject strong enough to meet the contemporary needs of the class struggle'.<sup>43</sup>

As a result of their encounter with Lenin, Hardt and Negri – perhaps the most celebrated Deleuzians in contemporary political theory – distance themselves from Deleuze's politics. In one of the only extended passages on Deleuze in *Empire* or *Multitude*, Hardt and Negri praise Guattari and him for diagnosing the machinery of contemporary society, but castigate them for offering such poor prognoses.

Deleuze and Guattari present us with a properly poststructuralist understanding of biopower that renews materialist thought and grounds itself solidly in the question of the production of social being . . . Deleuze and Guattari, however, seem to be able to conceive positively only the tendencies toward continuous movement and absolute flows, and thus in their thought, too, the creative elements and the radical ontology of the production of the social remain insubstantial and impotent.<sup>44</sup>

This passage shifts Negri's earlier assessment in his essay on *A Thousand Plateaus*. Now, Deleuze fails to heed Marx's injunction in the *Theses on Feuerbach* to transform the world rather than to understand it. Deleuze seems complicit with postmodern capitalism, to enjoy its deterritorializing flows. Deleuze's political thought is thus 'insubstantial' and 'impotent'.

Ironically, Hardt and Negri concede many of the points raised by Deleuze's sharpest critics on the left such as Alain Badiou, Slavoj Žižek, and Peter Hallward. In a notorious polemic, Žižek accuses Deleuze of being indifferent to real-world events. Deleuze's glorification of the virtual makes him 'an ideologist of today's "digital capitalism"', and his valorization of nomads working in open networks reinforces the operations of global capitalism.<sup>45</sup> By not naming an agent capable of overthrowing capitalism or affecting a cultural revolution – by not, in short, learning Lenin's or Mao's lessons – Deleuze is an inconsequential political thinker. Ultimately, Hardt and Negri agree with Žižek that Deleuze does not sufficiently empower the left to change the world.

## Deleuze on Left Dogmatism

Deleuze anticipates and contests a Marxist-Leninist interpretation and appropriation of his work in his book on Foucault. Refracting Foucault's ideas and themes through his own philosophical prism, Deleuze praises Foucault for 'abandoning a

certain number of postulates which have traditionally marked the position of the left'.<sup>46</sup> The dogmatic image of leftist thought supposes that power is a property that may be won by an economic class; that power is located in the machinery of the state; that economic power undergirds state power; that power is an essence that may be transferred from dominators to dominated; that the bourgeoisie maintain power through violence or ideology; and that the revolutionary aim is to win power and install a new legal machinery. Deleuze acknowledges that, in Marx's wake, many leftists are rethinking key political notions. Yet Deleuze rebukes leftists who retain or reintegrate certain Marxist-Leninist elements such as the demand for general centralization.<sup>47</sup> Deleuze's critique of Hardt and Negri, then, is that they endorse Marxist-Leninist postulates about the proletariat, revolution, and the end of sovereignty.<sup>48</sup>

In his 1990 interview with Negri, Deleuze refutes the Leninist assumptions embedded in Negri's political imagination. First, 'there's no longer any image of proletarians around of which it's just a matter of becoming conscious'.<sup>49</sup> Deleuze's point is not that the proletariat as a class has vanished, nor that the left should ignore workers' struggles, but that the concept of the proletariat determines too many issues in advance. In a rare occurrence of the term 'proletariat' in *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari remark that 'as long as the working class defines itself by an acquired status' it 'does not leave the plan(e) of capital'.<sup>50</sup> For Deleuze, the concept of proletariat works within a dichotomy – capitalism or communism – that the left should elude. The challenge for the left is to envision 'landscapes, characters, and behavior that are different from those to which traditional history, even of the Marxist variety, has made us accustomed'.<sup>51</sup>

Second, Deleuze demystifies the concept of revolution. Historical revolutions, Deleuze observes, almost always end up badly: the English Revolution led to Cromwell, the French Revolution gave us Napoleon, and the Bolshevik Revolution bolstered Stalin. Deleuze, like Kant, thinks that revolutions are dangerous and almost never change people's minds in a positive way.<sup>52</sup> Men's only hope,' Deleuze explains, 'lies in a revolutionary becoming'.<sup>53</sup> 'Becoming revolutionary' is a much more cautious form of political change than Lenin's 'experience of revolution'. Becoming revolutionary entails surveying the political landscape, attaining a certain degree of political power, inside or outside of the state, testing out new laws, policies, and rhetorics, and preserving the admirable elements of the society in which one lives.<sup>54</sup> 'As a rule immanent to experimentation', Deleuze explains, 'injections of caution'.<sup>55</sup> The best available option for the left in capitalist societies is to invent axioms and theorems that can steer economic forces in positive directions.<sup>56</sup>

Third, Deleuze does not think that communism, as a social condition after sovereignty, is desirable or viable. Deleuze responds to Negri, and the Marxist-Leninist tradition in general, in the discussion of the state and the war machine in *A Thousand Plateaus*. A state is defined by 'the perpetuation or conservation of organs of power'; it is the sovereign power that undertakes large-scale projects,

constitutes surpluses, and accomplishes public functions.<sup>57</sup> A war machine, by contrast, ‘exists only in its own metamorphoses’, as a scientific, technological, industrial, commercial, religious, or philosophical force that flees or punctures the containment of the state.<sup>58</sup> Negri, we have seen, interprets Deleuze’s political project of simply siding with the war machines against the state. For Deleuze, however, states and war machines coexist and compete ‘in a perpetual field of interaction’.<sup>59</sup> The great political question, for Deleuze, is how to draw the line between the state and the war machine, to strike the optimum balance between chaos and order, to take advantage of the life-affirming forces of metamorphosis without risking one’s individual or collective life.<sup>60</sup> For Deleuze, eliminating sovereignty, the political form of interiority, is suicidal, akin to injecting heroin to become a body without organs. It is far better to use a ‘very fine file’ to open up the political body to new possibilities than to wield a sledgehammer to obliterate its contours.<sup>61</sup>

In the next section, we examine in more detail Deleuze’s positive contribution to contemporary political thought. Now, we can observe how Deleuze’s critique of Leninist political thought continues to strike a nerve. Peter Hallward has recently argued that Deleuze prefers to investigate the mechanics of *dis-embodiment* and *de-materialization* than to promote concrete political change.<sup>62</sup> Hallward justifies his claim that Deleuze is an ‘*extra-worldly*’ philosopher by highlighting affinities between Deleuze’s philosophy and Neoplatonism, mysticism, pantheism, and theophanism. According to these traditions, the ethical task is to transcend oneself, not necessarily to reach a higher realm of being, but to access a greater creative force, whether one calls it God or a conceptual equivalent (energy, life, pure potential, the plane of immanence, etc.). Politics, for these philosophies, is beside the point. According to Hallward, Deleuze’s work offers an ‘immaterial and evanescent grip’ on the mechanisms of capitalist exploitation.<sup>63</sup> The politics of the future, instead, depends on ‘more resilient forms of cohesion’, ‘more principled forms of commitment’, and ‘more integrated forms of coordination’.<sup>64</sup> For Hallward, the contemporary left should turn to Lenin, not Deleuze, to theorize political subjectivity.

Deleuze would protest Hallward’s reading of his philosophy as well as the framing of the problem of left-wing thought. Hallward accentuates the moment in Deleuze’s thought in which he presses us to loosen the limitations that close us off from the virtual, but Hallward minimizes the complementary moment in Deleuze’s thought in which he invites us to embrace what has been created. In *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Deleuze utilizes Nietzsche’s image of the dicethrow to depict these two moments: ‘The dice which are thrown once are the affirmation of *chance*, the combination which they form on falling is the affirmation of *necessity*’.<sup>65</sup> Hallward furthermore accuses Deleuze of favoring contemplation over action based upon his conception of philosophy as the ‘creation of concepts’. Paul Patton raises a simple, but powerful objection to this line of argument: ‘Philosophy is not politics’.<sup>66</sup> In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze consistently juxtaposes

two sets of principles, the first pressing us to open our individual and social bodies to new ideas and experiences, the second to incorporate those ideas and experiences into our personal and political identities. *A Thousand Plateaus* insists that politics is about transforming the material world: ‘molecular escapes and movements would be nothing if they did not return to the molar organizations to reshuffle their segments, their binary distributions of sexes, classes, and parties’.<sup>67</sup> For Deleuze, philosophy may be about exploring the higher and lower reaches of this world – what he calls the virtual – but politics is about bringing these insights to bear on the actual world.

Deleuze and Guattari had leftist critics such as Hardt, Negri, Žižek, and Hallward in mind when *A Thousand Plateaus* declares: ‘We’re tired of trees.’<sup>68</sup> Hardt and Negri claim that the multitude is not a dogmatic concept because it does not have a transcendent organ. The problem with trees, however, is not that they have a head, but that they have a trunk. The trunk, in this case, is the postulate that a left political body should organize the proletariat, to enact a revolution, to surpass sovereignty. Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of arborescent leftism resonates with John Stuart Mill’s and Alexis de Tocqueville’s fears in *On Liberty* and *Democracy in America* about the ‘tyranny of the majority’. ‘A king’, Tocqueville observes, ‘has only a material power that acts on actions and cannot reach wills; but the majority is vested with a force, at once material and moral, that acts on the will as much as on actions’.<sup>69</sup> Deleuze, like Mill and Tocqueville, would not be comforted by Hardt and Negri’s claim that they renounce Lenin’s belief that the proletariat must be led by a vanguard. A vanguard may strike the body, but a multitude ‘draws a formidable circle around thought’.<sup>70</sup> For Deleuze, the left needs a new conceptual armory that is not tied to the Marxist-Leninist image of politics.

## Left Assemblages

The aim of this article is to recover Deleuze’s contribution to the contemporary left. The starting point of this section is Deleuze’s 1989 interview with Claire Parnet in which he explains what it means to be a leftist (*homme de gauche*).<sup>71</sup> Then, we connect these reflections with the analysis of abstract machines and assemblages in *A Thousand Plateaus*. This section defends Deleuze against Hardt and Negri’s accusation that his philosophy lacks a concept of left political subjectivity.<sup>72</sup> Positively, it advocates Deleuze’s concept of left assemblages as protean coalitions that articulate and enact the ideals of liberty and equality.

What, Parnet asks Deleuze, does it mean to be ‘on the left’? Deleuze specifies two components of the left that transform the conceptual apparatus of the liberal and democratic traditions.<sup>73</sup> The left is ‘a phenomenon of perception’. To be on the right means starting from one’s own concerns and interests and moving outwards, to other people, cities, countries, and species. Citizens of wealthy industrial countries tend to think first about their own financial status, then the gross

domestic product of the country, and then, remotely, the effects of global capitalism on other people, regions, animals, or plants. The left strives to invert this perspective. Being on the left means discovering that ‘Third World problems . . . are often closer to us than the problems in our own neighborhoods’.<sup>74</sup> Deleuze, here, refashions the concept of *equality*. Rather than focus on the equivalence between identical beings, Deleuze encourages us to situate ourselves mentally in the place of intrinsically different beings. In other words, Deleuze proposes one way that a post-identitarian metaphysics can still support the left’s concern with reducing inequality.<sup>75</sup>

The left is also ‘never of the majority’. In Deleuze’s precise terminology, a majority is a constant or standard used to measure other beings. In western political thought, the majority is often implicitly an ‘average adult-white-heterosexual-male-speaking a standard language’.<sup>76</sup> Ontologically, no being ever measures up exactly to this standard; the majority is literally an empty set. Ethically, however, beings can suffer by torturing themselves to conform to the standard. A minoritarian becoming refuses to fit into a mold. A minoritarian becoming – in language common to both Deleuze and Mill – is a plant that grows and develops according to the tendency of its inward forces.<sup>77</sup> The concept of minoritarian, then, revitalizes the concept of *liberty*. Deleuze radicalizes Mill’s thought, however, by emphasizing that liberty means transforming our desires as well as being unconstrained and empowered to achieve our present desires.<sup>78</sup> The left, in Deleuze’s final assessment, is ‘the aggregate of processes of minoritarian becomings’.<sup>79</sup> This definition expresses the way the left maintains a tension between the ideal of unity (‘an aggregate of processes’) and plurality (‘of minoritarian becomings’).

Deleuze’s 1989 interview enables us to reconstruct the left political theory of *A Thousand Plateaus*. In this text, Deleuze and Guattari create two concepts – abstract machine and assemblage – to designate how the left exists in thought and in extension. Ideationally, the left is an abstract machine, an incorporeal power that pilots the formation of assemblages.<sup>80</sup> An abstract machine shapes a body’s content and expression. Patton provides a helpful example of an abstract machine: a software program that turns a computer into a calculating or a gaming machine.<sup>81</sup> *A Thousand Plateaus* offers a political example: Lenin’s 1917 text, ‘On Slogans’, was an abstract machine that piloted the Bolshevik Revolution.<sup>82</sup> An abstract machine is not a Platonic idea, waiting in the ether for philosophers to discover it. An abstract machine is ‘singular and immanent’: singular insofar as its meaning is contingent to its time and place and immanent insofar as it dwells on the intellectual register of the plane on which we live.<sup>83</sup> The abstract machine of the left, in short, provides some unity to assemblages committed to the concepts of liberty and equality, but also offers a wide latitude to how assemblages contain and express those ideals.<sup>84</sup>

Materially, the left becomes concrete in assemblages. In the ontology of *A Thousand Plateaus*, there is a single ‘flow of matter-movement’ that courses through the universe. This flow of matter-movement differentiates itself, under

the piloting of abstract machines, into assemblages. An assemblage is a 'constellation of singularities and traits deduced from the flow'.<sup>85</sup> Order emerges out of chaos through assemblages. The brilliance of the concept of assemblages is that it describes an entity that has both consistency and fuzzy borders. A political assemblage – a city, state, party, or international order – has some coherence in what it says and what it does, but it continually dissolves and morphs into something new. An anti-war rally, for example, is an assemblage whose numbers of participants may change by the moment and whose messages may conflict with and complement each other. An assemblage perpetually transforms itself, like a cloud that pulls together and loses water molecules, or a human body that replenishes its cells.<sup>86</sup>

We may now pull together Deleuze's reflections on left assemblages. Left assemblages are semi-coherent political entities that express and work for the ideals of liberty and equality. They are steered by a plurality of abstract machines – often referred to by the names and dates in which they initially become manifest, e.g. the 1917 Lenin abstract machine or the 1927 John Dewey abstract machine – that often clash with one another. Being on the left means acknowledging that the virtual ideas of liberty and equality may never be definitively defined or actually realized. The abstract machine, or diagram, of the left is 'highly unstable or fluid, continually churning up matter and functions in a way likely to create change'.<sup>87</sup> Leftist ideas and practices are 'essentially contestable'.<sup>88</sup> Left assemblages operate on several spatial scales, from individuals to friendship networks, institutions, cities, nation states, and international bodies.<sup>89</sup> There is no guarantee that they will fit together in their ideals, aims, strategies, and tactics. The concept of assemblages, in short, displays a tragic vision of politics, in which ambiguity and conflict are unlikely to be resolved.<sup>90</sup>

The concept of left assemblages differs in at least three ways from the concept of the multitude. First, left assemblages may or may not fight for the working class. Environmental groups, for example, may decide that 'perceiving on the horizon' means protecting endangered animals rather than fighting for class interests. The alliance between environmentalists and labor unionists in Seattle in 1999, though remarkable, was temporary and fragile.<sup>91</sup> For Deleuze, Hardt and Negri's claim that left assemblages may magically cohere like Joseph's magical coat<sup>92</sup> repeats a Leninist fiction ('the united front') that should be dismantled. Second, left assemblages are not committed to revolution. In fact, the great political principle of *A Thousand Plateaus* – 'gently tip the assemblage'<sup>93</sup> – suggests that revolution is a poor strategy for actualizing the ideals of liberty and equality. Finally, left assemblages appreciate the possibilities as well as the dangers of sovereignty. War machines may help new identities cross the threshold of being, but states are needed to protect these identities in the long term.

The multitude is a left assemblage, but left assemblages are not necessarily the multitude. Hardt and Negri insist that *the* multitude is necessary to constitute society, 'to make decisions and act in common'.<sup>94</sup> Deleuze's whole political philosophy

recoils at this demand. Deleuze constructed the concept of assemblages precisely to show how the left could nurture diversity and disagreement. For Deleuze, the left can harbor deep differences within itself between environmentalists and industrialists, theists and atheists, traditional-value workers and liberal capitalists.<sup>95</sup> Deleuze and Guattari were tired of leftists who tried to unite the branches of the left to a common ideological trunk. They envisioned a left that prizes ‘underground stems and aerial roots, adventitious growths and rhizomes’, temporary and surprising campaigns that would assemble different constituencies for political action and then dissolve.<sup>96</sup> This concept of political subjectivity, for Hardt and Negri, does not pack the force necessary to overthrow capitalism. Deleuze would reply that the concept of the multitude is a seed that wants to grow into an oak tree. The left may be strong enough to permit the presence of militant communists, but it should seek to cultivate a more modest ethos among its members. Deleuze and Guattari create the concept of assemblage to help the left envision political bodies that may ‘gently tip’ society in the direction of freedom and equality. Left assemblages can still effect profound changes – e.g. to address global warming or to distribute global wealth – but they recognize that ‘a too-sudden destratification may be suicidal’.<sup>97</sup> For Deleuze, leftists must comport themselves with both militancy and self-restraint, a desire for transformation and care.

Bobbio’s analysis of the left may help us sharpen the positions and the stakes of the debate between Deleuze, Hardt, and Negri. The left differs from the right in its concern with equality. The extreme left seeks to achieve an egalitarian society through a ‘sudden leap forward’ or a ‘clean break’, and the moderate left promotes gradual change through the institutions of liberal and democratic societies.<sup>98</sup> The extreme left flirts with authoritarianism and violence, and the moderate left prizes liberty and respect for other partisans. Hardt and Negri, on this map, are on the extreme left: they desire ‘an unlimited destruction of the present . . . to construct a new world with unlimited creativity’.<sup>99</sup> Deleuze is on the moderate left: he prefers ‘local and specific struggles’ to cataclysmic events, jurisprudence to revolution.<sup>100</sup> Bobbio’s schema helps us see that Hardt and Negri do not fill in a hole in Deleuze’s political theory; rather, they appropriate his ideas for a political position that Deleuze vigorously opposed.

Why does this matter? *A Thousand Plateaus* is arguably the great political treatise of 20th-century French postmodernism, a text that incorporates the insights of Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, Lyotard, and Virilio and that confronts many of the perplexing scientific, technological, cultural, political, and philosophical developments of our time. *A Thousand Plateaus* expresses a political vision that invites everyone to participate in the Nietzschean task of self-overcoming, a radicalization of both liberalism and democracy. *A Thousand Plateaus* may enter the tradition of political philosophy as a text that shapes the political imagination as dramatically as Spinoza’s *Theological-Political Treatise* or Marx’s *Communist Manifesto*. Unfortunately, Hardt and Negri – arguably the most famous ‘Deleuzians’ in contemporary political theory – dismiss Deleuze’s politics as incomplete and impotent. This

article has aimed to recover Deleuze's vision of the left as an abstract machine effectuated in a plurality of interlocking and contending assemblages working for liberty and equality.

## Acknowledgements

This essay benefited from the comments of Peter Cannavó, Francois Debrix, Kennan Ferguson, Harry Gould, Peter Hallward, Mack Marianni, Guy McMichael, Nicholas Onuf, Stephen Orvis, Paul Passavant, Sharon Rivera, Federico Siniscalco, Jesse Tampio, Lars Tønder, participants at the 2005 ISA-South Conference, and anonymous reviewers.

## Notes

1. Norberto Bobbio (1996) *Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction*, tr. Allan Cameron. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2. Ibid. p. 24.
3. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000) *Empire*, p. xvi. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
4. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2004) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
5. Michael Hardt (1993) *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy*, p. xv. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
6. Ibid. p. 122.
7. Gilles Deleuze (2006) *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews 1975–1995*, ed. David Lapoujade, tr. Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina, pp. 169–74, 190–3. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
8. Antonio Negri and Félix Guattari invoke a revolutionary subject capable of aggregating the new proletariat in (1990) *Communists Like Us*. New York: Semiotext(e). Is Deleuze a communist like Negri and Guattari? Though Deleuze appreciates Marx's analysis of capitalism – particularly the tendency of capital to set and transgress its own limits – Deleuze never called himself a communist, and his political philosophy aims to create concepts for a non-communist left. In interviews and essays, Deleuze and Guattari acknowledged that they understood many of the concepts in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* in different ways. See the discussion of Deleuze and Guattari's working method in Daniel W. Smith (2006) 'Inside Out: Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus Papers*', *Radical Philosophy* 140: 35–9. In this article, I interpret the concept of assemblage in *A Thousand Plateaus* in light of Deleuze's writings and interviews and contrast it with Hardt and Negri's concept of the multitude. For an account of Guattari's politics, see Gary Genosko (2002) *Félix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction*. London: Continuum.
9. Nicholas Thoburn (2003) *Deleuze, Marx and Politics*, p. 1. New York: Routledge.
10. Ibid. p. 11. Thoburn criticizes Hardt and Negri's concept of the multitude for discouraging 'attention to the multiplicity, conflict and alternate trajectories of social arrangements' in (2006) 'Vacuoles of Noncommunication: Minor Politics, Communist Style, and the Multitude', in Ian Buchanan and Adrian Parr (eds) *Deleuze and the Contemporary World*, pp. 42–56. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
11. Philippe Mengue (2005) 'The Absent People and the Void of Democracy', tr. Simon Tormey, *Contemporary Political Theory* 4: 393.
12. Ibid. p. 396.
13. See e.g. Alberto Toscano (2005) 'Marx + Antonio Negri,' in Adrian Parr (ed.) *The*

- Deleuze Dictionary*, pp. 154–6. New York: Columbia University Press. For a critique of Hardt and Negri's claim to extend Deleuze's legacy, see Kam Shapiro (2004) 'The Myth of the Multitude', in Paul Passavant and Jodi Dean (eds) *Empire's New Clothes*, pp. 289–314. New York: Routledge.
14. This article aligns itself with the work of certain Anglo-American political theorists who read Deleuze as an immanent critic of liberalism and democracy, one who transforms liberal-democratic concepts such as normativity, freedom, equality, and judgment and invents new ones that circumvent the western philosophical tradition's emphasis on coherent subjectivities. See Paul Patton (2005) 'Deleuze and Democracy', *Contemporary Political Theory* 4: 400–13. Daniel W. Smith (2003) 'Deleuze and the Liberal Tradition: Normativity, Freedom and Judgement', *Economy and Society* 32(2): 299–324. William E. Connolly (2005) *Pluralism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
  15. Hardt and Negri (n. 3), p. 415.
  16. Antonio Negri (1995) 'On Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*', tr. Charles T. Wolfe, *Graduate Faculty Philosophical Journal* 18(1): 93–109. Michael Hardt's reading notes on *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* are available online (consulted Aug. 2007): <http://www.duke.edu/~hardt/Deleuze&Guattari.html>
  17. See 'Historicism', in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. URL (consulted Aug. 2007): Oed.com
  18. Negri (n. 16), p. 97.
  19. See, for instance, Antonio Negri (1999) *Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State*, tr. Maurizia Boscagli. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
  20. Negri (n. 16), p. 83.
  21. *Ibid.* p. 108.
  22. *Ibid.* p. 98.
  23. See the section on Marx's method in Hardt and Negri (n. 4), pp. 140–53.
  24. Negri (n. 16), p. 104.
  25. *Ibid.*
  26. *Ibid.* p. 102.
  27. *Ibid.*
  28. See Michael Hardt (2005) 'Into the Factory: Negri's Lenin and the Subjective Caesura', in Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (eds) *Resistance in Practice: The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, p. 14. Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
  29. Gilles Deleuze (1995) *Negotiations*, tr. Martin Joughin, p. 173. New York: Columbia University Press.
  30. For an alternate account of the multitude that also emerges out of the Italian radical left, see Paolo Virno (2004) *The Grammar of the Multitude*, tr. Isabella Bertolotti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson. New York: Semiotext(e). See also Robyn Marasco (2006) 'A Grammar of Hope in an Age of Empire?', *Theory and Event* 9(4).
  31. Negri registers his debt to Deleuze's reading of Spinoza in *Negri on Negri*, tr. M. B. DeBevoise, pp. 149–50. New York: Routledge.
  32. Hardt and Negri (n. 4), p. 349.
  33. *Ibid.* pp. 348–58. On the strangeness of Hardt and Negri's proposal to combine the politics of Lenin and Madison, see Timothy W. Luke (2006) 'Immaterial Labor and Democracy in *Multitude*', *Political Theory* 34(3): 365–71. On how Deleuze and Guattari rethink the Leninist image of the political party, see Simon Tormey and Jules Townshend (2006) *Key Thinkers from Critical Theory to Post-Marxism*, pp. 7–8, 38–62. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
  34. V. I. Lenin (1992) *The State and Revolution*, tr. Robert Service, p. 24. New York: Penguin Books.
  35. *Ibid.* p. 21.

36. Ibid. p. 74.
37. Ibid. p. 25.
38. See Slavoj Žižek (2001) 'Have Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri Rewritten the *Communist Manifesto* for the Twenty-First Century?', *Rethinking Marxism* 13(3/4): 190–8.
39. Hardt and Negri (n. 3), p. 52.
40. Hardt (n. 28), p. 21.
41. Hardt and Negri (n. 4), p. 357.
42. Ibid. p. 340.
43. Hardt (n. 28), p. 24.
44. Hardt and Negri (n. 3), p. 28.
45. Slavoj Žižek (2004) *Organs without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences*, pp. xii, 193–5. New York: Routledge.
46. Gilles Deleuze (1988) *Foucault*, tr. Seán Hand, pp. 24–5. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
47. Ibid. pp. 24–30.
48. For a critique of Hardt and Negri's formulation of the problem of political articulation, see Ernesto Laclau (2004) 'Can Immanence Explain Social Struggles?' in Passavant and Dean (n. 13), pp. 21–30. Bradley J. MacDonald (2006) *Performing Marx: Contemporary Negotiations of a Living Tradition*, pp. 113–37. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Terrell Carver (2006) 'Less than Full Marx', *Political Theory* 34(3): 351–64.
49. Deleuze (n. 29), p. 173.
50. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, tr. Brian Massumi, p. 472. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
51. Deleuze (n. 46), p. 25.
52. See the references to Kant in Deleuze and Guattari (1994) *What is Philosophy?*, tr. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press. For a critique of the theme of 'redemptive violence' on the contemporary left, see Christopher J. Finlay (2006) 'Violence and Revolutionary Subjectivity: Marx to Žižek', *European Journal of Political Theory* 5(4): 373–97.
53. Deleuze (n. 29), p. 171.
54. 'This is how it should be done: Lodge yourself on a stratum, experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, find potential movements of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjunctions here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times.' Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 161.
55. Ibid. p. 150.
56. For an application of Deleuze and Guattari's account of the capitalist axiomatic, see William E. Connolly (2008) *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Also Ian Buchanan and Adriann Parr (2006) 'Introduction', in Parr and Buchanan (n. 10), pp. 1–20.
57. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), pp. 357, 359.
58. Ibid. p. 360.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid. p. 203. See also Paul Patton (2006) 'Order, Exteriority and Flat Multiplicities in the Social', in Martin Fuglsang and Bent Meier Sorensen (eds) *Deleuze and the Social*, pp. 21–38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
61. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 160.
62. Peter Hallward (2006) *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*, p. 3. New York: Verso.
63. Ibid. p. 162.

64. Ibid.
65. Gilles Deleuze (1986) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, tr. Hugh Tomlinson, p. 26. New York: Columbia University Press.
66. Patton (n. 14), p. 409.
67. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), pp. 216–17.
68. Ibid. p. 15.
69. Alexis de Tocqueville (2000) *Democracy in America*, tr. Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop, p. 243. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
70. Ibid. p. 244.
71. Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet (1989) *L'Abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze*, tr. Charles Stivale, 'G as in "Gauche"'. URL (consulted Oct. 2004): <http://www.langlab.wayne.edu/CStivale/D-G/ABC2.html>
72. On the question of whether Deleuze and Guattari actually create a political theory, see Tormey and Townshend (n. 33).
73. Smith (n. 14), p. 301.
74. Deleuze and Parnet (n. 71).
75. Deleuze's idea to 'perceive the horizon' calls to mind the discussion of an 'enlarged mentality' in Hannah Arendt (1982) *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*, ed. Ronald Beiner, pp. 106–9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
76. Deleuze and Guattari (1987), p. 105.
77. John Stuart Mill (2003) *On Liberty*, ed. David Bromwich and George Kateb, p. 124. New Haven: Yale University Press. Mill seems to believe that our inward forces have a natural *telos*, while Deleuze seems more interested in what we can make those forces do.
78. For an account of Deleuze's conception of transgressive freedom, see Paul Patton (2000) *Deleuze and the Political*, pp. 83–87. New York: Routledge.
79. Deleuze and Parnet (n. 71).
80. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 141.
81. Patton (n. 60), p. 31.
82. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 83.
83. Ibid. p. 510.
84. On the possibility of the United States Constitution as an abstract machine, see Jeffrey A. Bell (2006) *Philosophy at the Edge of Chaos: Gilles Deleuze and the Philosophy of Difference*, pp. 217–18. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
85. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 406.
86. Ibid. p. 249.
87. Deleuze (n. 46), p. 35.
88. For a comparison of Deleuze's and William Connolly's notions of philosophical concepts, see Paul Patton (n. 78), pp. 13–14.
89. See Manuel DeLanda (2006) 'Deleuzian Social Ontology and Assemblage Theory', in Fuglsang and Sorensen (n. 61), pp. 250–66, and Aihwa Ong and Stephen J. Collier (eds) (2005) *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
90. In his 1989 interview with Parnet, Deleuze remarks that the best that the left can hope for is a government favorable to some of its demands. Still, from a Deleuzian perspective, it is a shame that Marie-Ségolène Royal did not win the French presidency, especially given Nicolas Sarkozy's overt contempt for the events of 1968. See William Pfaff (2007), 'In Sarkoland', *New York Review of Books* (14 June): 34–9.
91. See John C. Berg (ed.) (2003) *Teamsters and Turtles? U.S. Progressive Political Movements in the 21st Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
92. Hardt and Negri (n. 4), p. xiv.

93. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 161.
94. Hardt and Negri (n. 4), p. 223.
95. For an exploration of how Deleuze transforms the pluralist imaginary, see William E. Connolly (1999) 'Assembling the Left', *boundary 2* 26(3): 47–54.
96. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 15. On the distinction between (arborescent) movements and (rhizomatic) campaigns, see Richard Rorty (1998) *Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America*, pp. 111–24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
97. Deleuze and Guattari (n. 50), p. 503.
98. Bobbio (n. 1), p. 22.
99. Hardt (n. 28), p. 30.
100. See Alexandre Lefebvre (2005) 'A New Image of Law: Deleuze and Jurisprudence', *Telos* 130: 103–26.