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Introductory Detour

Est-il possible d’être communiste sans Marx? Évidemment. […] Nous ne croyons donc pas possible de parler du communisme sans Marx.

This croquis, albeit remaining synoptic and incomplete, attempts to literally sort out how the capture-devices of Capital can be appraised when taking into account the repercussions—political or economic, academic or cultural—of “May ‘68” strictly in relation to the difference between Marxism “and” Marxian economics (économie marxiste). For those who do not feel the necessity to distinguish between Marxism and Marxian economics, this may seem a boring exercise; yet it is an inevitable and indispensable procedure (particularly for the Marxists who are to still “breathe” in the re-territorialised time-space temporarily as well as geopolitically named Japan) that must be traversed as meticulously as possible in order to prepare the theoretical core ground for a larger project of mine, The Stratigraphy of Capitalism: the Capture-Devices of Capital (hereafter SC-CDC).

Considering the overall aim above, by all rights, I perhaps should have taken a strictly academic attitude and simply started my arguments from section II of this rough note in order to render the text less verbose and more compact and succinct. However, I have, albeit hesitantly, proscribed myself from doing so not simply due to my long-standing and naïve ailment—i.e., self-effacement—but by adding to the aim here a temporal (or perhaps even “ethical”) condition/limitation, in this case the historic Événement which was insisted to have

---

1 I deeply appreciate my comrade in arms, Professor Gavin Walker (McGill University), who not only checked my weird and indecent English—it cannot be an excuse to say that it’s just a manuscript written for a talk session—but also read my incomplete piece and gave me many suggestions in a casual manner. In addition to this, I would emphasise that his essay (“On Marxism’s Field of Operation: Badiou and the Critique of Political Economy,” Historical Materialism, 20(2), 2012) is the starting point from which I think it necessary to reconsider Marxian economics from the Badiouan and Negrian viewpoint. It goes without saying that all the possible shortcomings here are mine.

2 It is tremendously difficult to explain the relation(ship) between Marxism and Marxian economics. Marxian economics has long enjoyed its groundless privilege (i.e., economism, or precisely speaking, economic reductionism). In Japan the two have been clearly distinguished from each other in terms of discipline (in both senses) since the severance between science and ideology by Marxian economist Uno Kōzō and his epigones, and this “severance” traditionally reflects the historically unique “debate” among Japanese Marxism(s) in the 1920s and the early 30s. Gavin Walker and I are now organising a project to re-locate The Debate on Japanese Capitalism within the contemporary conjunctures.

3 You will see why I use the word “breathing” soon.
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not “taken place” in a complicated sense: “May ’68” in its generic connotation. In order for this self-imposed limit—in this sense ethics—to reveal itself academically, I placed at the very beginning of this text an epigraph, which, but then again, forces me to open the gate for a necessary—yet perhaps seemingly irrelevant at first glance—detour only in order to take a shortcut to the aim itself.

The epigraph comes from an essay of Toni Negri, and the first part of it clearly refers to two singular yet contrastive communists, Gilles Deleuze and Alain Badiou, when seen not only from their respective political viewpoints but also from their specific écarts towards their own versions of Marx. The second part “évidemment” upholds the position which Negri has been unswervingly occupying since his early years. In other words, Negri believes it possible (or, I should say, rather allowable) to be communist without Marx, but impossible (or, definitely unacceptable) to talk about communism without Marx. Given this dimensionally discrepant contrast—i.e. a contrast which is intentionally designed to contiguously pass by and miss the other—between Deleuze and Badiou on the one hand and Negri himself on the other, I would
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quickly pose the following rather blunt question.

If the Negri in the epigraph is *not inexact* in reading Deleuze and Badiou comparatively together with his own Marx, then, in order for me to be able to not simply *accept* but rather *undertake* both positions *simultaneously*, how do I have to consistently install a theoretical liason—whether positive or negative—*between* the possibility of “being communist without Marx” which Negri, reluctantly or not, admits and the impossibility of “speaking of communism without Marx” with which Negri definitely takes issue? To re-posit the agenda in this manner, however, instantly leads me, as one amongst the many *grouchy* Marxian economists—especially since its “purge” from the political front-scene or moreover from the streets, schools, factories, and everywhere that was totally *cleansed* and mutated after ’68—, to develop it into an intimately entangled one while putting aside the taken-for-granted fact that both are always-already “possible” and “compatible” insofar as they are merely enjoying the cozy discursive rocking chairs in their studies and/or giving pompous and carefree lectures in the classrooms that they are politically and in terms of the disciplinary *dispositif* allowed to dominate.

The question developed here is as follows. What are the *expunged Marxes*, or if anything, what is that *which is expunged* from (or in) these Marxes, seen in terms of the antipodal ends of the im/possibility (of being and/or speaking of communist/communism)? On top of that, I further ponder over what if I, feigning ignorance, or perhaps refusing to provide a detailed exploration of these many diverse Marxes functioning the lame excuse for its poor political accountability and theoretical persuasiveness as already proved tragically in ’68, simply supplant these possible Marxes with a *sole theory* now ossified as the institutionalised *Ding* called “Marxian economics/économie marxiste” whose only self-worth stems from its alleged logicality (or scientficity), useful only for vying in academic circles with orthodox/mainstream economics armed with highly “sophisticated” mathematical gadgets infiltrated by the *capitalistic axiomatics* from its theoretical infusion? Then how can and/or should I elucidate the difference between “being communist without Marxian economics” and “speaking of communism without Marxian economics”? To put it differently, am I allowed to say, as Negri optimistically does, that « Est-il possible d’être communiste sans économie marxiste?»

---

8 His Marx(es) changed as a matter of course; but the essential part of it converges on the dichotomous conceptualisation of the Marxian formal/real subsumption of (living) labour (power) as I will touch on shortly.


Évidemment. […] Nous ne croyons donc pas possible de parler du communisme sans économie marxiste ? The way in which the question is asked like this is much better, I believe, even for Negri who did not and needed not distinguish Marxist economics from Marxism under the banner or rather the pretext—scientific logicality in contrast to Marxian ideologies—of the Marxist critique of political economy.

As I will ask again in a different manner later, if so, then am I allowed to even reduce the question to its bare bones in a more sinisterly square manner and then rewrite the problem as follows? What has Marxist economics (without abandoning communism as its goal as well as its base) been doing since around ’68, or more broadly, since its fawning upon the triumph of science or scientificity over politics, whose irreparable consequence, in turn, I believe, is an unbridled unleashing of factually bloody politics (le politique) and therefore the corruption of politics (la politique) to the political (le politique)? Was it not necessary, at any rate, for the self-professed Marxian economists to take the trouble to crown their own versions of economics with the epithet “Marxian/marxiste”, which is, at the very most, proud only of its “being heterodox” per se while necessarily snuggling up inwardly to the visage oforthodoxeconomics, if they are not communists and do not fight for communism (of whatever forms) neither in their studies nor on the earth: in short, if they are not Marxists?

This série of sequential questions—still unfinished, and expecting a longer sequel like a laundry list—such as these, at which almost all of “rational” Marxian economists11 would undoubtedly cast dubious or even contemptuous gazes, as if they are burnt children who dread the fire, is exactly what I have been pondering upon or rather have been obsessed with as the basso ostinato of my historico-theoretical attempts since (the literally bloody defeat and aftermath or rather afterness) of ’68 while at the same time virtually accepting Badiou’s acerbic yet persuasive warning especially against the self-styled ex-activists including the ex-or would-be (or even wanna-be) “clandestine”-members of the still alive New Left parties around ’68, who now grumble shabbily and preach with an air of importance at those who they call ‘young kids’ in gasropubs.

At any rate, Badiou’s warning is:

Le sujet n’est pas un foyer12 de l’expérience ; et il n’y a pas d’expérience du sujet.13

---

11 By “rational” Marxian economist” here I don’t mean the so-called analytical Marxist and the members of the so-called September Group only; by that I would simply mean the Marxian economists who abandoned the critique of political economy.

12 The “foyer” should be usually rendered as “focal point” but this word immediately presses me to re-member the Derridian “hearth fire” which should be uncanny. For this, see the English translation of Jacques Derrida, La voix et le phénomene, Paris: PUF, 1967 (id., Voice and Phenomenon: Introduction to the Problem of the Sign in Husserl’s Phenomenology, trans. by Leonard Lawly, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2011, translator’s note 13, p. 97).
To be sure, we need to scrutinize his speculatively abysmal caution—commonsensical at first glance—reflecting the huge and bloody aftershock of '68, especially its kernel as to whether this “sujet” is individual or collective and how this “sujet”—I venture to say here, including *Partei* or *l’organisation politique*—is placed with regard to his overarching concepts such as “l’événement” (in con/dis-junction with “l’être”). Being forced to dissuade myself from delving into this philosophically as well as politically essential problem for this croquis, however, all I have to accept here at least is that his warning solemnly prevents me from jumping head on into this problem as it is and, therefore, legitimately coerces me to make a historico-theoretical, yet seemingly unrelated, round-about towards an apparently enigmatic conclusion in this rough note. All the more so I would venture to put the concisely minimised conclusion just here (meaning, before starting my *anabasis* at once objectively destined and subjectively designed to march back towards *katabasis*) not to mislead the readers into the labyrinth of the belated inundation of '68. That is:

Marxian economics cannot logically and automatically deduce what Marx called “Nicht-Capital” as ontically collective subject-placement expected to rise up automatically against Capital. It is because Capital pledges “It-Self” to *almost* succeed historically as well as theoretically in establishing “It-Self” as the Universal Set—*si il’y en a*—either in which there remains no Complementary Set or in which a Complementary set is (always already) at once formally and substantially pre-subsumed under Capital as a Subset (not as so-called living labour but as variable capital), so that the proletariat Marx and so-called Marxists have been prospecting for is to be posited as “Vide” or ø. All that remains possible for us to do is to emphasise, therefore, that the “Nicht” as “Vide” not simply divides into Two but potentially multiplies through “the hole of Event/le trou de l’événement”.

I would move retroactively or in a Hegelian manner of “die Reise wieder rückwärts”.

---


14 Of course Badiou very often talked about his “experiences” even boastfully, which I think is rather charming. See, for instance, Alain Badiou, « Penser le surgissement de l’événement », in id., *Cinéma*, Textes rassemblés et présentés par Antoine de Baecque, Paris: Nova éditions, 2010, pp. 172ff.


17 That is not to say that, since the living labour is alienated *from* “le propre” and reified as variable capital, it should be *restored*. It is impossible in the first place because we are prohibited to think about “le propre”. Ontically the only one “thing/Ding” that exists is the variable capital *encrusted with* us; nothing else in this world.
from this anticipated conclusion, which is theoretically scheduled to be revised in Part 2 of this croquis to come though, via the necessary detour as the experiential and intuitional arkhe (Ur-Teil) as it were, to the aim I set at the very beginning of this piece, and in this very sense I would get my round-about started with some rather dry lines from an essay penned by a young friend, Alberto Toscano, who said:

Tell me how you survived the 1980s and I'll tell you who you are. This might be an apt adage for the handful of contemporary radical theorists from the 1960s levy (1950s, in Negri's case) who have garnered such attention in the last decade from younger generations learning to cope with and contest neoliberalism.\(^{19}\)

In connection with this nuanced, or better, selectively and clearly targeted, vitriolic sarcasm, which I am fond of very much, I would also ask you to pay another attention to an unsung hero\(^{20}\) Sebastian Budgen's moving obituary seeing off Daniel Bensaïd.

According to Budgen, Bensaïd said sunnily—I could imagine, maybe pathetically as well—« Je m'accroche », which, as a matter of course, means in English “I'm hanging in there”. Budgen goes on to write that “he said” so “a few days before he died; and indeed he did, like a boxer determined to remain standing until the final bell.”\(^{21}\)

Am I being anachronistic and even sentimental to refer to this episode of Bensaïd? I have to confess, for sure, I did give more than a passing thought to the Adagio—Вы жертвою пали …—of Shostakovich's Symphony No. 11 when I read Budgen's obituary, but I did so not sentimentally; I am not lavishing a sort of macho praise upon Bensaïd as the last man standing. Rather quite the contrary, as everyone who knows him personally realises: I just want to emphasise the historically disjunctive conjunction where the two, or I would expect, multiple\(^{22}\) remote generations are literally doomed by Capital “It”-Self and its self-made and convenient History to encounter aleatorily\(^{23}\) each other in this neoliberal era as the positive

---

20 I personally know a good episode about him demonstrating his venerable personality as a communist organiser, but unfortunately it is not the place to talk about it.
Nichts on the lieux spécifiques illuminated by policing searchlights of the squads of riot police, and I would think it is nothing but the necessary Clinamina (la contingence/l’aléa nécessaire, pour ainsi dire).\textsuperscript{21} And in this very respect, the two linguistically different vehicles of the same tenor—“Je m’accroche” and “I’m hanging in there”—should be the crucial ingress of this seemingly redundant yet absolutely necessary digress in the sense that the problem here should be coupled to the Badiouan question in what follows.

The Badiouan question I mentioned above is: where/what is the “there” of “I’m hanging in there”? And I would quickly bring up an answer with some sort of conviction to my own question as follows: This “there” is neither what Bensaïd self-mockingly called the “Comintern bonsai”\textsuperscript{25} of the 80s where Ernest Mandel “with a purposeful grimace but not a terrible sound”\textsuperscript{26} was there too; nor the place of NPA (Nouveau parti anticapitalist)\textsuperscript{27} by which he managed to cope or rather deal with the 21st century as one of the communists surviving the aftermath/mess of ’68. This “there” is none other than some specific moment when/where the English adverb “there”—place/lieu—and the French reflexive pronoun se/me—sujet—are to become eventually (événementiellment) identical to and/or invaginated with each other in the struggle-processes on the street and everywhere with tear-gas hanging in the air. In this sense, it is by all odds the événement in the Badiouan sense—ayant-lieu-qua-sujet—
and hence, the event-fidelity-truth(procedure). In other words, the événement is a place-lieu/subject—Esplace/Splace (espace de placement)—as subject (to Truth)—when/where “I’m hanging in there” becomes not simply linguistically but rather substantively identical to “Je m’accroche”, and ‘68 was exactly the sparkingly symbolic Esplace/Splace of/for the Badiouan subject (to Truth) discovered in many lieux, which again drives my conviction that ‘68 reopened the Pandra’s Box that was, however, already wide open with the bloodshed of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and then knowingly covered up/deleted as if nothing had happened there and in s/he, but which finally disclosed a heap of self-deceits long accumulated not only in Marxian economics but in Marxism as well.

With this basic hunch derived from the experience of my own ‘68 through what I call “la fenêtre fixe”; or, bearing in mind Badiou’s unusual encouragement(?) that “Le courage est in-dé-sens, supporté par l’excès sous une loi scindée […] Cherchez votre indécence du moment (Courage is in-de-sense, based upon the excess under a split law. […] Look for you current indecency)” I’ve launched, as I touched on at the beginning, upon a new project and this note is one of my run-ups towards it.

Aside from the Introduction, the project is actually composed of five or six historico-logical descriptions of the Narratives of Capital which Capital itself fabricated according to its own impossible dream about It-Self, and this rough sketch is the preparatory logistics by which to spearhead the other parts. Almost of all them have much to do with the hopefully total deconstruction of Marxian economics and Marxist State Theories at the same time as they aim towards the genuine re-establishment of the Marxian critique of political economy. I do so by choosing an apparent cliché and positively introducing the viewpoints of various radical theorists and/or philosophers, such as Louis Althusser, Nicos Poulantzas, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Mario Tronti, Antonio Negri, early Alain Badiou,

---

28 See Bruno Bosteels, “Translator’s Introduction” to Alain Badiou, The Theory of the Subject, trans. by Bruno Bosteels, London: New York, Continuum, 2009, p. xxxi. One thing I want to point out here is the fact that Bosteels does not think a great deal of Marxian critique of political economy even compared to Badiou himself.

29 The “subject” here has a double connotation: the first aspect is the subject in relation to the object; the second is something that is “sub-jected”, in short, “subjection”.


31 You will be able to detect here something in vogue like “Bio-something” or even worse, “Bio-anything,” but I am not going to deodorise it simply because of it for a while.
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and the recent Maurizio Lazzarato.34

I Quadruple Original Problematisation

I enumerate these big names solely because they are the necessary theoretical pieces (or “blocks,” to use the Deleuze-Guattarian expression) for the project. In other words, I refer to them not to comprehensively examine them—it’s not my usual tack; I don’t like writing a boring textbook on intellectual history or Marxian economics—but to squeeze out of their arguments certain vital points at issue in my new project, strategically fragmenting them even against their own grain, and then stratigraphically re-gathering them according to my own narrative. And whether or not this works solely hinges upon how or along what line I can constellate them with more concretely distinct problematisation(s) in order for me to be able to retroactively regress to the conclusions I rather abruptly pre-set (voraus-setzen) above.

I.1 Quadruple Question Problematised

The pivotal point at issue traversing this note should be made more precise in terms of the following intertwined quadruple question, the procedure of which is expected or rather designed to re-incorporate the “expunged”—as I will explain shortly—Marxian economics into the disgraced Marxism—as I also will touch on shortly in close relation to the former—in my project. As you will see, I propose a newly created examination of the modern and/or contemporary forms of “außer-ökonomischer Zwang” operated—reluctantly or not—by


34 I will take up Lazzarato (and Negri) in Part 2 of this croquis together with Carl Schmitt. What I would point out in advance is that Lazzarato’s is a kind of new economism which has experienced a sort of politicism originating from the Marxian reductive economism and which is also relied on the Foucaultian Bio-politics as well as Carl Schmittian view of the State as his resources. See Carl Schmitt, The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum, trans. and annotated by G. L. Ulmen, New York: Telos Press Publishing, 2006.
Capital or “l'expropriation (l'ex-propre) capitaliste” which should be historico-categorically distinguished from “peaceful”—as it were—exploitation through the “natural”, i.e., illusionally self-regulated35 market autonomia based on the modern contract system whose alias is the modern state.36 So much is this the case that the basic theoretical problematisation is as follows, given the natural-born dysfunction of the capitalist market by which to allegedly organise the society on its own:37

“What” ought to capture “what”, and “for what” and “how”?

To this quadruple question, three answers (or rather capitalist responses) are already ready to be pre-paired or almost pre-fixed somehow, as far as the anticipated theoretical structure of the project is concerned.

The first “what” should be Capital as the autistic Subjekt-qua-Substanz, if permitted to

35 For the illusion of the appearance of the “natural-ness” of free market, see, for example, a climinologist Bernard Harcourt’s The Illusion of Free Markets: Punishment and the Myth of Natural Order, Cambridge, Boston: Harvard University Press, 2012.

36 I would add, however, a clumsily long footnote here before setting an immediate problematisation while having in mind the Foucaultian disciplinalisation in relation to the binary of exploitation and expropriation. I can say that, we have to re-define the “exploitation” not simply based upon the putatively “peaceful” or “échangiste” contract-system of modern society but all the time violently and institutionally backed by some sort of “socio-political” incarceration. It, at the same time, outright forces me to refer to the specific Marxian concept “expropriation” supposedly based on the so-called “außer-ökonomischer Zwang. See David Garland, Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990 and id., David Garland, “What is a ‘History of the Present’? On Foucault’s genealogies and their critical preconditons,” Punishment & Society 16(4), 2014. See also Dario Melossi and Massimo Pavarini, The Prison and the Factory: Origins of the Penitentiary System, trans. by Glynis Cousin, Macmillan Press, 1981 [1977], and Georg Rusche and Otto Kirchheimer, Punishment and Social Structure, with a new introduction by Dario Melossi, New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2003. And it also reminds me of Negri’s “Social Factory” which is supposed to exhaustively “envelope” the society (Antonio Negri, Social Factory, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 1998. See also, Gerald Raunig, Factories of Knowledge Industries of Creativities, Afterword by Antonio Negri, trans. Aileen Derieg, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2013), or less so, Michael Hardt’s once much talked “The Withering of Civil Society” (Michael Hardt, “The Withering of Civil Society,” Social Text, No. 45, Winter 1995, pp. 27–44. See also, Mario Tronti, “La fabbrica e la società (1962),” in id., Opera e capitale, Roma: DeriveApprodi, 2006). And as to the latter I’d better point out here in advance a crucial Marxian concepts such as the “Formal/Real Subsumption of ‘Living’ Labour under the Capital” re-interpreted, or say, too linearly re-interpreted by Negri. I inserted Negri here thinking about the high possibility not to be able to reach him in the course of my talk today.

37 Do not “misread” it simply as the famous neoclassic problem such as the “market failure” and “government failure” dichotomty.
have recourse to the Hegelian *Logic*. The second “what” as the specific object—and *hence* subject—necessarily locked on to by the first “what” should be Living Labour *enclosed* again or *on all such occasions repeatedly*[^38], or not ontically but ontologically speaking, “Nicht-Capital”, if I borrow Marx’s neologism inscribed in the *Grundrisse*[^39] (which finally disappeared in *Das Kapital* as a theoretical device). Of course, that is not to say that the world is simply[^40] composed of the two *antagonistic* opposites such as Capital and (Living) Labour, although it is still an obsessive predilection for Marxian economists. It can be said *so only insofar* as the impossible external observation-measurement can be possible[^41] and land (and labour) as second nature can be methodologically ignored its “natural-ness” and then incorporated as *artefacts* under the condition that it is supposed to be assuredly *internalised as* accountable/commensurable rent (and wage-labour) based on the *commodifiable* and *alienable* property rights secured and *quantified* forcefully, i.e., lawfully by the State with the capitalist market[^42]. And this predilection is, if truth be told, flirting with the third question below.

The third question “for what” is connected to the “exteriority” (see Part 2) in the sense that the capitalist “außer-ness” has to be occasionally and synthetically reproduced through the accumulation process of Capital—whether in simple reproduction or expanded reproduction—for Capital to be able to survive as Capital while keeping up appearances indirectly.

[^38]: Of course the first enclosure—expropriation—is the so-called “primitive/originary” accumulation of capital.


[^40]: When I say “simply” I have in mind “land and labour” or “exteriority” in relation to the property right as the “internalisation”. See Part 2 of this croquis.


[^42]: See Yutaka Nagahara, “*Monsieur le Capital* and *Madame la Terre* Do Their Ghost-Dance: Globalizaiton and the Nation-State,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 99(4), 2000. I also quote here Jean-Luc Nancy not to forget how important it must be in this respect. Nancy said that “[I]f capital is not able to absorb all significance in the commodity, although it aims at nothing other, that is perhaps also because it does not entirely come from the commodity alone: what precedes capital is wealth as glitter, the wealth does not produce more wealth, but which produces its own splendor and its own opulence as the glow of a meaning in which the world is wrapped (but also blinded and suffocated by its glitter—at the same time that such glitter is captured by the hierarchy. Capital converts the glitter into an accumulation that produces as wealth that is defined by its own (re) productivity.” Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Creation of the World or Globalization*, trans. and introduction by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007, pp. 47–8 (id., *La création du monde ou la mondialisation*, Paris: Galilée, 2002, p. 48).
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deserving or directly as Capital. As to this problem, however, I would quote a seemingly obsolete—compared to the high-profile philosophical icons I enumerated above—passage from Uno Kōzō first as that which enables me to relativise these icons and saves the central setting of Marxian economics as still indispensable. Uno said:

Capitalism turns all products into commodities—it turns labour power itself into a commodity as well, but it cannot produce this as a commodity by means of capital. As a result, in order to completely commodify labour power, capital requires the industrial reserve army. Yet, unless this industrial reserve army is formed by capital itself, capitalism cannot posit the social foundations of its own establishment as a historical society.43

Needless to say Uno explicates the so-called the industrial reserve army here as that which Capital itself can produce de facto (i.e., not de jure) through some contrivances, and when he wrote this he might have had in mind his own edifice of Crisis Theory as that which could legitimately—and quantum-theoretically—equip itself with analytic devices to logicalise and confirm the contrivances as something at once inside and outside while at the same time changing or rather blurring the demarcating line between them. This problem per se is too big to talk about here and await another essay of mine; what is more intriguing here, however, despite the fact that it is usually left out as taken-for-granted, is to unravel the specific reason why Uno who exerted all his strength to establish the theory of pure capitalism44—takes so much trouble to emphasise the patent fact that without this contrivance, “capitalism cannot [substantively as well as formally] posit the social foundations of its own establishment as a historically specific society”.45

The reason I have to give to this intriguing question is very simple. It is the keystone and sole legitimacy exactly for Capital to solicit “It-Self” for a historically specific role that is supposed to organise modern society unassistedly. In other words, Uno actually points out the historically specific partiality of capitalism seen from the viewpoint of modern society, through which, ironically speaking, Capital arrogates (this time) to It-Self the sole historical role to organise society—whose alias is called “civil and/or market society”—without any assistance outside of It-Self. For Capital, in other words, the capitalist society ought to be


45 Two parentheses are my interventions.
totally identical to the civil and/or market society even though Capital knows it is definitely not.\textsuperscript{46} So much so that it \textit{ought to be} fortified with some contrivances to compensate for, and then cover up its partiality—the imperfectness Capital has been suffering and \textit{a fortiori} disavowing from its advent—and this is why Capital \textit{ought to equip} (imperfect/partial) It-Self with some “\textit{außer}-devices” \textit{as its genuine inside by its nature} in order to capture (living) labour(-power) as a \textit{perfect} Complementary Set which speaks \textit{only} “Warensprache”,\textsuperscript{47} or specifically \textit{capitalised}—and then \textit{securitised—population} in the Foucaultian sense if I take it \textit{lightly} in advance to some extent, to at last become a complete/universal \textit{and in this sense} closed and perfect It-Self, and in relation to this desire or \textit{rational delirium} of Capital in the Deleuzian sense of the word as I will refer shortly, the next point becomes more crucial: that is, what does the “how” I posed before actually mean?

As I have just intimated, Uno at first glance seems to speak here merely of the so-called industrial reserve army fluctuating according to the almost clocklike phase-changes of the “business cycle,” which has much to do with the accumulation of fixed capital and therefore \textit{at once} creates the fictitious capital as the last device of financial liquidation/securitisation of the fixed capital as a hunk of hugely accumulated “dead-labour” \textit{and} changes the forms of the industrial reserve army \textit{stocked as the potential living labour}.\textsuperscript{48} As is well known, however, this explanation has been relativised in a specific manner recently\textsuperscript{49}, and even Uno, who died without witnessing the newly emergent economic situations Negri \textit{et al.} witnessed after the 80s,\textsuperscript{50} methodologically expected that it could no longer explain anything under our current situation as it is, while nevertheless having a firm conviction that the industrial reserve army can and should be logicalised and hence \textit{internalised (enclosed?)} into the closed theoretical system through the business cycles themselves. So I would \textit{reinterpret} politico-economically his and Marx’s notion of the industrial reserve army along with the Foucaultian concept of \textit{population} which is seen to compose the capitalised civil society that “must be defended”\textsuperscript{51}, and all the more because of it the SC-CDCs have to incessantly try to subsume it, \textit{at once}
formally and substantively, as some-thing or some-Ding composed by both Capital and Nicht-Capital as a coerced complicit twin to be defended altogether.

I would sort out these SC-CDCs, to put it concretely, as a series of the conceptions that commences with the Althusserian “appareils” to the Foucaultian “dispositif” via Poulantzas’ interventions which eventually function at once as a “double-sided attack or two-front war against” and “bridging between” the Althusserian appareils and the Foucaultian dispositif, and finally the Deleuzo-Guattarian creative concepts, such as the “agencement-machine”.

Here, hopefully you will have already perceived my methodological stance repudiating the Manichean conceptions such as « Pouvoir - Savoir » - quo - « Répressif-Idéologique » for example. I am going to map these devices out not according to a diachronic order but to its synchronic co-appearances. In other words, what I call SC-CDC should be stratigraphically mapped out as being layered like geological folds (disambiguations) or say a pli-cated mille-feuille at once unto the micro-dimensions and the macro-dimension of capitalist society. For that, in what follows I concretise the question further yet in a quick manner to close the section I as succinctly as possible.

---


55 In other words, I am very critical of the Negri who emphasised the necessity of the independent chapters on the State and the Labour. See, for example, Antonio Negri, Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse, trans. by Harry Cleaver, Michael Ryan and Maurizio Viano, ed. by Jim Fleming, New York: Autonomedia, 1991.
I.2 Triplet Basic Question Concretised

The focal questions translated from the quadruple original question by drawing additional lines are as follows:

The first question I would re-pose here is: what are the criticisms Marxian economics “and” Marxism received around ‘68? To this non-academic question I would dispatch the two seemingly antithetical representatives of the critiques who are critical of Marxism, Foucault and Badiou, whose work I mine for my own productive use out of their huge corpus. And you will be able to witness both of them, as if they were sitting back to back, converging into one thing from the opposite. They are, in my understanding, a verso and recto.

The second question which has much to do with the first, as I insinuated before, is: what were Marxian economists “and” Marxists doing before ‘68? In other words, what in fact is it that they proudly insisted that “they” had “scientifically” proved, mainly based on Das Kapital as a logical system? To this question Deleuze and Guattari will be invited first as telling witnesses, and I would summon and interpellate Mario Tronti simply yelling “Hé, vous là-bas!” to stand by as a temporal stand-in for Negri. Once again you will be able to witness both of them, as if they were sitting back to back, converging into one thing from opposite sides. And this “one thing” is exactly what I want to highlight in this note, and from which I would get a view of how to critically re-connect Marxian economics with Lazzarato’s recent another version of “Capitalisme d’État”\(^{57}\) and some kind of Theory of Rentier Capitalism (hereafter TRC) while taking into consideration the capitalist distinction and priority-order between “having (un avoir)” and “being (l’être)” articulated in the Deleuzo-Guattarian argument (“1837 – de la retournelle”)\(^{58}\) I would refer to in the last section of this note Part 1.

Foucault comes in first in any way.


II Friendly Shots in Any Way

II.1 Epistemological Critique: Foucault

In 1966, Foucault brought out one of his masterpieces, *Les mots et les choses*, the English title of which is *The Order of Things*—actually *L’Ordre des Choses* is the original title to which Foucault himself strongly stuck yet in vain—, and I believe the latter is much understandable than the original in terms of what Foucault would have Marxists like us reconsider. In it, you can read the very famous and strategically furious stanza that wholly denounces the Marxism with no mercy whatsoever.

At the deepest level of Western knowledge, *Marxism introduced no real discontinuity* [coupure réelle]; it found its place without difficulty, as a full, quiet, comfortable and, goodness knows, satisfying form for a time (its own), within an epistemological arrangement that welcomed it gladly (since it was this arrangement that was in fact making room for it) and that it, in return, had no intention of disturbing and, above all, no power to modify, even jot, since it rested entirely upon it.59

This critique alone could be sufficiently devastating for Marxism. Foucault, nonetheless, did not ease his attack and went on to say, which must be catastrophic for Marxism:

Marxism exists in nineteenth-century thought like a fish in water: that is, it is unable to breathe anywhere else.60

“[C]omme poisson dans l’eau”: quite a metaphor. It not only simply sacrifices (as it deserves?) but also cripplingly derides and makes a fool of Marxism as a historical mal-framework in terms of epistemology. I read it right after the Japanese translation of it came out in 1977 (incidentally it was the peak of the bloody 1970s in Japan), and was emotionally “flabbergasted” at this mentally persuasive tone, to say the truth. Pierre Macherey quite recently eases me of my bitter past pain by proposing his eclectic re-reading of Foucault together with, or “avec”, Marx, to use Jacques Bidet’s manoeuvring,61 taking up a few words like “la vulgate marxiste traditionnelle”.62

We can list up many attempts which have manufactured innumerable kinds of recon-

---


60 Ibid., p. 274 (p. 262). Italicisations are mine.


ciliations between Marx and Foucault issued especially from the Marxist camp. But it truly means nothing because almost all of these eclectic ways out of the problem (out of what and for what?) have ended in failure and left nothing productive for both sides seen from the viewpoint of the theoretical re-investigations. Instead, we have to grasp and revise what Foucault purported to mean by his unsparing imprecation against Marxism so as to newly create another version of the Marxian critique of political economy. And in this very milieu, this denouncement, actually this metaphor (“poisson dans l’eau”) per se, immediately reminds me of Paul Veyne. Parenthetically, Veyne said in his book on Foucault that “I might well have entitled this book Le Samurai et le Poisson Rouge (The Samurai and the Goldfish).”\(^{63}\) So much so, some said, that it is of no use for me to take this up seriously; but it is strategically necessary since he writes as follows. Here you can see that the split without any incongruities in fact schizophrenically functions as one, methodologically speaking.

Veyne has a point, I should admit, in this interestingly schismatic manner because although he criticised Marxism more harshly than Foucault himself by specifically pointing out the “deceptively transparent glass bowl” into which Marxism arrogantly or even naively withdraws on the one hand, he, notwithstanding, is actually referring to Foucault’s Véridicition in a positive manner in the very same paragraph on the other.\(^{65}\) In relation to this non-paradoxal—\(a\) fortiori unfathomable—schism, I, being seized with unjustified anger at that moment against Foucault, was almost tempted to automatically ask back: What if Foucault also cannot but be “trapped in ‘discourses’ as if in a deceptively transparent glass bowl”. However, this query, admittedly a bit infantile, forces me in a flash to ask myself again: how can this “deceptively transparent glass bowl” be recognised and analysed in any way? Isn’t it tantamount to straying into the Weberian “Struggle among the Gods” and the so-called “Wertfreiheit”\(^{66}\) which in turn might automatically introduce the Schmittian Tyranny

---


\(^{64}\) Ibid., p. 14.
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of Values even if it is posited as a negative example like Lazzarato does. And in this respect, can we not be justified to retrieve Karl Mannheim’s binary: “Seinsgebundenheit/Seinsverbundenheit”? Excluding the essential problem that Mannheim’s “Wissen” should be distinguished from the Foucaultian epistêmê and therefore his notion of dispositif, Mannheim had already spoken of the “Seinsverbundenheit des Wissens”. He said:

[We] will present the sociology of knowledge as a theory of the social or existential determination of actual thinking. It would be well to begin by explaining what is meant by the wider term “existential determination of knowledge” (“Seinsverbundenheit des Wissens”).

And then he goes on to propose his own definition of ideology as “the phenomenon of collective thinking, which proceeds according to interests and social and existential situations” and marches forward by saying “To begin with” to start with:

To begin with it could easily be shown that those who think in socialist and communist terms discern the ideological element only in the thinking of their opponents while regarding their own thought as entirely free from any taint of ideology. As sociologists there is no reason why we should not apply to Marxism the perceptions which it itself has produced, and point out from case to case [from Fall (contingency) to Fall (contingency)] its ideological character.

If it is the case, and I’m convinced it surely is, isn’t it totally of no use to attempt to fathom the “deceptively transparent glass bowl” in the first place?

I am asking this a bit ingenuously not since it is concerning the famous problem of infinite regress but since I am encouraged by Jean-Luc Nancy and thinking about “l’interprétation-coupure” posited by Badiou in this respect, of course, together with Foucault’s véridiction. I also took up the question above or discussion not because I would attempt to bring forward my counterarguments to Foucault but rather because I would put the focus on the other

68 Lazzarato, Gouverner par la dette, op.cit., pp. 21ff. (id., Governing by Debt, op.cit., pp. 27ff.).
69 “Seinsverbundenheit des Wissens” is translated into English as the “existential determination of knowledge”. I dare to point out that this translation is awkwardly odd.
aspect of what Veyne called “the skeptical Samurai”’s anti-universalism, anti-historicism, and nominalism. In this regard, I should compare the so-called Foucaultian “nominalisme” (in relation to his concept of “power”) with Badiou’s specific concept or “truth-procedure” such as “name/naming” which actually is “surnuméraire”. This is a crucial problem even for Marxian economics but unfortunately I cannot afford to focus on it in this rough outline; however, the one thing I want to point out here in relation to this is Foucault’s mode of expression when he emphasised his “nominalisme”.

Foucault, after having explicated “the omnipresence of power” and averred that “Power is everywhere […] because it comes from everywhere”, with or based on his conviction about his alleged necessarily ubiquitous resistance (not struggle!), said that, all the more so “one needs to be nominalistic, no doubt” (Il faut sans doute être nominaliste). Needless to say, he talks about his own version of nominalism as nothing other than a strategy absolutely necessitated to elude the inescapable “deceptively transparent glass bowl” without being unaware of its deceptiveness, only through which can the subject as the inner observer (on the street, factories, schools and so on) be in-formed (in exchange for having neurosis or even the same

---

72 I suspect he is not able to get out of Young Marx (see Benjamine Hutchins ed., Jean-Luc Nancy, Justice, Legality and World, London: Cintinuum, 2012). But anyway Nancy said that “[A] world is a world only for those who inhabit it. To inhabit is necessarily to inhabit a world, that is to say, to have there much more than a place of sojourn: its place, in the strong sense of the term, as that which allows something to properly takeplace. To take place is to properly arrive and happen [arriver]; it is not “almost” arrive and happen and it is not only ‘an ordinary occurrence’. It is to arrive and happen as proper and to properly arrive and happen to a subject.” (Nancy, The Creation of the World or Globalization, op.cit., p. 42 [id., La création du monde ou la mondialisation, op.cit., pp. 35–6]).
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delirium as Capital).
In connection to this, Badiou could be understood to say that:

Tout Sujet est coextensif à une strategie.78

In this sense it is nigh-impossible even for Foucault to get out of this “deceptively transparent glass bowl” without which he cannot “breathe” like the Marxism he totally denounced, but the good thing is that he himself was one of the most astute thinkers (or observers who have got complete knowledge about the so-called “observer effect”), along with Marx himself, on the subject of its deceptiveness, because Foucault notes in The Birth of Biopolitics an anticipation of his notion dispositif as follows:

Politics and the economy are not things that exist, or errors, or illusions, or ideologies [La politique et l’économie qui ne sont ni des choses qui existent, ni des erreurs, ni des illusions]. They are some things that do not exist and yet [pourtant] which are inscribed in reality and fall under a regime of truth dividing the true and the false [un régime de vérité qui partage le vrai et le faux].81

This is all the more crucial as Foucault was deeply concerned with Véridiction armed with skeptical nominalism in his last years. So what is at stake here is the fact that Marxists, whether new or old, were righteously deprived of their groundless insistence/privilege that they are the one and only species-being which could be independent of the alienated or rather fetishised and/or reified situation and get out of this glass bowl and, on top of that,

79 I should add in passing that Agamben’s notion of dispositif and Foucault’s are alike in appearance but quite different in nature. See, for example, Giorgio Agamben, Qu’est-ce qu’un dispositif? Paris: Payot & Rivages, 2007 (id., What is an Apparatus [sic]? and other essays, trans. by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009). This problem is crucial for my new project. I have already talked about the commodification of (living) labour power, which has also much to do with the capture of human bodies. See, for a while, François Guéry and Didier Deleule, Le corps productif, Paris: Editions Mâme (Collection “Repères,” directed by Gilles Anquetil), 1972. See also, as a not cool interpretation of Le corps productif, Philip Barnard and Stephen Shapiro, “Editors’ Introduction to the English Edition,” in François Guéry and Didier Deleule, The Productive Body, trans. and Intro. by Philip Barnard & Stephen Shapiro, Alresford, Hants: Zero Books, 2014, pp. 1–45.
80 The focal point at issue is not simply “divide” but “partage” which really connotes not a simple separation but “share”.
“objectively”—or say, from the viewpoint of economic analyses and diagnoses—analyse by recourse to or by openly smuggling in some other “discourse” called historical materialism whose privileged function has been based mainly upon Marxian (scientific?) economics as the so-called Queen of the social sciences.

But it should be admitted that this could result in yet another “deceptively transparent glass bowl”, which turns out to be, in the last analysis, the notion that there is no “deceptively transparent glass bowl” around us whatsoever; we are that which is reified par excellence, and so what?; we are just incessantly creating our own “deceptively transparent glass bowls” whilst at the same time exposing others’ deceits triumphantly but opportunistically like Deus ex machinā. And this is exactly that which has much to do with what politics (la politique) is supposed to be in relation to the political (le politique) in Badiou’s sense of the word.

Badiou, by sharply distinguishing politics (la politique) from the political (le politique) taking into consideration Nancy and Lacoue-Labarthe’s distinction between politics and the political with reference to Hannah Arendt and Claude Lefort, talks extensively about “the fiction of the political” which is “punctured by politics as the hole of the event [Le politique n’a jamais été que la fiction où la politique fait le trou de l’événement. Un énoncé canonique (de Rousseau à Mao)]”.83 Foucault’s or Veyne’s “glass bowl” is in this context equal to what Badiou calls the “fiction-qua-le-politique” in which the Marxism Badiou denounces as goldfish was also swimming unknowingly together with other goldfishes. It was and still is an open secret and if it is the case, then the problem becomes what goldfish we individuals have to embrace as our collective self strategically, having the “Nichts” or “void” of or against Capital in mind? Be that as it may, I am not talking about decisionism even if I cannot deny that Badiou is a specific kind of decisionist; I’m talking instead about “l’événement” which remains to arrive, but not messianically. It is just like a Kierkegaardian “choice is chosen”. Here is where the problem of ’68 resides both historically and substantively, the many diverse experiences of which are ours (since the theorisation of the event can be only authorized belatedly, but fortunately or not, is meaningless for the situation in which it is authorised).

In order to pursue this problem further in terms of the critique of the Marxism I know, I need another criticism that comes from the inside or ex-inside. So here is where Badiou is invited as a powerful critic; yet he was already with us, as you have probably already sensed.

---


83 Badiou, Peut-on penser la politique?, ibid., p. 12. See also Katja Diefenbach, Marxism’s puncture: Reading Badiou’s Can politics be thought?” (www.after1968.org)
II.2 Political Critique: Badiou

Badiou overtly proclaimed that “Son crédit est épuisé”.84 “Son”: Whose? Of course, Marxism’s. Marxism’s credit, or rather open-date has run out—or precisely speaking, Marxism’s credit is worn out. This remark was open to the public in 1985, the date of which is far away from Foucault’s criticisms I’ve just mentioned above and also far-off from the events of ’68 towards which Badiou himself seemed to be not wholeheartedly sympathetic.85 The chronological vicissitude of Badiou’s works is now under close scrutiny from many angles,86 and I’d better leave this toilsome yet inciting project to the brilliant active scholars like Bruno Bosteels, Peter Hallward, and Alberto Toscano; in other words, it is not necessary, at least here and now, for me to take it up within the logical structure of my project; at stake here instead should be at least the fact that it was avowed, after the official declaration of the end of the Cultural Revolution in 1977 and before the Tian’anmen Square Protests of 1989 and the Fall of the Berlin Wall and the Collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989/1991. *Scilicet*, it was during the tough as well as bubbly and flamboyant 80s when it was declared.87 Badiou continues, explaining his actual “vouloir-dire”:

Today, the referents of Marxist politics are not Marxist. There is a fundamental delocalisation of Marxism. Previously, there was a kind of self-reference, because Marxism drew its general credit from states that called themselves Marxist, from wars of national liberation under the direction of Marxist parties, from workers’ movements framed Marxist unionists. But this referential apparatus is gone. The great mass historical pulsations no longer refer to Marxism, after, at least, the end of the Cultural Revolution in China: see Poland, or Iran. Therefore, there is an expatriation of Marxism [its variant: « une expatriation de la politique »]. Its historical territoriality is no longer

transitive to it. The era of self-reference ([l’autoréférence] is closed. *Marxism no longer has a historical home* [its variant: *La politique n’a plus de patrie historique*])

Leaving aside the implications with respect to the fact that Badiou identifies his Marxism with *la politique* (it may be closely connected with “a Subject to Truth”


89 It is also complicated to interpret this “a Subject to Truth”: is it the subject who/which resides in the truth”; or the subordination to the truth (i.e., in this case the subject is the truth)?


91 For the Heideggerian *Verwindung*, see Gianni Vattimo, “‘Verwindung’: Nihilism and the Postmodern in Philosophy,” *SubStance* 16(2), No. 53, 1987.
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I believe, to put it quite bluntly, that Marxism doesn’t exist [le marxisme n’existe pas]. […] “Marxism” is the name (void) of an absolutely inconsistent set [un ensemble absolument inconsistant], once it is referred back, as it must be, to the history of political singularities [à l’histoire des singularités politiques].

Badiou’s criticism against “Marxism” is not simply a political denunciation (and the abandonment of it as its result, not to mention); it is clearly derived directly from his deep suspicion—maybe not distrust and I have some evidence related to it, but I am not going to look into it to prove my conviction—towards Marxian economics.

The target should be how to deal with its cleansed logicality and historicity without content despite that its political task is to delineate its “quasi-causality”. It is because he says:

[...] l’économie politique dite marxiste n’a pas su critiquer sa propre critique, c’est bien connu. Elle a représenté la mise en fiction philosophique du pointage, par Marx comme par Lénine, de ce que le réel de la politique n’est jamais que rencontré, hasardeux. [So called Marxist political economy has not been able to criticise its own critique. It has philosophically [rather scientifically] fictionalised that which both Marx and Lenin had pointed out, namely, that the real of politics is never anything but encountered and chanced upon.]

What did he purport to mean by saying that? « C’est bien connu »? Isn’t it the same as exactly what Mannheim has already proposed in the 1930s? Of course its cleansed logicality and its disavowed historicity embedded in Marxian economics are his target. In other words, for Badiou, thinking about its ludicrous competition with the orthodoxy, Marxian economics, as a discrete “discipline”, doesn’t exist! This problem, which should be commonsensical among us now, should be closely connected with the second question I raised before. That is, what on earth were Marxian economists doing before and right after ’68 to cope with its cumulative arteriosclerosis or say autistic “autoréférence” and “autodéveloppement” firmly established by an apparatus of “la marxisation”? In relation to this, I should quote some passages from Deleuze-Guattari’s masterpiece, which bid farewell to ’68 and its after-math/mess as well. Deleuze and Guattari will give us a clear answer.

---

93 See Diefenbach, Marxism’s puncture: Reading Badiou’s Can politics be thought?, op.cit. It is the most persuasive essay on it thus far. Gavin Walker also begins talking about the Badiouan “torsion”.
II.3 “Polito-Economic” Critique: Deleuze and Guattari

In 1972, Deleuze and Guattari made the following pronouncement, which is crucial and which also provokes Poulantzas’s unnecessarily harsh counter-arguments against Foucault as well as Deleuze and Guattari based on his strategically impetuous “torsion”—I believe—of them, but also criticisms against Althusser, as we will see in Part 2:

The regulative functions of the State do not imply any sort of arbitration between social classes. That the State is entirely in the service of the so-called ruling class is an obvious practical fact, but a fact that does not reveal its theoretical foundation. The latter is simple to explain: from the viewpoint of the capitalist axiomatic there is only one class, a class with a universalist vocation, the bourgeoisie [c’est que, du point de vue de l’axiomatique capitaliste, il n’y a qu’une seule classe, à vocation universaliste, la bourgeoisie].

“Vocation universaliste, la bourgeoisie”, which immediately reminds us of the Weberian “Beruf”. They also said in keeping with what they call “obvious practical fact” above:

The opposition is between the class and those who are outside the class [L’opposition est entre la classe et les hors-classe].

Please note here that the class/la classe, in other words, the bourgeoisie as the “vocation universaliste” bestowed solely by Capital (clothed with the protestant God), is a sole and/or unique class legitimately (axiomatically?) existing and “named” in the capitalist system from its advent; however, its supposed and complicit counterpart, which can result/derive from “la classe” only ex-post/belatedly (or rather eventually), is rent into the two in that the definite article “les” is as a matter of course plural or multiple but the “hors-classe”—the Complementary Set to the Universal Set which Capital monopolises to It-Self—is apparently singular “(hors-)classe” (albeit always in multiplicities?). In this regard, the English transla-

---

97 Ibid., p. 47, p. 62, p. 59 et passim. He also said “La marxisme parle alors du mode sur lequel le marxisme pénètre le réel de la lutte des classes: partis marxistes, directions marxistes, États marxistes. Le « il y a » devient: « il y a du marxisme »”. (ibid., p. 59). It is exactly what Foucault talks about the relation between Savoir and Pouvoir and his dispositif.


100 Deleuze and Guattari, Anti-oedipus, op.cit., p. 255 (p. 303). Italicisations are mine.
tion misses somehow the nuanced singular/multiple relation manuevred and crystalised in the Trinity Formula (whether the Marxian version\textsuperscript{101} or Deleuzo-Guattarian one\textsuperscript{102}) by Capital, or its multiplicity concerning class for Deleuze and Guattari. To repeat, Capital arrogates to It-Self the Universal Set in which “les hors-classe” comes on and off \textit{eventually} as the (\textit{timid} or \textit{domesticated}) Complementary Set formed according to some-Ding, which Badiou wants to name “surnuméraire” on the one hand and Deleuze and Guattari would name “relative deterritorialisation”\textsuperscript{103}—destined never to reach the “absolute deterritorialisation” unless Capital itself is dismantled—on the other.

The Deleuzo-Guattarian important conclusion presented here, which is the most stark indication for us Marxian economists as well, is, therefore, that there is a sole and unique class \textit{in terms of} “l’axiomatique capitaliste”, to which Badiou will counter-propose a thesis I will touch on below. But at this point, I have to make an answer to the question I myself raised before. At my own question “What on earth were Marxian economists doing before and right after ’68?”, I would \textit{launch} my answer like this: Marxian economists “scientifically” proved, at best, that \textit{Capital nigh-possibly can} (\textit{continue to}) \textit{exist} on its own \textit{du point de vue de l’axiomatique capitaliste}. Simply speaking, Marxian economics proved what Capital dreams itself as the rational system of the \textit{“autoréférence”} and \textit{“autodéveloppement”}—in short, closedness—firmly established by an apparatus of “la marxisation” itself. And in this regard, I would also remind you of Deleuze’s famous and catastrophic critiques against the \textit{rational} closedness of Marxian economics in relation to this. I love it most among many such passages.

We don’t use the words “normal” and “abnormal.” Every society is at once rational and irrational. They are necessarily rational in their mechanisms, their gears and wheels, their systems of connection, and even by virtue of the place they assign to the irrational. … Reason is always a region carved out of the irrational … Underneath all reason lies delirium, and drift. Everything about capitalism is rational, except capital or capitalism. … Something that has not remarked enough in Marx’s \textit{Capital} is how Marx is fascinated by capitalist mechanisms, precisely because, at one and the same time, \textit{it is demented and which nevertheless works} [\textit{c’est dément et ça marche très bien}]\textsuperscript{104}.


\textsuperscript{102} Deleuze and Guattari, \textit{A Thousand Plateaus}, op.cit., pp. 443ff. (id., \textit{Mille plateaux}, pp. 554ff.).

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., p. 54 \textit{et passim} (id., \textit{Mille plateaux}, p. 73 \textit{et passim}).

In relation to this, Deleuze defines Capital by (auto-)referring to his version of Nicht-Capital (the potential proletariat an sich) as an indispensable moment, and he sometimes describes it with his specific and beautiful notion, the “Stutter/Bégayer” and “déménte” of the orderly Business Cycles (i.e., Crises), so much so that Badiou, “le communiste sans Marx”, together with another “communiste sans Marx” Deleuze, could cheerfully tease Marxists, or rather Marxian economists by asking:

Votre prolétariat, où est-il? N’est-ce pas un signifiant imaginaire?

And this gibe, towards which Étienne Balibar once tried to indirectly “answer”, has much to do with his characterisation of “economism”, an almost incurable disease which Marxian economists self-assuredly and Marxists opportunistically contract and both of them necessarily develop the very same symptoms politically. And the symptom of which Badiou condenses into the sole thesis is crucial:

\[ \text{L’
 économisme, qui aime les distinctions, pose l’extéritorité} \]

The exteriority against what? But why don’t I ask in a straightforward manner “what interiority it is supposed to have as its counterpart/reversed complementary set” here? But anyway Badiou also said the following, and it is absolutely yet enigmatically vital.

\[ \text{[L’]e monde bourgeois esplace la classe, le capital est le lieu du prolétariat} \]

The crucial nucleus must be how to decrypt this specifically dense but surprisingly simple proposition that “le capital est le lieu du prolétariat” since, as I mentioned before, “le lieu” has much to do with “le sujet” being tightly chained to “l’être”, which, I believe, should be delineated only under the context of his neologistic verb “esplacer/splace”. What could be said, at the very least here, is that this has much to do with the word “place/lieu,” or more to say, “ayant-lieu/taking-place”.

---
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If it is the case, then I would hazard to interpret his statement that “capital is the place of the proletariat”, quite bluntly, as the same statement presented in Deleuze and Guattari before. That is, to use my own way of paraphrasing, Capital desires to auto-exist—and perhaps auto-develops as well as auto-refers—as the place where the proletariat takes place not cyclically but spirally as an event (taking-place) at once as living labour (alienation/Entäußerung?) and as variable capital (reification/Versachlichung?). What is important is that it must be “at-once” because it is exactly what the proletariat is or is willingly coerced to be, ontically speaking. In other words, there is no one who heaves a sigh just simply because s/he recognises, all of sudden or not, being alienated and/or reified while dreaming of somewhere or other where what is “propre” is flourishing, bravely overcoming what is “ex-propre” so-called. Further, there is no necessary—in other words, aleatory—connection between them. The subject should be argued for or procured within the process of struggles (all the more reason why Poulantzas should be invited next as a main guestspeaker), or precisely speaking, the event. In this very regard, Badiou said « Un Sujet est un point de conversion de l’impossible en possible. L’opération fondamentale d’un sujet se trouve au point où de l’impossible se convertit en possibilités ». Can’t you imagine that Bensaïd is still “breathing” here too? Thus Badiou also argues:

La bourgeoisie fait-elle sujet? […] Contredisons, c’est un truc du par-être. La bourgeoisie ne fait plus sujet depuis longtemps, elle fait lieu. Il n’y a qu’un sujet politique, pour une historisation donnée [Does the bourgeoisie make a subject? […] Let me contradict myself, it is a trick of par-appearing. The bourgeoisie has not been a subject for a long time, it makes a place [where the proletariat takes place]. There is only one political subject, for any given historicisation].

What we have to be careful with here is the background. That is, that these statements were collected from the same seminar and the title of this seminar is « Il n’y a pas de rapports de classe », which, needless to say, is resonant with Lacan, not simply « Il n’y a pas de rapport sexuel » but more importantly « Il n’y a pas de rapport sexuel chez l’étre parlant ». And to this crucial theoretical circumstance I would bring in the Mario Tronti of Operai e capitale, as an ontic and somewhat optimistic witness as well as a stand-in for Negri who would overtake
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and then take over Tronti. Tronti states in a rather speculative manner first:

The working class does what it is [La classe operaia fa quel che è {La classe ouvrière fait ce qu’elle est}]. But it is, at one and the same time, the articulation of capital, and its dissolution. Capitalist power seeks to use the workers’ antagonistic will-to-struggle as a motor of its own development.116

Then he goes on to say yet in a more expository way:

Exploitation is born, historically, from the necessity for capital to escape from its de facto subordination to the class of worker-producers [Lo sfruttamento storicamente nasce dalla necessità, per il capitale, di sfuggire alla subordinazione di fatto alla classe degli operai produttori].117

In this sense, as Toscano succinctly summarises, “The political history of capital” is considered as “the history of the successive attempts of the capitalist class to emancipate itself from the working class”118 who is “muete”,119 and it is exactly what the Deleuzo-Guattarian prominent triplet “territorialisation”—“de-territorialisation”—“re-territorialisation” purports to mean.

Having Tronti’s (and Negri’s) ontic Marxism(-qua-Marxian Economics) in contrast to Badiou’s Theory of Placement (The Theory of Subject) as the precursor to his Theory of Event (Being and Event), I have to walk towards what I would call Multiple Nichts. For that very reason, I return to the Deleuzo-Guttarian axiomatique capitaliste again, and would add one thing deduced from the quotation from Deleuze and Guattari above: That is, there is only one class in capitalism as you have already seen; however, it is always already haunted by the State of whatever forms (clothes) whose primordial and imaginary fount is the Urstaat incessantly and retroactively re-membered by Capital for its Present (or its Now-Here, i.e., Nowhere). But this theoretical structure lays itself wide open to the criticisms by a jurist whose name is Poulantzas,120 and who nevertheless bridges the Althusserian appareils and the Foucaultian dispositif unexpectedly.

What is important in this logical line is how to grasp the “exteriority” which “econo-
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mism” inescapably posits (and even celebrates) and which Poulantzas tried to destroyed by nullifying the dichotomy of “interiority” and “exteriority” per se by at once introducing a symbolic word such as “débordment”\textsuperscript{121} and criticising the “échangiste” State theories.\textsuperscript{122} In order to think about it, I have to introduce the Poulantzas first who is rent between the Althusserian appareils and the Foucaultian dispositif and then move to the Lazzarato who re-introduces the Foucaultian Biopolitics and combines it with the Marxian critique of political economy in the Sections III and IV. But I would talk about it on another occasion just leaving the scheduled trace of what I am about to think about it:
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\textsuperscript{120} “I am not guided in this by the long-standing and simplistic belief of Hegelian-Marxist historicism to the effect that capitalism constitutes the progressive and linear flowering of ‘buds’ contained in pre-capitalist modes of production—much as man is supposed to explain the ape. Too many theorists of power are still haunted by the idea that the capitalist State is the perfect materialization of some Urstaat constantly borrowing its way through historical reality, and that it therefore provides the ground on which to present general propositions on the State”, Poulantzas, \textit{L’Etat, le pouvoir, le Socialisme}, op.cit., p. 23 (\textit{State, Power, Socialism}, op.cit., p. 21).

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p. 40, pp. 50–51 (p. 36, p. 45).

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., p. 54 (p. 50).