

John Protevi www/protevi/com/DG

Notes on Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc, *Politique et État chez Deleuze et Guattari*

Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc, *Politique et État chez Deleuze et Guattari: Essai sur le matérialisme historico-machinique* (Paris: PUF, 2013)

Part I: Arche-violence: The Presuppositions of the State

Part II: Exo-violence: The War Machine Hypothesis

Part III: Endo-violence: The Capitalist Axiomatic

Part I: Arche-violence

Chapter 1: Historical Materialism and schizo-analysis of the State form

Chapter 2: Capture: A concept of primitive accumulation and the power of the State

Part II: Exo-violence: The War Machine Hypothesis

Chapter 3: Nomadology: Toward the war machine hypothesis

Chapter 4: Formula and Hypothesis: State appropriation and the genealogy of the power of war

Part III: Endo-violence: The Capitalist Axiomatic

Chapter 5: The capitalist axiomatic: States and accumulation on the global scale

Chapter 6: Becoming-minority, becoming-revolutionary

Conclusion: Micropolitics has not taken place

Part I: Arche-violence

Chapter 1: Historical Materialism and schizo-analysis of the State form

There's always an undecidability in the notion of Ur-staat as theory of State form: DG's work is both materialist history of an apparatus of power (rewriting of, e.g., Engels, *Origin of the Family ...*) and analysis of historical desire / collective subjectivation / group fantasy (rewriting of, e.g., Freud, *Totem and Taboo*)?

That is, how to reorient desiring production from primitive immanent horizontalism (saturation of social field by always unequal obligations ["mobile blocs of debt"] to barbarian transcendent hierarchical center (infinite debt owed to emperor). This is the problem of desire Clastres never solved: he could show primitive machine wards off the State by production of desire for war-prestige in the chiefs, as well as desire for equality and free time by everyone, but could never show how it became desire for the State. That was always a mystery to him.

State form always in excess of its own material apparatuses (A03). Then we see formation of notion of "apparatus of capture" in ATP 12-13.

Aporias of the origin of the State: impossible genesis and undiscoverable beginning

DG will deconstruct the problem of the origin of the State. It is impossible to identify the State with its material apparatuses. 1) you have to account for state by historical materialist means; 2) but evolutionist accounts face aporias which problematize the self-presupposition and self-production of the State. This problem on the anthropological history plane is doubled by a problem on the philosophical plane between the materialist and idealist notions of the state.

Simply put, you need surplus to feed military and administrative specialists but you need military and administrative specialists to enslave and exploit (turn primitives into peasants who owe debts to emperor).

DG's anthropological sources, Sahlins (economics) and Clastres (politics), show impossibility for primitives to develop a stock or a separate apparatus of power.

Sahlins	Clastres
Nomadic foragers	Sedentary horticulturalists
Economics (first affluent society)	Politics (tribe is locus of power)
Impossible surplus: refused or consumed	Impossible separate power: chiefs \neq kings

Sahlins: Following Marx and Childe, there needs to be a prior development of productive forces to enable the constitution of a stock, but anthropology attests to positive mechanisms to prevent such a stock.

There does seem to be possibilities of mixed economies: foraging, horticulture, shepherding which might lead to small stocks?

Clastres: in fact you need the State (difference in political power to enforce exploitation) in order to have "economics." Refusal of the State as well as refusal of "economics." But that leaves him with "mystery" of origin of the State (though with nod to demographics...).

DG will end up with a topological approach, avoiding aporias of origin of State from evolutionist position. But first, they do *a passage to the limit w/r/t archeology*:

"we can't ever go back far enough: there are always Neolithic empires to be found, perhaps almost Paleolithic." That is, the archeological quest moves from de facto to de jure: what are criteria for "States"? Are they contemporary with, or even the precondition for Neolithic sedentarization, urbanization, and agriculture? Cf Braudel and Jacobs w/r/t Catal Huyuk: does the city precede the agricultural countryside? Here is where DG pose the Ur-staat: "unconditioned" bcs it poses its own presuppositions.

The movement of auto-presupposition of the Ur-staat: Antinomic historicity of the State-form

Wittfogel and the re-writing of "Asiatic mode of production." State is not instrument of pre-existing dominant class: it is itself direct organization of society enabling surplus production which it then immediately appropriates; it is therefore itself what produces the dominant and subordinate classes.

We need to rethink the three social machines of A03; they are not evolutionist.

Primitive	Barbarian	Capitalist
Tribe	Empire	System
Territorial	Despotic	Axiomatic
Unity of an Ideal-type: theoretical subsumption of many different heterogeneous societies	Unity of an omnipresent actual or virtual reality: even in SWS or capitalist, it's a return to an origin which never took place	Unity of a singular universal

Anchoring Ur-staat in Asiatic mode makes it a "paradigmatic moment of every State": hence an ideal abstraction, an objective dimension of every historical State. So it's presupposed by every historically concrete State as a latency that each State reactualizes. So it's a split temporality: each State is always already there and yet always being reborn; return to origin that never took place. So we get an aporetic alternation between Marxist materialist and Hegelian idealist conceptions of historicity of the State.

Here we see the Nietzschean figure of the conqueror, the founder of empires: this is an enunciative rupture, the announcement of a radical exteriority, an atheoretic cut into their discourse.

Neither concept nor apparatus: the State-form as originary phantasm and as delirium of the Idea

A double impossibility: 1) the development of material conditions of the State presupposes the existence of the State-form; 2) the State-form cannot be identified with the "auto-movement" of its idea w/o rendering its temporal origin unlocatable. So we need a new comprehension of "State-form," to account for its double excess: its material excess over its apparatuses and its ideal excess over the auto-movement of its concept.

- 1) Temporality of State-form: always already there and "surging forth once and for all." This concerns the "semiotics" of the State-form analyzed by "overcoding" in AO and by "capture" in ATP. Semiotics or "collective regimes of signs" are spatio-temporal agencements, which "configure" space-time. This enables us to understand the mechanisms of anticipation of what doesn't yet exist yet still exerts a real action. This takes us back to Clastres's notions of anticipating and warding off the State w/o the problems of linear temporal evolution that he faced.
- 2) Topology of machinic processes on which modes of production depend such that the State is always imbricated with other social machines. State capture, primitive anticipation-conjuration, nomadic war machine, capitalist globalization, ecumenical organizations, town trade network polarization...
- 3) Paranoia of the State: what is developed alongside the State (the primitives who ward off the State, the nomads who seek to destroy the State, the escaped slaves who take a line of flight from the State) is seen as that which comes from an absolute outside.
 - a. Hence the issue of institutional violence or excess violence or cruelty of the State beyond what is necessary for its functions.
 - b. Here we see the coincidence of overcoding and impossibility of overcoding. That is, when you overcode flows you release decoded flows.
 - i. Overcoding flows of primitive action to become exploited labor you release a flow of escaped slaves and / or free labor in the mines and smiths / metallurgists.
 - ii. Creating money for taxes allows banking and commercial flows of money.