



PROJECT MUSE®

An American Body | Politic

Herzogenrath, Bernd

Published by Dartmouth College Press

Herzogenrath, Bernd.

An American Body | Politic: A Deleuzian Approach.

Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2010.

Project MUSE., <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/15061>

NOTES

Introduction

1. See also Le Goff, "Head or Heart?"
2. See also Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned*, and J. Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic*.
3. See Matthews, "The Snake Devices."
4. More than twenty years later, in December 1775, Franklin, under the pseudonym An American Guesser, wrote a letter to the editor of the *Pennsylvania Journal* that was published with the headline "The Rattle-Snake as a Symbol of America." In this letter, Franklin pointed out the rattlesnake's "vigilance . . . magnanimity and true courage," properties that made it a symbol of the "temper and conduct of America" (*Writings* 744–46).
5. See Sommer, "Emblem and Device."
6. Fittingly, Thomas Jefferson called Adams "the colossus of independence" (quoted in McCullough, *John Adams* 163).
7. See Laclau, *Emancipation(s)* and *The Making of Political Identities*; Mouffe, *Deconstruction and The Return of the Political*; and Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony*.
8. See, for example, Bercaw, *Gender*; Berry, *Postcommunism*; Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments*; Cherniavski, *Incorporations*; Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; Henley, *Body Politics*; Hess, *Reconstituting the Body Politic*; Holland, *The Body Politic*; Hunt, *Eroticism*; L. Johnson, *Death*; Kaminsky, *Reading the Body Politic*; J. Sweet, *Bodies Politic*; and Weitz, *The Politics of Women's Bodies*.
9. In a conversation with Michel Foucault, Deleuze claimed that "a theory is exactly like a box of tools. It has nothing to do with the signifier. It must be useful. It must function" (Deleuze and Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power" 208).
10. I am borrowing the phrase "unlikely alliance" from Judith Butler, who uses it to express her critical stance toward the adaptation of Deleuzian thought by feminism or ecocriticism: "Indeed, some have argued that a rethinking of 'nature' as a set of dynamic interrelations suits both feminism and ecological aims (and has for some produced an otherwise unlikely alliance with the work of Gilles Deleuze)" (*Bodies That Matter* 4). These "dynamic interrelations" not only *within* nature, but also *between* nature and culture, will be a focal point of my study.
11. Blurb on the back cover of *Revisionary Interventions into the Americanist Canon*, edited by Donald E. Pease (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994), which is a reprint of a special issue of *boundary 2*, 17 no. 1 (Spring 1990).

Chapter 0. Body|Theory|Politic: Body|Theory

1. A far from exhaustive list would include such diverse works as T. Armstrong, *American Bodies*; Birke, *Feminism*; Brackenridge, *Body Matters*; Cash and Pruzinsky, *Body Image*; Conboy, Medina, and Stanbury, *Writing on the Body*; Davis, *Embodied Practices*; Falk, *The Consuming Body*; Featherstone, *The Body*; Fishwick, *The Body*; Gatens, *Imaginary Bodies*; Gimlin, *Body Work*; Goldstein, *The Male Body*; Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*; Halberstam and Livingston, *Postmodern Bodies*; Hancock, *The Body*; Hassard, *Body and Organization*; Jacobus, Keller, and Shuttleworth, *Body/Politics*; Jagger, *Gender, Body, Knowledge*; Laqueur, *Making Sex*; Leder, *The Absent Body*; Lingis, *Foreign Bodies*; MacCannell and Zakarin, *Thinking Bodies*; E. Martin, *Flexible Bodies and The Woman in the Body*; Punday, *Narrative Bodies*; Scarry, *The Body in Pain*; Seltzer, *Bodies and Machines*; Shilling, *The Body and Social Theory*; Spretnak, *The Resurgence*; Suleiman, *The Female Body*; Tasker, *Spectacular Bodies*; H. Thomas, *The Body*; Turner, *The Body and Society*; Weiss, *Body Images*; and Wykes and Gunter, *The Media*.

2. Deleuze would undoubtedly dispute the idea that the body is a metaphor: for him, the body not only is located *in* time and space, the body first of all *produces* time and space. Time and space are not preexisting linearities through which a body passes, and there is no neutral medium of time and space *in which* movement takes place; rather, time and space are constituted by the interplay of the body's movements and nonhuman forces.

3. It might be argued—as the neurobiologist Steven Rose does—that in the course of the semioticization of the body and materiality, postmodern theorists and natural scientists alike “use the name given to the science, *biology*, to replace its field of study—life itself and the processes which sustain it . . . So ‘biological’ becomes the antonym not for ‘sociological’ but for ‘social’” (*Lifelines* 5).

4. I am borrowing the term “intelligent materialism” from Hanjo Berressem. In his essay “Matter that Bodies,” he develops an ‘intelligent materialism|realism’ with Deleuze, and against Butler.

5. See, for example, Serres, *The Birth of Physics and Genesis*; Prigogine and Stengers, *Order out of Chaos*; and Maturana and Varela, *The Tree of Knowledge*.

6. In Butler's *Bodies That Matter*, Plato seems to be the archenemy, the source of the misogynist tradition of Western phallogocentrism—see Butler's discussion of the Platonic *chora* (35–48). Caroline Bynum has pointed out the tendency of much of postmodern Body|Theory to “sweep . . . two thousand years of history into what can only be called a vast essentialization . . . —ostensibly in the name of antiessentialism” (“Why All the Fuss” 6). Not only is the Platonic and Cartesian dualism not the whole of Western philosophy, but in his chapter on the simulacrum in *The Logic of Sense*, Deleuze has pointed out the seeds of a “reverse Platonism” in Plato himself, and Gordon Baker and Katherine Morris question the Cartesian legend and the accuracy of attributing to Descartes the rigid kind of dualism that Anglo-American philosophy bases its refusal on, since they have “a large investment in the *truth* of the Cartesian legend” (*Descartes' Dualism* 3).

7. See Patton, *Deleuze and the Political*, for a concise analysis of the importance of Deleuzian thought for poststructuralist political thought.

8. For a detailed assessment of Deleuze's engagement with contemporary science, see De Landa, *Intensive Science*.

9. Quoted in Villani, 130: “Je me sens bergsonien, quand Bergson dit que la science moderne n’a pas trouvé sa métaphysique, la métaphysique dont elle aurait besoin. C’est cette métaphysique qui m’intéresse. . . . Je me sens pur métaphysicien” (my translation).

10. In a footnote referring the reader to James Gleick’s *Chaos: Making a New Science*, they add: “Science feels the need not only to order chaos but to see it, touch it, and produce it” (*What Is Philosophy?* 229, note 14).

11. Deleuze/Guattari’s concept of the machine which is *not* restricted to the symbolic is thus yet another instance in which they stray from Lacan, and in which their work constitutes a critique of [Lacanian] psychoanalysis.

12. It is statements like these that effectively counter readings of Deleuze (and Guattari) as mere apostles of chaos and anarchy. They are not against systematics, but against the suffocating effects of static hierarchy and outside control.

13. Deleuze/Guattari refer to Simondon’s attempt to explain individuation—the genesis of an individual—as a self-organizing process of preindividual singularities and differences. According to Deleuze, what Simondon describes is “a whole ontology, according to which Being is never One” (“On Gilbert Simondon” 89)—note the remarkable affinity with Deleuze’s own ontology. Simondon addresses the political implications of the hyломorphic model when he states that “form corresponds to what the man in command has thought to himself, and must express in a positive manner when he gives orders” (quoted in *Thousand Plateaus* 555, note 33).

14. As Deleuze points out, “Spinoza, on the whole, is a disciple of Hobbes . . . on two general but fundamental points, he entirely follows the Hobbesian revolution, and I believe that Spinoza’s political philosophy would have been impossible without the kind of intervention that Hobbes had introduced to political philosophy” (“Seminar on Spinoza 12/12/1980”). The two points in question are, first, Hobbes’s break with the Aristotelian and Ciceronian tradition that equates the state of nature with a good way of living and state of being, the state that conforms to the essence in a good society—the *eudaemonia* of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*—and, second, the substitution of “the idea of a pact of consent as the foundation of the civil state for the relation of competence such as it was in traditional philosophy, from Plato to Saint Thomas” (ibid.).

15. The legal tradition also constitutes the Body/Politic as a legal person—the definition of which in English law resonates nicely with Deleuze/Guattari’s formula for a transcendent system: “if n men unite themselves in an organized body, jurisprudence, unless it wishes to pulverise the group, must see $n + 1$ persons” (Maitland, “Moral Personality and Legal Personality” 316).

16. In *Multitude*, Hardt/Negri explicitly refer to the swarm as yet another variant of the multitude. They do not, however, directly link the *emergence* of such a kind of knowledge to Spinoza’s concept of the common notions (see 91–93).

17. Deleuze’s preface appeared in the French translation of Negri’s book, *L’anomalie sauvage*. The English translation of Negri’s book does not contain the preface, which was reprinted in a collection of Deleuze’s work (“Preface”).

18. Maybe one should also translate *virtuellement* as “on the level of the virtual virtuality.”

19. Likewise, “Children, Fooles, and Mad-men, that have no use of reason, may be Personated by Guardians, or Curators; but can be no Authors . . . of any action done by them” (*Leviathan* 219)—thus they are not *authorized* to enter into a contract.

20. Spinoza claims: “I start from the natural rights of the individual, which are co-extensive with his desires and power, and from the fact that no one is bound to live as another pleases, but is the guardian of his own liberty. I show that these rights can only be transferred to those whom we depute to defend us, who acquire with the duties of defence the power of ordering our lives, and I thence infer that rulers possess rights only limited by their power, that they are the sole guardians of justice and liberty, and that their subjects should act in all things as they dictate: nevertheless, since no one can so utterly abdicate his own power of self-defence as to cease to be a man, I conclude that no one can be deprived of his natural rights absolutely, but that subjects, either by tacit agreement, or by social contract, retain a certain number, which cannot be taken from them without great danger to the state” (*Theologico-Political Treatise* 10).

21. Indeed, Spinoza insists that “the right of the supreme authorities is nothing else than simple natural right, limited, indeed, by the power, not of every individual, but of the multitude, which is guided, as it were, by one mind—that is, as each individual in the state of nature, so the body and the mind of a dominion have as much right as they have power” (*Theologico-Political Treatise* 301).

22. In Hobbes’s *Leviathan*, the sovereign is exactly that “additional dimension”: “he which is made Sovereign maketh no Covenant with his Subjects beforehand . . . ; because either he must make it with the whole multitude, as one party to the Covenant; or he must make a severall Covenant with every man. With the whole, as one party, it is impossible, because as yet they are not one Person: and if he make so many severall Covenants as there be men, those Covenants after he hath the Sovereignty are voyd, because what act soever can be pretended by any one of them for breach thereof, is the act both of himselfe, and of all the rest, because done in the Person, and by the Right of every one of them in particular” (230). The retroactive logic of the whole concept is quite apparent here.

23. For Deleuze, though, this plane of immanence is not simply given: because of the constant flux of the forces and relations of which it is composed, “it has to be constructed” (*Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* 128).

24. Tucker conceived the famous prisoner’s dilemma in a memo at Stanford in 1950. This memo was later published by Dresner and Flood under the title “On Jargon: The Prisoner’s Dilemma.”

25. There have been attempts to read Hobbes’s state of nature in terms of the prisoner’s dilemma, out of which cooperation arises. However, these readings, I argue, tend to overlook the fact that this cooperation is enforced [by fear/law] and has to be transformed by a contract into a stable/static organization that in turn mutes [or at least controls/regulates] self-organization (see, e.g., Grim, Mar, and St. Denis, *Philosophical Computer*).

26. Patton’s remark that the hierarchical organization of society as “Hobbes’s solution to the problem posed by [the] universal drive to increase power at the expense of others follows the . . . model of simple linear increase” (“Politics and the Concept of Power” 150) shows that the logics of the zero-sum game are involved here.

27. “Therefore notwithstanding the Lawes of Nature . . . , if there be no Power erected, or not great enough for our security, every man will and may lawfully rely on his own strength and art, for caution against all other men” (*Leviathan* 223–24).

28. For a religious person who believes in an afterlife, not even death signals the final round.

29. All of these traits are ‘forces’ in the Deleuzian sense—forces that, according to Deleuze, have “the power to affect (others) and be affected (by others again)” (*Foucault* 71). They belong to the “variables expressing a relation between forces or power relations . . . To incite, provoke and produce . . . constitute active affects” (70–71).

30. Thus, ultimately, the difference between power and knowledge—knowledge as *savoir*—is “stratified, archived, and endowed with a relatively rigid segmentarity. Power, on the other hand, is diagrammatic: it mobilizes non-stratified matter and functions, and unfolds with a very flexible segmentarity” (Deleuze, *Foucault* 73). In Hobbes, this ‘instrumental reason’ creates a contract—a first law—which is then iterated in the “Artificial man,” the Leviathan, as “*Equity and Lawes, an artificial Reason and Will*” (*Leviathan* 81). What we find here is thus a proliferation of molar laws.

31. See Damasio, *Descartes’ Error*, for a neuroscientist’s take on the Cartesian notion “I think, therefore I am.”

32. See *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (124–25), where Deleuze comments on Jakob von Uexküll’s analysis of the tick in terms of a set of affects.

33. Using a virtual environment, Axelrod had shown that “the idea that ‘good guys finish last’ (i.e., that the most rational strategy is to betray one’s partner) [which] had become entrenched in academic (and think tank) circles” (De Landa, “Virtual Environments”)—or, in Hobbesian terminology, that in the absence of a central authority, men are inclined to solve problems by violence—was simply one alternative.

34. Carlyle also is already anticipating the claim that White was to make almost 150 years later: “For as all Action is, by its nature, to be figured as extended in breath and in depth, as well as in length . . . so all Narrative is, by its nature, of only one dimension; only travels towards one, or towards successive points: Narrative is *linear*, Action is *solid*. Alas for our ‘chains,’ or chainlets, of ‘causes and effects,’ which we so assiduously track through certain hand-breadths of years and square miles, when the whole is a broad, deep Immensity, and each atom is ‘chained’ and completed with all” (“On History” 95).

35. See De Landa’s *A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History* for such a project inspired by Deleuze/Guattari and complexity theory. See also Herbst, “Entkoppelte Gewalt” and *Komplexität und Chaos*, and Reisch, “Chaos, History, and Narrative.”

36. This is precisely how the dates that provide the titles for the various chapters of Deleuze/Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus* function—as proper names for force fields.

Chapter 1. *The Puritans’ Two Bodies*

1. As we will see later, John Winthrop commented on the fact that in a commonwealth, “no man hath lawful power over another, but by birth or consent” (“Defence” 67)—clearly opting for the second alternative in the case of New England. Hobbes said: “Dominion is acquired two wayes; By Generation, and by Conquest” (*Leviathan* 140).

2. Albeit hierarchical, static, and in its ultimate consequences conservative.

3. Here it is quite revealing that the Massachusetts Bay Company was a company of shareholders.

4. See Hill, *Change and Continuity in 17th Century England, Puritanism and Revolution*, and *The World Turned Upside Down*.

5. In the original German, Freud uses the word *Bindemittel*, which comes even closer to the word *ligament* in Winthrop's sermon.

6. However, Freud also mentions the lethal, authoritarian underside of that "democratic strain": "But even during the kingdom of Christ those people who do not belong to the community of believers, who do not love him, and whom he does not love, stand outside this tie. Therefore a religion, even if it calls itself the religion of love, must be hard and unloving to those who do not belong to it. Fundamentally every religion is in this same way a religion of love for all those whom it embraces; while cruelty and intolerance towards those who do not belong to it are natural to every religion" ("Group Psychology" 128).

7. Freud also says: "There is no doubt that the tie which unites each individual with Christ is also the cause of the tie which unites them with one another" ("Group Psychology" 123).

8. Of course, this love is as illusory in the Freudian sense as it is imaginary in the Lacanian sense of the word, also with regard to the aggression and exclusionary quality inherent in love.

9. However, self-love comes in again through the back door since, as Freud later shows, the love for the leader-as-ego-ideal is in fact love for a part of the self. Winthrop concedes as much when he states that "the ground of love is an apprehension of some resemblance in the things . . . Thus it is between the members of Christ; each discerns, by the work of the Spirit, his own Image and resemblance in another, and therefore cannot but love him as he loves himself" ("Modell" 42).

10. Freud concedes that in religious groups, both types of identification are at play simultaneously: "Every Christian loves Christ as his ideal and feels himself united with all other Christians by the tie of identification. But the Church requires more of him. He also has to identify himself with Christ and love all other Christians as Christ loved them. At both points, then, the Church requires that the position of the libido which is given by group formation should be supplemented" ("Group Psychology" 167–68).

11. Freud writes: "Its [the super-ego's] relation to the ego is not exhausted by the precept: 'You *ought to be* like this (like your father).' It also comprises the prohibition: 'You *may not be* like this (like your father)—that is, you may not do all that he does; some things are his prerogative'" ("The Ego and the Id" 374). Prohibition and ideal thus are the two modes of the symbolic *ego ideal*.

12. Through God, the name of the father, sociopolitical and moral order was founded and literally embodied through his son. In fact, the Puritans tended to see God as the point of origin of America—for example, in their reading of lives and events as biblical *types*, and in the work of Puritan historians, such as Prince, *Chronological History of New-England*, which traces American history back to the sixth day of creation, the day God created human beings. For America's obsession with origins, see also T. Martin, *Parables of Possibility*.

13. Thus, in the symbolic, the subject is presented not only with wholeness, but also with the possibility of dismemberment—a structure analogous to the tragedy inherent in the mirror stage.

14. See Lacan's "*Che vuoi?*" (*Écrits* 312).

15. In a work called "A Note upon the 'Mystic Writing-Pad,'" Freud compared the psyche to a waxen surface—the Mystic Writing-Pad was a children's toy—that retains permanent traces plus the eternal capacity for new inscriptions.

16. I am referring here to Lacan's notion of the four discourses that structure symbolic action and intercourse. See Berressem's analysis of this discursive machine in *Pynchon's Poetics*, 207–15.

17. Winthrop is a proto-Hobbesian here—Hobbes claimed, in *Leviathan*, that a “family if it be not part of some Common-wealth, is of it self, as to the Rights of Sovereignty, a little Monarchy; whether that Family consist of a man and his children; or of a man and his servants; or of a man, and his children, and servants together: wherein the Father or Master is the Sovereign” (*Leviathan* 143).

18. In Taylor, *The Poems of Edward Taylor*, see 118–27, 137–39, and 148–52, which closely follow the Canticles/Song of Solomon.

19. In addition to Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, see, for example, Mauss, *Techniques, Technology and Civilisation*; and Elias, *The Civilizing Process*.

20. In the Puritan frame, Foucault's two notions of the term *subject* are related in such a manner that the ultimate impossibility to know oneself [or one's place in God's plan, one's grace] makes it even more necessary to obey. Being tied to one's identity, trying but ultimately failing to know, subjects this subject even more strongly to God's law—self-knowledge [Am I saved?] is finally revealed by being written onto one's body.

21. Freud also notes this fact when he refers to a dissolution of a “body of troops” (“Group Psychology” 126) in case of panic as a consequence of the break of libidinous ties holding that body together.

22. See, for example, I. Mather, *Returning unto God* 11; and Edwards, *Religious Affections* 274 and following.

23. Within a few years, Winthrop's ligaments of love had sedimented into “Bands of Authority.”

24. St. Paul wrote: “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ” (Galatians 3:27–28).

25. Shepard, for instance, wrote: “the soul, therefore, is the subject of faith, called ‘the heart’” (*Works* 1:199).

26. See, for example, Bynum, *Holy Feast and Fragmentation and Redemption*.

27. Jonathan Edwards stated that “the saints are the jewels” (*Religious Affections* 233).

28. A comparison might be drawn between the *sarx/sōma* dichotomy and the somewhat analogous distinction in the Puritan images of New England's nature as both wilderness and garden.

29. However, it has to be noted that the “Compleat Body of Divinity” and the “Body of Death” somehow correspond to each other. Walter states: “There are as many *Lusts* in Indwelling Sin, as there are *Laws* in the Word of God: To every *Law* there is an opposite *Lust* . . . Indwelling Sin is an *Entire Body of Lusts*, which is contrary to the *Entire Body of Divine Laws*” (8). Corresponding to the divine law of the father, there is also a “*Law of Sin*” (1 and 8).

30. Winthrop's religious rapture, described in *Life and Letters* (1:105–6), and Taylor's metaphors of an almost bodily union with Christ are good examples, which also show the conflation of the bodily and the spiritual.

31. In fact, Freud calls such an extreme idealization “bondage” (“Group Psychology” 144), thus putting the idealization of Christ and the inward man in close proximity to

“the bondage of . . . the inward man” (Willard, *Compleat Body of Divinity* 229) exerted by Satan.

32. According to Lacan, the *object o* is the symbolicalimaginary reconstitution of the forever lost object, which, since it is defined precisely by its absence, is “in fact simply the presence of a hollow, a void, which can be occupied . . . by any object” (*Four Fundamental Concepts* 180).

33. In one poem, Taylor uses these images for the human body: “ball of dirt,” “my poore wither’d stump,” “lump of clay,” and “tumberill” (75).

34. Lacan, in “Television,” refers to “the abject [*abjet*] that I have come to call my object petit a” (21); a footnote points out the homology with *petit tas*, little pile, thus also excrement. Here is the origin of Kristeva’s concept of the abject.

35. George Goodwin, quoted in Bercovitch, *Puritan Origins* 19.

36. In this way, Hawthorne’s *A—The Scarlet Letter*—can be read as Lacan’s Big Other [*Autre = A*], language/culture inscribed onto the body.

37. It should be noted that the legalistic version of the term *ligament* denotes a third party, a go-between between the members of the community and God[’s Word]—the theological ‘pincer’ of transcendence: everything acquires value only via its relation to God (or his representatives on earth).

Chapter 2. “A ‘Physics’ of Power”:

Phase Transitions and Turbulence in the Antinomian Controversy

1. The Familists were a religious group that preached direct communication between God and mankind, both male and female. Because of this, they were often accused by their enemies [the ‘Orthodoxy’] of advocating free love and sexual promiscuity.

2. This account, probably written in 1638, was published anonymously and edited by Winthrop’s friend [and ardent anti-Hutchinsonian] Thomas Weld, who also wrote a 20-page preface.

3. In addition to Knight, see, for example, Erikson, *Wayward Puritans*; and Hall, *The Antinomian Controversy*. This invaluable collection gathers together the most important surviving documents of the ‘Hutchinson case,’ such as Winthrop’s *Short Story*, and the reports of Hutchinson’s examination and trial.

4. Knight here is closely following the terminology of William Haller, who distinguished between the spiritual brotherhood of dissenting Puritans and the “intellectual fathers of independency” (78).

5. Miller [in]famously declared: “I have taken the liberty of treating the whole literature as though it were the product of a single intelligence” (*The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* vii), equating this “single intelligence” with an essential unity and orthodoxy of the Puritan elite following the lead of William Ames—mainly the vision of Winthrop.

6. The names “Fathers” and “Brethren” show the difference in structure of these two parties—the one more vertical/hierarchical, the other more vertical/legalitarian. This grouping also permits the inclusion of John Cotton and Thomas Shepard in the discussion. Both men were highly important figures in the controversy—so important that some historians,

including Hall, have moved them to the fore, replacing Hutchinson and Winthrop. These two choices of protagonists need not be mutually exclusive, though.

7. Foucault noted: “And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a ‘head,’ it is the apparatus as a whole that produces ‘power’ and distributes individuals in this permanent and continuous field” (*Discipline and Punish* 177).

8. According to Deleuze, “power in Foucault . . . isn’t just violence, isn’t just the relation of a force to a being or an object, but corresponds to the relation of a force to the other forces it affects, or even to forces that affect it (inciting, exciting, inducing, seducing, and so on, are affects) . . . There’s the relation between forces and form: any form is a combination of forces . . . human forces aren’t on their own enough to establish a dominant form in which man can install himself. Human forces (having an understanding, a will, an imagination, and so on) have to combine with other forces: an overall form arises from this combination, but everything depends on the nature of the other forces with which the human forces become linked” (*Negotiations* 117).

9. See chapter 5 of this book.

10. The University Press of New England’s anonymous reader pointed out to me that Jim Egan has made a similar claim in *Authorizing Experience*.

11. An increase of dead bodies equals a decrease of economic working power.

12. This theory of family government, as David Flaherty notes, “charged the head of the household with the duty of surveillance over the behavior of everyone . . . The family was the immediate agent of social control in seventeenth-century New England” (56). Cotton Mather stated that “families are the Nurseries of all Societies; and the First Combinations of Mankind. Well-ordered Families naturally produce Good Order in other Societies” (*A Family Well-Ordered* 3–4).

13. This division of the land was “conducted formally and was intended to be a permanent one, the land passing forever into private hands” (Cronon 73). The 1635 anonymous “Essay on the Ordering of Towns” demanded that each individual should be given the amount of land which was “his due proportion, more or less according unto his present or apparent future occasion of Employment,” and based on how many servants and cattle he had to “improve” the land (183).

14. See Serres’s comment on Descartes’ *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* [1628–29] in “Festes, Flüssiges, Flammen.” Serres shows that Descartes basically treats the liquid and the disjunctive as similar cases of nonsolidity, of the nondefined.

15. De Landa is drawing on Arthur Iberall’s ideas, as put forward in *Towards a General Theory* (122–26).

16. Concepts are seen as the immutable Hegelian *Begriff*, which is derived from the German *begreifen*, to grasp, which again refers to a solid object.

17. The Antinomian foundation becomes fluid kind: Hutchinson is marked as “the fontaine . . . of all our distempers” (Hall 275). In addition, Hutchinson builds her doctrine on “bottomlesse revelations, as either came without any word, or without the sense of the word” (274), in contrast to the “solid arguments” (289) of the magistracy, the “well-grounded Christians” (276).

18. The building that Winthrop refers to in this quotation is further specified by another architectural metaphor as the “*legall way of evidencing their good estate by Sanctification*” (Hall 204)—the covenant of works.

19. In a pun on Deleuze/Guattari's concept of "minor science" [*science mineur*], Hutchinson's doctrines were also a science *mineur* in the sense of a 'minor science,' undermining the foundations of the orthodox Puritan elite, as well as in the sense of an almost terrorist attack of a someone laying a mine on these very foundations.

20. "For they being above reason and Scripture, they are not subject to control" (Hall 274).

21. This sermon can be dated to the middle or late 1620s, when Cotton was the minister at Hutchinson's English parish.

22. Winthrop, much more moderate than his allies Hooker and Shepard, uses the euphemism of framing the affections, whereas Hooker claims that "*the soule must be broken and humbled, before the Lord Jesus Christ can, or will dwell therein, and before faith can be wrought therein*" (*The Soules Implantation* 3).

23. A better name for equilibrium thermodynamics would have been *thermostatics*.

24. In the trial, John Cotton speaks of the dangerous consequences of Antinomianism, which sets "an open Doore to all Epicurisme and Libertinisme; if this be soe than come let us eate and drinke for to morrow we shall dye" (Hall 372). For someone who believes that the world is created by the *clinamen* [by chance, turbulence, and accident—ultimately, by grace] and that it will perish again likewise, Epicurism [or hedonism] is not excess; it only appears that way to those who believe that there is an intentionality or final cause of life, and that you can 'direct' this intentionality by doing good deeds.

25. It seems only appropriate that after Hutchinson's death, a river was named after her.

Chapter 3. Cotton Mather: *The Angel and the Animalcula*

1. Foucault commented on the epistemic rupture and historical discontinuity between the baroque and the classical worldview, and on the significance of the book metaphor: "The great metaphor of the book that opens, that one pores over and reads in order to know nature, is merely the reverse and visible side of another transference, and a much deeper one, which forces language to reside in the world, among the plants, the herbs, the stones, and the animals" (*Order of Things* 35).

2. Of course, one cannot actually speak of a 'New England baroque,' since the baroque is inextricably tied to Catholicism. Yet, given the era's position at the threshold to the Enlightenment, the term *baroque* might be used to characterize Mather's approach to science.

3. For detailed accounts of the Boston epidemic and the ensuing controversy, see Fitz, "Zabdiel Boylston"; Blake, "Inoculation Controversy"; P. Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* 345–66; and Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America*. I have drawn on the wealth of information provided in these texts.

4. See Fenn, *Pox Americana*, for a history of the smallpox epidemics in America. See also McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples*, for an analysis of social and cultural life as deeply connected to its ecological environment, which also includes the impact of epidemics and microorganisms.

5. Kittredge convincingly argues that Boylston published this tract, but that Mather wrote it. Despite Mather's positive account of the knowledge of blacks, this can be seen as an example of what Sander Gilman calls the "nexus of blackness and madness" (131).

6. John 5:2–4: “Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep [market] a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.”

7. For statistics, see Stearns, who reports an overall number of 5,889 cases of smallpox, with 844 deaths (*Science in the British Colonies of America* 421). Blake refers to 5,759 infected persons, of whom 842 died (*Public Health* 61).

8. See, for example, Middlekauff, *The Mathers*; and P. Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*.

9. Douglass later embraced the procedure of inoculation, and even as early as May 1, 1721, he acknowledged in a private letter to Cadwallader Colden: “But to speak candidly for the present it [smallpox] seems to be somewhat more favourably received by inoculation than received in the natural way” (“Letters from Dr. William Douglass” 170).

10. The phrase *dead in law* uncannily foreshadows the Lacanian distinction between the symbolic body and the real body, with the logical priority of the former.

11. Mather himself is a case in point—as a Fellow of the Royal Society, it is ultimately his name that is associated with the introduction of smallpox inoculation in the colonies.

12. For a short biography of Douglass, see Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America* 477–84.

13. See also Shryock for an account of a general tendency to friction in the colonies between ‘learned’ and ‘unlearned’ medical men (*Medicine and Society in America* especially 1–43).

14. For a detailed analysis of the English medical hierarchy in use in the early eighteenth century, see Pelling and Webster, “Medical Practitioners.” See also Estes, Cash, and Christianson, *Medicine in Colonial Massachusetts*.

15. From the anonymously published “Graph. Iatroon Letter” of 1765, announcing the formation of a medical society composed of college-graduate MDs, which sixteen years later became the Massachusetts Medical Society (quoted in Burrage, *A History* 3–4).

16. Paracelsian medicine differed from Galenic medicine in almost every aspect, and Paracelsian theory, with its religiously motivated medical philosophy, provided a viable alternative to the views of the ‘heathen’ Galen. Yet most medical practitioners managed to reconcile the [mostly theoretical] differences, practicing alchemic [Paracelsian] medicine within a humoral [Galenic] framework. See Debus, *Chemical Philosophy*; and Rattansi, “Paracelsus.” See also Debus (*Man and Nature*) for a redefinition of the role of Paracelsian and iatromechanical thought as central in the scientific revolution.

17. The term is Félix Guattari’s, following Bakhtin (see Guattari, *Chaosmosis* 16).

18. This, I argue, is the way Mather should be read—as a polyvocal writer, and not simply as a lopsided bigot. See also his claim in *Magnalia Christi Americana* of being an impartial historian, not because of some obscure objectivity or sticking to facts, but because he endeavors, “with all *good Conscience*, to decline this writing merely for a *Party*” (1:13).

19. This letter has neither date nor addressee; its content, however, suggests that it was written sometime around 1690, on the occasion of the issuance of the first bills of credit—paper currency—in Boston, which Cotton Mather supported.

20. Mather's books are textual machines—consisting of a bricolage of fragments of different discourses such as theology, medicine, and science [and different scientific schools, such as alchemy, iatromechanism, and iatrophysics]—dealing with the universal the body as a machine. If these two machines are brought into conjunction—if one lets the one engineer the other, and vice versa—various crossreadings/crossbreedings are possible.

21. First published in 1691, this is a book written not “by a clergyman with scientific interests,” but by “a scientist with a theological veneer” (Jeske 587). Ray's *Wisdom of God* is regarded as the founding text of modern zoology and—via William Paley's *Natural Theology* (1802), which merely restates Ray's theses—as the direct ancestor of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*. Mather is clearly taking sides by modeling his book—and, I argue, also his persona or voice in *The Christian Philosopher*—on “the Industrious Mr. Ray” (*The Christian Philosopher* 10).

22. According to Cartesian dualism, the body is a machine under the control of a rational soul (mind). Since animals lack reason, they are merely soulless organic machines. Leibniz states that “this is also what made those same Cartesians think that only minds are monads, that there are no souls of animals, and still less any other *principles of life*. The Cartesians offended too much against people's ordinary beliefs by refusing all feeling to animals” (“Principles,” *Philosophical Texts* 260).

23. Mather's objective is to “offer up to God the *Praises* which are owing from and for [creation]” (*The Christian Philosopher* 236), one of the main characteristics and functions of Man, whereas it has to be argued to what degree God's presence in Leibniz's system is a concession to the conventions of his times. Yet the rapturous praises to God that pop up constantly in Mather's text, when he binds scientific facts [and more often than not facts that go against the grain of Puritan tradition] back into the safety of God's plan, can be seen as an instant of what Guattari—trying to think, with Bakhtin, in a polyphonic subjectivity—calls “the refrain”: “Like Bakhtin, I would say that the refrain is not based on elements of form, material or ordinary signification, but on the detachment of an existential ‘motif’ (or leitmotif) which installs itself like an ‘attractor’ within a sensible and signification chaos. The different components conserve their heterogeneity, but are nevertheless captured by the refrain which couples them to the existential Territory of my self” (*Chaosmosis* 17).

24. Deleuze uncovers surprisingly modern conceptions of the world and the body in Leibniz's work. For a detailed discussion of the Leibnizian/Deleuzian conception of the machine [albeit in the context of artificial life], see Berressem, “Of Metal Ducks.”

25. Compare Deleuze's heuristic visions of a “*philosophically* bearded Hegel, a *philosophically* clean-shaven Marx” (*Difference and Repetition* xxi).

26. See also Belcher, “Journal.” Two days later, Belcher had lunch with Leibniz and Queen Sophia Charlotte.

27. Kenneth Silverman dates this sermon April 14, 1689, immediately after the news of the Glorious Revolution reached Boston (*Life and Times* 69).

28. He also wrote: “In nature, everything is full . . . Because of the plenitude of the world everything is linked, and every body acts to a greater or lesser extent on every other in proportion to distance, and is affected by it in return” (“Principles,” *Philosophical Texts* 259).

29. “C'est ainsi que, jettant en même temps plusieurs pierres dans une eau dormante, nous voyons que chacune fait des cercles sur la surface de l'eau” (“Leibniz an die Kurfürstin Sophie,” *Die philosophischen Schriften* 566).

30. Randolph had been sent to the colonies by Charles II, to investigate violations of England's colonial laws, and the state of affairs on site. Randolph was also chiefly responsible for the plan to consolidate all American colonies into an English dominion, and he served on Governor Andros's council.

31. This document, attributed to Cotton Mather, Increase Mather, and Simon Bradstreet, attempts to justify the arrest of Governor Andros and the members of his council, also listing the accusations they were charged with.

32. On the concept of good government in the political sense, see, for example, the election sermon of Samuel Willard (*Character*), stressing the idea of the proper use of authority.

33. Mather does not mention Harvey, yet he takes over Harvey's quantitative determination of the capacity of the heart almost verbatim: compare *The Christian Philosopher* 280 with *The Anatomical Exercises* 62–63.

34. The air that we breathe also has this 'muscular' constitution. Following Boyle, Mather sees the air as consisting of "*Corpuscles*" (*The Christian Philosopher* 73) of different kinds. He stresses a particular sort of particles as "being the distinguishing Parts of the Air, taken in the stricter sense of the Term. These Particles have an *Elasticity* in them; are springy; resemble the *Spring* of a *Watch*. *Elasticity* is an essential property of the *Air*" (74).

35. See, for example, Increase Mather, *New-England Vindicated*.

36. See also Jennifer Jordan Baker, "Cotton Mather's Theology of Finance."

37. Mather also wrote: "Indeed where the Use of *Money* has not been introduced, Men are brutish and savage, and nothing that is good has been cultivated" (*The Christian Philosopher* 127). In *Leviathan*, Hobbes himself draws the connection between blood and economy, seeing "mony [as] the Bloud of a Common-wealth" (300).

38. This issue parallels the course of events in Freud's myth of the primal horde. It is thus fitting that a pro-gold tract on the post-Civil War discussion of the introduction of the greenback dollar—an issue anticipated by the bills of credit—by David Wells is titled *The Silver Question: The Dollar of the Fathers versus the Dollar of the Sons*. On the issue of the gold standard, see Walter Benn Michaels, *The Gold Standard and the Logic of Naturalism*, in particular chapter 5.

39. See Derrida, "Plato's Pharmacy." For another discussion of the Derridean implications of Mather's advocacy of inoculation, see Breitwieser, "Pharmaceutical Innovation."

40. See, for example, how Mather, in his discussion of smallpox and inoculation, can be seen to almost equate the circulation of the smallpox virus and the circulation of the practice of inoculation: "There are two towns contiguous to Boston. The smallpox entered the town to the northward, where the people were poisoned with outcries against the inoculation. There they died by scores; they died in shoals; the place was *Aceldama*. The smallpox entered the town to the southward, and of the first fourteen or fifteen men that were taken with it, about eleven died. But the supervisors, after the example of their wiser pastors, coming at once into the inoculation, there died *not one man* after it. One would think here was an experiment enough to instruct a country; yea, to instruct a nation" (*Selected Letters* 365).

41. For Mather and his affinity to deism, see Riley, *American Thought*, in particular chapter 3. Riley sees Mather as cautiously instrumental in the "change from a gloomy theology to a cheering theodicy" (57).

42. Clarke was an English theologian and a disciple of Newton, and *The Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence* was actually a discussion of God's relation to the world, in which Clarke defended Newton's conception against Leibniz. In a letter to Gurdon Saltonstall, Mather singled Clarke out as one of the "two grand satanic tools" of what he regarded as the "Arian heresy" in England (*Selected Letters* 289). Newton was also under suspicion of Arianism, a doctrine that denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. Mather and Leibniz thus could be seen joining the same side, since Leibniz also warned that "Natural religion itself, seems to decay (in England) very much" (*Leibniz-Clarke* 11).

43. Given the shared Protestant background, Leibniz's preestablished harmony, I argue, can be seen as the philosophical and complexified version of the traditional theological concept of providence and predestination.

44. If it were not for the preestablished harmony/ProvidencelGod's plan, the universe would be devoid of metaphysics, blindly unfolding, the effect of mere chance, which is inconceivable.

45. As an aside, the situation that Leibniz evokes bears more than a slight similarity to the political situation of the American colonies.

46. Breitwieser rightly argues that there is a point in saying that "Cotton Mather inoculated the Mather tradition insofar as he was a scion who became one with it—that is, insofar as he suppressed his transformative impulses" ("Pharmaceutical Innovation" 120). I would also add that Mather's 'baroque' and encyclopedic style in *The Christian Philosopher* and *The Angel of Bethesda* is a kind of montage writing in the sense of Derrida's "citational grafting" (see "Signature, Event, Context" 320).

47. For example, Shakespeare writes in *Hamlet*: "virtue cannot/ so inoculate our old stock but we shall relish of/ it" [*Hamlet*, edited by Horace Howard Furness (6th ed., London: J. B. Lippincott, 1877, act 3, scene 1, lines 117–18)].

48. In a similar manner, this metaphor also echoes the recurrent image of printing Christ's/God's emblem or signature onto the believer's soul.

49. This explains why Mather takes pains to fashion Phips as a kind of new Winthrop, an attempt that costs him four times as much writing space as he needed for writing Winthrop's biography. For Gura, this displays a desperate avoidance of the fact "that the days of John Winthrop could not be restored" ("Cotton Mather's *Life of Phips*" 449).

50. The fact that Barthes sees the origin of this bourgeois myth in the "bourgeoisie as a joint-stock company" ("Myth Today" 137) recommends it even more strongly for its application to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Regarding its origins as a kind of shareholder company, "the bourgeoisie no longer hesitates to acknowledge some localized subversions: the avant-garde, the irrational in childhood, etc. It now lives in a balanced economy: as in any sound joint-stock company, the smaller shares—in law but not in fact—compensate the big ones" (150–51).

51. This parallels the topology of the *projective plane* in Deleuze, the infinite torsion that constitutes the world. In connection with the baroque figure of the fold, so dear to Leibniz and Deleuze, see Mather's adherence to the theory of preformation, which "conceiv[es] the organism as a fold" (Deleuze, *The Fold* 10): for Mather, the "*True Seed* lies in so *Little Room*, that it is not visible to the Naked Eye . . . But in that *Little Room*, there lies the *whole plant*, in all the *True parts* of it; which is afterwards evolved and extended" (quoted in Levin, "Giants in the Earth" 768).

52. With regard to the analogy between skin and ports—the site where inside and outside meet, and also the site where the sea enters the land, where not only honest sailors, but also pirates hover and invade the Body|Politic—it is interesting to see that Mather scorns the pirates because they have overstepped the limit and taken too high a quantum of that dangerous liberty. As a result, he tries to inoculate them with an equally high dose of order—hence the myriad of Mather’s ‘execution sermons,’ such as *The Vial Poured Out upon the Sea: A Remarkable Relation of Certain Pirates Brought unto a Tragical and Untimely End: Some Conferences with Them* (1726), which recounts his attempts at last-minute conversions of the pirates.

53. Mather himself is not blind to the fact that the parasitic relationship between host and virus—depending on its status as endemic or epidemic—is anything but linear when he points out the curious fact of the “perpetual (and sometimes *strangely periodical*) visits which this destructive malady is ever making” (*Selected Letters* 360, my emphasis).

54. Mather takes the name of his concept from Genesis 2:7, where it denotes the breath of life with which God animates Adam. The ‘*Nishmath-Chajim*’-Chapter was published in 1722 as a pamphlet called *Angel of Bethesda*—thus indicating its relevance and importance in Mather’s view.

55. I would argue it is almost a Spinozist position; see Spinoza’s *amor intellectualis dei*—which he defines as the “love for a thing which is eternal and infinite”—God. The fact that Spinoza had worked for a long time grinding lenses for microscopes might not be without relevance here. It is also interesting to note that Spinoza arrives at this love from a traumatic situation, which he compares with a “fatal disease,” where one is “compelled to seek with all [one’s] powers a remedy” (*Ethics* 225).

56. Mather’s example—in particular his observation that, as in a fractal, “it seems any *single Part is equal to the Whole*”—faintly echoes Leibniz’s notion of the monad, which, although singular, encompasses the whole universe within it.

57. Note that Mather envisions the infinitely small animals—the *animalcula*—to have all the parts and functions of actual visible animals; here he follows Leeuwenhoek, who “‘often fancied’ that he could detect the parts of the foetus in it, viz., head, shoulders, and thighs” (Cole 9).

58. Leibniz goes on to claim that “there are scarcely ten men in the world who are carefully at work on this, and if there were a hundred thousand, there would not be too many to discover the important wonders of this new world which makes up the interior of ours and which is capable of making our knowledge a hundred thousand times greater than it is . . . A man in Delft [i.e., Leeuwenhoek] has accomplished wonders at it, and if there were many others like him, our knowledge of physics would be advanced far beyond its present state” (566).

59. In a similar vein, Henry Power, an English physician and natural philosopher who lived from 1623 to 1688, comments on the minute “anatomical engines” revealed by the microscope. He hypothesizes a “rude countryfellow,” who does not know anything about “the internal fabrick” of a machine, and who just “perchance hears the clock and alarum strike in it.” Yet only the microscope “will give a satisfactory account of the phenomena” (quoted in Laudan, “The Clock Metaphor and Probabilism” 101).

60. In *The Christian Philosopher*, Mather says of breathing that it is “A Faculty of such importance to *Life*, that . . . *Breath* and *Life* are so concomitant, as to be equivalent”

(277). Later in this chapter, I will comment on Mather's concept of the *Nishmath-Chajim*, the breath of life, which is "the *Strength* of Every Part in our Body, and that gives *Motion* to it. Here perhaps the Origin of *Muscular Motion* may be a little accounted for" (*The Angel of Bethesda* 33).

61. On the one hand Leibniz distinguishes between 'two floors' and two logics—that of the monad [spirituallmental] and that of the body [physical]—which have no connection if it not were for the preestablished harmony between them. On the other hand, he constantly puts matter into the monad, and anchors the monad in matter.

62. Leibniz wrote: "Imagine there were a machine which by its structure produced thought, feeling, and perception; we can imagine it as being enlarged while maintaining the same relative proportions, to the point where we could go inside it, as we would go into a mill. But if that were so, when we went in we would find nothing but pieces which push one against another, and never find anything to account for a perception" ("Monadology," *Philosophical Texts* 270).

63. John Ray (*Wisdom of God* 17), quoted verbatim by Mather in (*The Christian Philosopher* 131).

64. See Gordon W. Jones's introduction to Mather's *The Angel of Bethesda* (xvii).

65. It was also a way for Mather to bridge the apparent paradox of holding both sin and the animalcula responsible for illness—working on the body on two different fronts, as it were.

66. See also Mather's diary entry for November 16, 1705: "The Oracles of God, make a distribution of Man, into three Parts, the *Spirit*, the *Soul*, and the *Body*. The *Anatomy* is admirable; the Consideration of the Distribution would be of no little consequence. The *Spirit* is the rational mind; created and infused, by an immediate Operation of God. The *Soul*, is a vital Flame, convey'ed from our Parents; the next Seat of our Passions; of so fine a Temper that it can strike the *Spirit*, and yet of so gross a Temper, that it can also move the *Body*; tis the *Soul* by which all meer *Animals* are actuated. The *Body*, is the obvious Receptacle and Habitation of these wonderful Agents" (1:526). In the politicized context developed so far, it might be of no little consequence that the middle realm of the soul—which turns out to be the *Nishmath*—is "convey'ed from our Parents," or, the founding generation of Puritans.

67. It has been pointed out that Mather's conception also allows for the idea of what we would today call psychosomatic illnesses and their treatment. See Mather's *Diary* (1:526–27) for his idea about how such psychosomatic interactions could work.

68. Deleuze writes: "For Leibniz, the two floors are and will remain inseparable; they are really distinct and yet inseparable by dint of a presence of the upper in the lower . . . Is it not in this zone, in this depth of the material fabric between the two levels, that the upper is folded over the lower, such that we can no longer tell where one ends and the other begins, or where the sensible ends and the intelligible begins?" (*The Fold* 119).

69. However, they lack a *rational soul*, and therefore it might be argued that in animals, the *Nishmath* in fact takes the place of that rational soul [or mind or consciousness]—it is "the *Soul* by which all meer *Animals* are actuated," (Mather, *Diary* 1:526); indeed, the "*Nishmath-Chajim* is much like the *Soul* which animates the *Brutal World*" (*The Angel of Bethesda* 32).

70. Likewise, Mather's allegory of the variety of handwritings sees them as singular, but universally so.

71. On the ever refined matter, Martial Gueroult wrote about Leibniz's views: "Comment, en effet, concevoir 'le ressort' si l'on ne suppose pas que le corps est composé, qu'ainsi il peut se contracter en chassant de ses pores les particules de matière subtile qui le pénètrent, et qu'à son tour cette matière plus subtile doit pouvoir expulser de ses pores une autre matière encore plus subtile, etc. à l'infini" (32). Deleuze's *The Fold* (143, note 14) gives an English translation: "How can we conceive of the *motivating force* if we fail to suppose that the body is composite, and that thus it can be shrunk in flushing out of its pores the subtle particles of matter that penetrate it, and that in turn this more refined matter must be capable of expulsing from its pores another, even more refined matter, etc., ad infinitum."

72. One can almost distill a theory of speeds here: fast is good, but too fast—like too slow—is bad. In political terms, Mather aims at a [semi-]stable, yet dynamic, system.

73. This differentiation—again—repeats the structure of the *pharmakon*. In Mather's proto-account of the immune system, the *Nishmath* performs the task of the antibodies, while the virus is the antigen. What further complicates the issue is the fact that, at a particular level, they both can be one and the same: when the antibodies become auto-antibodies—that is, antibodies directed against themselves—in what is known as auto-toxic autoimmune diseases.

74. On preformation and epigenesis, see Deleuze, *The Fold* 9–10.

75. Leibniz, quoted in Loemker, "Boyle and Leibniz," 43. The "flower of substance" might thus be regarded as a more 'material' preliminary stage of the monad, which, according to Leibniz, is only abstract/spiritual but is nevertheless always assigned to a body.

76. Mather might also be worrying about the mechanical philosophers who assume that the body—as a mechanic automaton—was built solely from units of inert matter, from which it could be followed that the units—like the parts of a clock—could be dismembered and reassembled again without loss. Yet what gets lost is the *Nishmath*, 'life,' without which the body would in fact be just a finitely complex 'man-made' machine.

77. According to Aram Vartanian's introductory monograph, it was indeed de La Mettrie's "primary task . . . to *vitalize* the Cartesian 'dead mechanism' approach to biology . . . La Mettrie had first to show that purposive motion could only be a property of organized matter as such, or, put differently, that the man-machine was automatic in a manner that no man-made machine, requiring direction from without, could truly duplicate" (19). Thus, de La Mettrie had more in common with vitalist thought than the title of his treatise supposes.

78. The "great mechanical philosophers of the seventeenth century . . . lent their support . . . to the maintenance of established monarchical authority" (Jacobs 31).

79. Reill sees this as part of a double movement, completed by a resurrection of elements—alchemy and hermetic thought—that were kept alive in popular culture, for example in the guises of household remedies.

80. This is a move quite typical of a whole tradition in American history/literature: the utopian future bears a remarkable resemblance to myths of the past. See Herzogenrath, "Looking Forward/Looking Back" and "Adam in the Rear-View Mirror" on this point.

81. In his more 'traditional' readings of Leibniz's concept of preestablished harmony, Reill puts it in the category of a mere harmony of concord, yet Deleuze has uncovered

exactly this harmony of diverging series in Leibniz. Mather's complexification of providence tends in the same direction, I argue.

82. This is the title of Thom's influential book, in which he develops his catastrophe theory.

Chapter 4. "I Am the Poet of Little Things": Walt Whitman and Minor Poetics|Politics

1. It bears a close affinity to Deleuze|Guattari's concept of *geophilosophy*—Anglo-American literature thus is to French literature what geophilosophy is to 'traditional metaphysics,' or geohistory to 'traditional history.' On the concept of geophilosophy, see *What Is Philosophy?* (in particular chapter 4), and Bonta and Protevi, *Deleuze and Geophilosophy*. See also Surin, "A Question."

2. In a way, this describes Derrida's mantra "*There is nothing outside of the text* [there is no outside-text; *il n'y a pas de hors-texte*]" (*Of Grammatology* 158). In marked contrast, for Deleuze, it is precisely literature's "relationship with the outside" (Deleuze and Parnet, *Dialogues* 36) that matters.

3. As Deleuze notes, "[t]he founding act of the American novel . . . was to take the novel far from the order of reasons, and to give birth to characters who exist in nothingness, survive only in the void, defy logic and psychology and keep their mystery until the end" (*Essays Critical and Clinical* 81).

4. It must be noted that this seeming dualism between major|minor and majoritarian|minoritarian is subverted by Deleuze|Guattari in their insistence that "we must distinguish between: the majoritarian as a constant and homogeneous system; minorities as subsystems; and the minoritarian as a potential, creative and created, becoming" (*Thousand Plateaus* 106).

5. Tocqueville's observation that in an aristocratic literature, literary and political activity condense in a ruling class that "keeps itself entirely aloof from the people" coincides with Kafka's remark that in a minor literature, "literature is less a concern of literary history, than of the people" (193).

6. The respective powers of the major and the minor are of different orders—similar to Spinoza's distinction between *potestas* and *potentia*, the "powers (*puissances*) of becoming . . . belong to a different realm from that of Power (*Pouvoir*) and Domination" (*Thousand Plateaus* 106).

7. Thus Deleuze|Guattari's concept of the 'minor writer' is the complete antithesis of Foucault's and Barthes's 'author-function.'

8. Deleuze|Guattari do not explicitly use this term, but they refer to "the conditions of minor literature and politics" (*Kafka* 86).

9. Deleuze writes: "Oh, the poverty of the imaginary and the symbolic, the real always being put off until tomorrow" (Deleuze and Parnet, *Dialogues* 51). For cultural|linguistic constructivism [Lacan's psychoanalysis is based on that concept], the imaginary and the symbolic, images and words, dreams and the talking cure are the pillars on which they are based: systems of representation are always founded on the exclusion of the real. Deleuze, however, wants to 'get through' to this enigmatic real, this 'outside,' and touch literature [and politics] in its relation to that outside.

10. Deleuze stresses the fundamentality and centrality of this proposition when he claims that “we will call ‘nonempiricist’ every theory according to which . . . relations are derived from the nature of things” (*Empiricism* 109).

11. Manning admits having read Deleuze’s writings on Hume and American literature only after her own book was written, and although she sees similarities between her approach and Deleuze’s, she ultimately dismisses Deleuze’s reading as historically insensitive, one that finds only its “own [postmodern] image in the writing of the past” (18). While this is highly debatable, Manning’s difficulties with Deleuze seem to be an example of a general underlying [and unresolved] tension between the historian’s contextualization and the philosophical approach.

12. Vice versa, Hume sees a nation as “nothing but a collection of individuals” which comes into being by means of “sympathy or contagion of manners” (*Essays* 20).

13. As a result of the riots and election frauds, Kansas’s admission to the union as a state was rejected by Congress. As a final irony, however, as antislavery settlers outnumbered proslavery ones, Kansas was eventually admitted on January 29, 1861, just before the start of the Civil War—as a free state.

14. See, for example, Loving, *Emerson, Whitman, and the American Muse*; Shephard, *Walt Whitman’s Prose*; and Trachtenberg, “Walt Whitman.”

15. See also Hollis, *Language and Style*; Larson, *Whitman’s Drama of Consensus*; and Dougherty, *Walt Whitman and the Citizen’s Eye*.

16. See Allen, *Solitary Singer*; E. Miller, *Walt Whitman’s Poetry*; Black, *Whitman’s Journey into Chaos*; Killingsworth, *Whitman’s Poetry of the Body*; and Moon, *Disseminating Whitman*.

17. That can be read as yet another way of saying that difference precedes [and escapes] identity, becoming precedes [and escapes] being, etc.

18. Eric Wilson has pointed out that *Leaves of Grass* can be read as Whitman’s “manifesto of nomadic thought” (119), as a rhizomatic, perpetually branching and bifurcating text, but he relates it to Whitman’s [and Deleuze’s] reading of Lucretius rather than connecting it to the assemblage Anglo-American literature|Humean empiricism proposed by Deleuze.

19. Allen points out that the title *Leaves of Grass* refers not to a single book, but to “the whole *corpus* of Walt Whitman’s verse published between 1855 and 1892” (*Whitman Handbook* 104).

20. Deleuze|Guattari quote Henry Miller: “Grass is the only way out . . . *It grows between*, among other things . . . the weed is rank growth . . . : it points a moral” (*Thousand Plateaus* 19).

21. Every single leaf of grass is itself a rhizome that connects with the larger dynamics of life. Echoing atomist philosophy, and also Leibniz, Whitman states that “different objects which decay, and by the chemistry of nature, their bodies are into spears of grass” (*Notebooks* 1:57).

22. As Emerson explicitly states, “the Idealism of the present day acquired the name of Transcendental, from the use of that term by Immanuel Kant, of Konigsberg” (“The Transcendentalist,” *Selected Essays* 246).

23. See Q. Anderson, *The Imperial Self*.

24. Nor did the book itself have any information about its author.

25. According to Deleuze, “the great English and American novelists often write in percepts” (*Negotiations* 137).

26. In particular, “the attitude of great poets is to cheer up slaves and horrify despots” (*Poetry and Prose* 17).

27. Deleuze and Guattari write: “It breathes, it heats, it eats. It shits and fucks” (*Anti-Oedipus* 1)—the body as a site of production.

28. In his preface to the 1855 edition, Whitman hints at the fact that he structures his “kosmos” with rhizomatic alliances rather than hierarchical orders: “There will soon be no more priests. Their work is done . . . A superior breed shall take their place . . . the gangs of kosmos and prophets *en masse* shall take their place. A new order shall arise” (*Poetry and Prose* 4–5).

29. What Whitman describes is similar to the position of the minor poet in Deleuze and Guattari’s *Kafka*: “If the writer is in the margins or completely outside his or her fragile community, this situation allows the writer all the more the possibility to express another possible community” (17).

30. The Whitman item, a second draft of “Quicksand Years That Whirl Me I Know Not Whither,” was written 1861–62.

31. *The Gathering of Forces* collects the editorials, essays, reviews, etc. that Whitman wrote as the editor of the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle* in 1846–47.

32. The idea of an elective affinity between Whitman and Lincoln is based on the fact that Whitman wrote elegies on Lincoln’s death. Whitman had planned to write a kind of ‘poetic advice primer’ for President Lincoln, as an entry in his notebooks shows: “Brochure.—Two characters as of a dialogue between A. L. ____n and Walt Whitman.—as in ? a dream—or better? Lessons for a President elect—Dialogue between W.W. and ‘President Elect’” (“Brochure” 174). See also Epstein, *Lincoln and Whitman*.

33. For a literary analysis of war rhetoric, the ways in which bodily injury and mutilation are rewritten as gain, see Scarry, *The Body in Pain* (especially chapters 2 and 3).

34. In contrast to this negative view, Hakim Bey wrote: “Ours is no art of mutilation, but of excess, superabundance, amazement” (37). And although “truly fearful things exist” in the world, “some of these things can be overcome—on the condition that we build an aesthetic on the overcoming rather than the fear” (78)—exactly what Whitman’s minor poetics/politics is attempting to do.

35. Whitman also wrote: “The political class is too slippery for me—even its best examples: I seem to be reaching for a new politics—for a new economy: I don’t know quite what, but for something” (quoted in Traubel 1:101).

36. Whitman wrote: “I have attempted to construct a poem on the open principles of nature . . . every page of my book emanates Democracy . . . and the sense of the New World in its future, a thoroughly revolutionary formation to be exhibited less in politics and more in theology, literature and manners” (*The Complete Writings* 9:34).

37. On Whitman’s notion of “the aggregate,” see also Berressem, “Serres Reads Pynchon.”

38. In this essay, Carlyle was attacking Benjamin Disraeli’s proposal to extend the franchise to the working classes, but included “the American War, with Settlement of the Nigger Question” (5), as a prime example of such swarmery.

39. See Allen, *The Solitary Singer* 138–40. See also Wright (*A Few Days in Athens*). As Whitman notes, Wright’s “book on Epicurus was daily food to me” (quoted in Traubel 2:445).

40. See also De Landa: “a complex assemblage of a large number of heterogeneous components: diverse reproductive communities of animals, plants and micro-organisms, a geographical site characterized by diverse topographical and geological features, and the ever diverse and changing weather patterns” (*Intensive Science* 64).

41. Taken from the 1860 edition of *Leaves of Grass*, this last stanza is missing in subsequent editions.

42. Whitman also wrote: “I am the poet of little things and of babes” (*Notebooks* 1:70).

Chapter 5. A Physical Theory of Heredity|Heresy: The Education of Henry Adams

1. Among those studies of political theorists|historians that *do* read Adams for his ‘politics’ are Hanson and Merriman, “Henry Adams”; Shklar, *Redeeming American Political Thought*; and Young, *Henry Adams*, which shows that Adams may have been disappointed by the corrupt democracy of the late twentieth century, but he was a fervent believer in democratic ideals as such. After all, Adams’s political views, in his self-assessment, “tend to democracy and radicalism” (*Letters* 2:301).

2. On Adams and science, see also Jordy, *Henry Adams*; and Wasser, *Scientific Thought*.

3. Together with “The Tendency of History” and “The Rule of Phase Applied to History,” this essay was posthumously published by Adams’s brother Brooks Adams under the misleading title *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma*.

4. In *Chaos Bound*, N. Katherine Hayles has provided an insightful reading of *The Education of Henry Adams* in the light of chaos and complexity theory. However, she is much more interested in the discursive complexity of Adams’s text than in his development of concepts of complexity—in fact, for Hayles, chaos theory seems to be another name for poststructuralism.

5. Within *The Education*, the same structure is repeated in the much-anthologized chapter 25, “The Dynamo and the Virgin.”

6. Adams also gives a political ring to the notion of variation|variety, which connects it with American democracy: “The American in his political character, was a new variety of man” (*History Madison* 1332).

7. Serres writes: “The [old] law is the plague. Reason is the fall. The reiterated cause is death. Repetition is redundancy. And identity is death” (*Birth of Physics* 109).

8. “The ego is a composite body . . . It resembles the Harlequin’s coat, adjectives sewn together, that is, terms placed side by side” (*Tiers-Instruit* 221, my translation).

9. See Freese, “Henry Adams.”

10. Adams also wrote: “The inertia of several hundred million people, all formed in a similar social mould, was as likely to stifle energy as to stimulate evolution” (*History Madison* 1345).

11. According to Spencer, “there is no warrant whatever for assuming this” (200).

12. This is a position, I argue, that is repeated today in cultural|linguistic constructivism.

13. Deleuze/Guattari write: “Not every organism has a brain, and not all life is organic, but everywhere there are forces that constitute microbrains, or an inorganic life of things” (*What Is Philosophy?* 213).

14. That the decrease of state control, as envisaged by Spencer, led to the social Darwinism of laissez-faire capitalism nicely parallels the position of capitalism in Deleuze/Guattari’s thought. While capitalism on the one hand has liberating effects, since it operates by a rigorous deterritorialization and decoding of free flows, on the other hand it rigorously reterritorializes and ‘overcodes’ these flows again into commodities and monetary equivalences, so that real freedom is impossible.

15. This novel was first published anonymously in 1880; only after 1925 was Adams listed as the author.

16. And complexity theory might be an effective way to deal with the dilemma of democracy.

17. One of the main physical forces of history, according to Adams, is inertia, the “property of matter, by which matter tends, when at rest, to remain so, and, when in motion, to move on a straight line” (*Education* 417). As Adams states in a 1883 letter to Samuel Tilden, “my own conclusion is that history is simply social development along the lines of weakest resistance, and that in most cases the line of weakest resistance is found as unconsciously by society as by water” (*Letters* 2:491). Such inertialstifling order leads to linearity and ultimately entropy; newness/mutations emerge out of the [nonlinear] “side-paths.”

18. That is also in line with Adams’s ‘residual Puritanism’—the second law of thermodynamics can be read as the scientific variant of the Puritan jeremiad.

19. For Serres, the shift from *turba* to *turbo* has a political connotation, since it also denotes the shift from a disordered “multitude, a large population, confusion and tumult” (*Birth of Physics* 28) to a self-organized [vertical] social movement.

20. The importance of the multitude is also revealed in Adams’s momentous flirtations with socialism and Marxism: “Not that I love Socialism any better than I do Capitalism, or any other Ism, but I know only of one law of political or historical morality, and that is that the form of Society which survives is always in the Right; and therefore a statesman is obliged to follow it, unless he leads . . . One need not love Socialism in order to point out the logical necessity for Society to march that way; and the wisdom of doing it intelligently if it is to do it at all.” (“Henry Adams to Brooks Adams, May 7, 1898,” in *Letters* 4:586–87). He also wrote: “By rights, he should have been also a Marxist but some narrow trait of the New England nature seemed to blight socialism, and he tried in vain to make himself a convert. He did the next best thing; he became a Comteist, within the limits of evolution” (*Education* 217).

21. It was the publication of this article in the *Westminster Review* in England that made Adams feel like “a pirate” (*Education* 271).

Chapter 6. “A Sonorous People”: *TechnoMusic and the Joyful Body/Politic*

1. The quote is from Barthes, “Musica Practica” 153. In Heath’s translation, the passage reads: “to operate his music, to draw it (it is willing to be drawn) into an unknown praxis.”

2. Techno is far from being a ‘monolithic style.’ I will use the word here as a term that includes techno’s various subsets and coextensive styles, such as electronic [dance] music, house, jungle, breakbeat, trance, and gabba.

3. In fact, according to Frankie Knuckles, a deejay, in 1977, the year Attali’s book was published, house music was ‘born’ in the Warehouse in Chicago (see Anz and Meyer, “Die Geschichte von Techno,” 17).

4. See, for example, coverage of the topic in magazines such as *i-D* and *Spex*, and books like Reynolds, *Energy Flash* and *Generation Ecstasy*; Redhead, *Rave Off*; Collin and Godfrey, *Altered States*; Saunders and Doblin, Saunders; and Eisner, *Ecstasy*.

5. I also heed Deleuze/Guattari’s advice in the French 1976 edition of *Rhizome*, as expressed in one of this chapter’s epigraphs, to find passages in books that suit the project: “Yes, take what you want” (68). This different version of the “Rhizome” chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus* appeared in an English translation by Foss and Patton.

6. There have been four CDs that explicitly acknowledge the relation between techno and the work of Deleuze: *Modulation and Transformation* and *In Memoriam Gilles Deleuze* [both on Achim Szepanski’s Mille Plateaux Label], and *Folds and Rhizomes for Gilles Deleuze* and *Double Articulations > Another Plateau* [on Guy Marc Hinant’s label Sub Rosa]. See also Buchanan and Swiboda, *Deleuze and Music*, in particular Murphy, “What I Hear Is Thinking Too.”

7. Deleuze/Guattari point out that even the most revolutionary ‘bards’ songs can “also bring about the most Oedipal of reterritorializations, oh mama, oh my native land, my cabin, olé, olé” (*Kafka* 24).

8. In *Spectacular Vernaculars*, Potter understands hip-hop as a political practice—a “signifyin(g)” practice, as Henry Louis Gates would have it—with its Black English as a vernacular of deterritorialization [*becoming-minor*] of the ‘major’ language.

9. This is a point where the two different strands of music momentarily touch, since even punk and heavy metal use *distorted* sounds—sounds in which the effect of [formerly unwanted] *noise* was in fact taken as a definition of rock music.

10. See Lyotard: “The grand narrative has lost its credibility” (*Postmodern* 37).

11. Note that artists such as Scanner [Robin Rimbaud], or Negativland’s Weatherman [David Wills] use surveillance technology [scanners] in order to create sonic landscapes by creating tracks from ‘scanned’ telephone conversations, in which the voices become sonorous, and the sonic—rather than the representational—aspect of the voice is made use of.

12. In its precarious position of being neither representational affirmation nor representational negation, techno occupies a position similar to Bartleby’s formula: “I prefer not to.”

13. “Une mondialité rythmique, de jazz en rap et au-delà . . . Oui, du bruit: c’est comme le revers d’une pensée, mais c’est aussi comme ce qui gronde dans les replis des corps” [my translation].

14. Freud wrote: “Man has, as it were, become a kind of prosthetic God. When he puts on all his auxiliary organs he is truly magnificent; but those organs have not grown on to him and they still give him much trouble at times” (“Civilization” 280).

15. Kristeva links the semiotic to Deleuze/Guattari’s notion of the ‘schizophrenic flow’ qua modern literature, “in which the ‘flow’ itself exists only through language, appropriating and displacing the signifier to practice *within it* the heterogeneous generating of the ‘desiring machine”’ (*Revolution* 17).

16. Deleuze|Guattari point out that “a musician requires a *first type* of refrain, a territorial or assemblage refrain, in order to transform it from within, deterritorialized, producing a refrain of the *second type* as the final end of music: the cosmic refrain of a sound machine” (*Thousand Plateaus* 349).

17. Elias Canetti wrote: “In the changing constellations of the pack, in its dances and expeditions, he [the member of the pack] will again and again find himself at its edge. He may be in the center, and then, immediately, at the edge again; at the edge and then back in the center” (93).

18. With respect to techno, there have been a multitude of references to tribalism, modern primitivism, and voodoo magic. In techno music, such connections are made clear in ‘sub-genres’ such as tribal dance or jungle. Thus, hackers, cyberpunks, techno artists, and other deterritorializers of computer technology are the new magicians of the digital age, the shamans and voodoo priests of technology.

19. See the 1992 CD of the American crossover band Rage Against the Machine, which prides itself on explicitly stating in the liner notes that “no samples, no keyboards or synthesizers were used in the making of this recording.”

20. The duplicity of techno and modernist music with respect to childhood is alluded to in Else Kolliner’s analysis of Igor Stravinsky’s ‘infantilism.’ She states that Stravinsky’s music creates a “new realm of fantasy . . . which every individual once in his childhood enters with closed eyes.” Stravinsky’s techniques of “continual change of beat, the stubborn repetition of individual motives—as well as the disassembling and totally new re-composition of their elements . . . are instrumentally accurate translations of child-like gestures of play into music” (quoted in Adorno, *Philosophy* 162–63).

21. Since I have related techno to Kristeva’s concept of the semiotic earlier, I would like to add her warning not to confuse the semiotic with the analog: “This heterogeneity between the semiotic and the symbolic cannot be reduced to computer theory’s well-known distinction between ‘analog’ and ‘digital’” (*Revolution* 66).

22. The title of a track by the techno artist Cosmic Baby.

23. The promise of a return to the pre-Oedipal and uncastrated realm of childhood also lies at the heart of Jaron Lanier’s manifesto for virtual reality: “All of us suffered a terrible trauma as children that we’ve forgotten, where we had to accept the fact that we are physical beings and yet in the physical world where we have to do things, we are very limited. The thing that I think is so exciting about virtual reality is that it gives us this freedom again. It gives us this sense to be who we are without limitation” (quoted in Wooley, *Virtual Worlds* 14).

24. Judgment Night is the name of a series of big techno raves in the 1980s|1990s. Judgment Day refers to notions such as doomsday, God’s final judgment, at which point humans have to pay for their sins. Judgment thus implies a deeply negative view of life, desire related to lack and debt. Nietzsche, Artaud—and techno’s judgment night—reveal a desire “to have done with judgment” (Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical* 126), to affirm life. The BwO is a way to do away with judgment, with the organism as “the judgment of God” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus* 158)—it a mode of production rather than of containment.

25. This is the title of a 1993 Ambient|Trance CD by Drome.

26. Deleuze|Guattari comment on the use of drugs in order to make yourself a body without organs, but they also warn that this experimentation might result in the complete

deterritorialization of the ‘empty BwO.’ However, they ask, “could what the drug user . . . obtains also be obtained in a different fashion in the conditions of the plane, so it would even be possible to use drugs without using drugs, to get soused on pure water” (*Thousand Plateaus* 166)—or sound?

27. Borrowing the term from Duns Scotus, Deleuze|Guattari describe haecceity as “a mode of individuation very different from that of a person, subject, thing, or substance. We reserve the name haecceity [it-ness] for it. A season, a winter, a summer, an hour, a date have a perfect individuality lacking nothing, even though this individuality is different from that of a thing or a subject. They are haecceities in the sense that they consist entirely of relations of movement and rest between molecules or particles, capacities to affect and to be affected” (*Thousand Plateaus* 261). See also Jordan, “Collective Bodies.”

28. An obvious liaison between techno and mysticism can be observed in the trend of merging Gregorian chants or Hildegard von Bingen’s “Canticles of Ecstasy” with techno beats. For another example, watch the video of Scubadevil’s “Celestial Symphony,” which features film sequences of religious rituals and fade-ins of possible combinations of 0 and 1. As an expanded metaphor of the information superhighway and in analogy with rock ’n’ roll culture as an extended metaphor of the street, the two variants of techno—the *abject* and the *sublime*—can be read as the information superhighway to hell and the information superstairway to heaven.

29. In *Ocean of Sound*, David Toop has traced the development of the early-twentieth-century avant-garde and its use of religious rituals [e.g., gamelan music] through the American minimalists to present-day electronic music.

30. On La Monte Young and his microtonal variations, Deleuze|Guattari comment: “It is clear that what is necessary to make sound travel, and to travel around sound, is very pure and simple sound, an emission or wave without harmonics (La Monte Young has been successful at this)” (*Thousand Plateaus* 344). It is no coincidence that Reich and Glass are valued by the intelligent techno community as important ancestors. Two projects cement this indebtedness and influence: Aphex Twin’s collaboration with Glass, and the Steve Reich Remixed Project, presenting interpretations of Reich’s minimal music by distinguished techno artists such as DJ Spooky The Subliminal Kid, Cold Cut, and Ken Ishi.

31. Deleuze blames Kant for finally returning to an ultimate harmony in reason, where the faculty of reason harmonizes the breakdown of representation in the sublime experience.

32. In fact, related to speeds and slownesses, there is no ‘subject’ in the first place, since they “produce individuations without a ‘subject’” (Deleuze and Parnet, *Dialogues* 33).

33. The love parade originated in Berlin in 1989, but it has spread all over the world, to places such as Tel Aviv, Mexico City, Seattle, and San Francisco.

Conclusion

1. Deleuze and Guattari wrote: “An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it expands its connections”

(*Thousand Plateaus* 8). Regarded from this perspective, ‘Americanness’ can only denote a *becoming-American*.

2. Note again the ambiguity of the word *missing*: missing in the sense that it *has yet to be made*, and in that the people [just like the ‘self’ in self-organization] is ultimately missing—there is no such thing as a permanent unity called self or people.