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All sessions will be held on the Purdue University West Lafayette campus in the Vision 21 Conference Room in Beering Hall (BRNG), Seventh Floor, Room 7150.

8:30-9:00am  Continental Breakfast

Morning Session

9:00-10:00am  Daniel W. Smith, Purdue University
  “Against Social Evolution: Deleuze and Guattari’s Social Typology”

10:00-11:00am  Justin Litaker, South Alabama University
  “The Role of Labor, Value, and Power in Deleuze and Guattari’s Political Philosophy”

11:00-11:15am  Coffee Break

11:15am-12:15pm  Jon Roffe, University of New South Wales
  ‘Price, Money and Memory” (from Deleuze and Guattari to another modern monetary theory)

12:15pm-2:00pm  Lunch

Afternoon Session

2:00-3:00pm  Gregg Flaxman, University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill
  “Off the Grid”

3:00-4:00pm  Ronald Bogue, University of Georgia
  “Esprit de Corps and the War Machine”

4:00-4:15  Coffee Break

4:15-5:15  Eugene Holland, Ohio State University
  “Deleuze, Markets, and Capitalist Axiomatics”

6:00-  Dinner/Reception at Catherine and Dan’s place, 216 N. 6th St, #3A, in downtown Lafayette. All are welcome.
Abstracts

Ronald Bogue, University of Georgia
“Esprit de Corps and the War Machine”

In *A Thousand Plateau’s* Plateau 12, “Treatise on Nomadology: The War Machine,” Deleuze and Guattari pose the question, “What is a collective body?” This leads them to differentiate between bodies and organisms, attributing *esprit de corps* to bodies and *âme d’organisme* (soul of the organism) to organisms. Ultimately, Deleuze and Guattari oppose *esprit de corps* to *âme d’organisme* as nomadic to sedentary, the war machine to the State apparatus, the smooth to the striated, rhythm to meter, and so on. Their point of entry to the notion of *esprit de corps* is a discussion of *asabîya* in Ibn Khaldun’s 14th-century *Muqaddimah*. Deleuze and Guattari’s reading of Khaldun raises interesting questions about the *esprit/âme* distinction, the warrior, war and the State that are compounded by an examination of their remarks on the hoplite reform and Clastres’ account of war in traditional societies.

Gregg Flaxman, University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill
“Off the Grid”

This paper revolves around Gilles Deleuze’s concept of a post-disciplinary or “control society.” Rather than simply rehash Deleuze’s theory, this talk seeks to understand control by dint of piece of American vernacular—going “off the grid.” Ultimately, I argue that the genealogy of the phrase, traversing cartography, renewable energy, radical libertarianism, and the digital revolution, discloses the political and biopolitical problem posed by control itself.

Eugene Holland, Ohio State University
“Deleuze, Markets, and Capitalist Axiomatics”

My paper will explore the political implications of what D&G mean by calling capitalism a uniquely ”axiomatic system,” starting with the difference between intensive and extensive multiplicities (derived from Jon Roffe’s critique of their invocation of set theory v/v axioms), moving through segmentation and quantum flows (particularly as regards capital, money, and markets), the major/minor distinction, and ending with an examination of the difference and relations between conjunctions/conjugations and connections.

Justin Litaker, South Alabama University
“The Role of Labor, Value, and Power in Deleuze and Guattari’s Political Philosophy”

Deleuze and Guattari are by no means unique in grounding much of their political philosophy in political economy. Indeed, some of the most influential works in contemporary political philosophy, such as John Rawls’s *A Theory of Justice* and Robert Nozick’s *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, are so grounded in certain economic theories that they arguably stand or fall on the latter’s viability. The global economic crisis of 2008 elicited a critique of the orthodox political economy that we find at the heart of such influential political philosophies as Rawls and Nozick’s. One aspect of this critique demonstrates how orthodox political economy has managed to render essential components of economic life invisible. For example, when they’re not absent entirely, the following components are emaciated and made explanatorily impotent by orthodox economic thought: power, desire, agency, subjectivity, labor, the production process, debt, money, and time.
To fill this lacuna, heterodox political economy has stepped in with an explanatorily coherent analysis of capitalism, one that restores the significance of those previously mentioned empty or missing elements. Herein lies the potential importance of a political philosophy like Deleuze and Guattari’s, based as it is in such heterodox economic thought. In this paper, I will focus on the use Deleuze and Guattari make of Marxist political economy in their analysis of the labor process, value, and the origins and reproduction of a specific relation of power unique to the capitalist form of social production. I will argue that their account here not only transfers the advantages of this heterodox political economy, but transforms the latter into fruitful conceptual tools proper to a political philosophy of contemporary capitalism.

Jon Roffe, University of New South Wales
“Price, Money and Memory” (from Deleuze and Guattari to another modern monetary theory)

This paper will begin and be framed by what I see as a problem internal to Deleuze and Guattari’s positioning of the State in capitalism, according to which capitalist States are models of realization for the single capitalist axiomatic. The problem concerns the origin of the axioms themselves: who is the agent of axiomatization? It appears it cannot be the States, which only realize these axioms; equally, it does not seem that the global level of capital can responsible either, characterized as it is by an impassive monetary mass. Further, if there is a single capitalist axiomatics, then it how is it that the axioms realized by States differ - who is responsible for their addition and subtraction?

One resolution of this problem is to shift the locus of the analysis from the global axiomatic to the State, which will be considered as the producer and regulator of axioms. This allows us to redefine coding and axiomatization in terms more familiar to economic analysis: price and value. It also makes room for a concept of the market qua the locus of the intensive ordinates of capitalist society.

I will use this way of reformulating Deleuze and Guattari’s position as the basis for three consequent modifications to their account: with respect to the location of the State (from States to states of the market), with respect to money (from two forms of money to one), and with respect to memory (from two forms of memory to three).

Daniel W. Smith, Purdue University
“Against Social Evolution: Deleuze and Guattari’s Social Typology”

One of Deleuze and Guattari’s most challenging and radical theses in Capitalism and Schizophrenia is that societies do not evolve from more primitive “hunter-gatherer” societies to more complex “State” forms, such as the archaic empires of Egypt or Babylon. They base these claims, in part, on the work of anthropologists such as Clastres, Sahlins, and Mauss, who showed that “primitive” societies are constituted by mechanisms that actively ward off the formation of a State-like apparatus of power (chieftainship, war) or the formation of markets (potlatch). As a result, they argue, social change must be understood to take place within what they call a field of coexistence, in which primitive societies and States coexist, and have always coexisted. This argument against social evolution—or at least conceptions of linear (or even multi-linear) social evolution—has important implications in several domains which we will explore in this paper, particularly with regard to Deleuze and Guattari’s socio-political theory and their theory of temporality.