

## Reading desire

Emilian Mărgărit  
Al.I. Cuza University of Iasi

Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc, *Deleuze et L'Anti Œdipe. La production du desir*, Paris : PUF, 2010

**Keywords:** critique, desire, production, schizo-analysis, capitalism

A French equivalent of the classical work on Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*, *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia* of Brian Massumi (Massumi 1992) has just appeared. Author of two previous publications, *L'Energie spirituelle*, PUF, 2009 (*Spiritual Energy*) and *Philosophie politique (XIX-XX siècles)*, PUF, 2008 (*Political Philosophy (19-20<sup>th</sup> centuries)*), Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc has, since 2006, a PHD in philosophy. After teaching for seven years (2002-2008) at the University of Lille 3, he started working as a researcher at the International Center for the Study of Contemporary French Philosophy (Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris) and in the EuroPhilosophie Programm (Le Mirail, Toulouse). Being interested in philosophers such as Deleuze, Foucault, Sartre etc., he is concerned with the way their concepts can be used in the fields of social and practical theory. The year 2010 salutes the publication of his third book, *Deleuze et L'Anti Œdipe. La production du desir (Deleuze and Anti-Oedipus. The Production of Desire)*, Paris: PUF, 2010, ISBN: 978-2-13-056901-5, 153 p.

The equivalence issue between Sibertin-Blanc's and Massumi's books is based on the level of hermeneutical clarity in respect to the concepts forged by Deleuze and Guattari in their *Anti-Oedipus*. What makes the French exegesis suitable for further comparison is first of all the analytic dimension of his undertake, the precision regarding conceptual cuts, the bibliographic roots of some concept unrevealed with much care, and last but not least, the relative small but dense number of

pages in a *livre de poche* format. The explanation line regarding the logic of *Anti-Oedipus* is intended as an attempt to catch the singularity of the aforementioned book. This singularity embeds three critical assumptions, three theoretical reactions that are clearly explained, which also form the sequence of the French author's exegesis.

a.) The first one is a social critique that has much in common with the Foucauldian analysis on the psychiatric institution function, showing that it is a transitory point between the family institution and the juridical institution, an instrument of social control combining power with knowledge. A new psychiatry, a materialist psychiatry forging a new method will set the right stake of the regime of desire. The analytical materialist field will draw the features of desire and with that, the theoretical core of *Anti-Oedipus*. The concept of desire is adequately explained by Sibertin-Blanc, focusing on the surface of the schizo-analysis. Desire should be understood as an immanent cause or the auto-production of human life, binding the manifestation of nature and history, leaving thus behind an anthropomorphic concept of desire. In respect to the concept of desire, the schizo-analysis will have a triadic form of expression: 1) Developing the univocity of desires marking libidinal economy and social economy that unfolds as identity of nature; 2) Making visible the criteria of distinction between modes of production in respect to the desiring formations and social formations; 3) Unveiling the conditions that could sustain the conceptualization of immanence belonging to the desiring production.

The stake of the analysis of desire is the relation it might have, what triggers it and the finality of its manifestation. The cause of desire does not presuppose an objective representation, but an expressive representation, the movement of desire being embedded in a social milieu (Sibertin-Blanc 2010, 6-7, 19-20, 25-27).

In this chapter, as well as throughout the entire book, readers are acquainted with the authors (Freud, Lacan, Melanie Klein, Marx, Balibar, etc.), and Deleuze & Guattari are being confronted, exposing the line of attack and the argumentation filling the critic dimension of their concepts.

Finally, the materialistic fields of his analysis correlate capitalism and schizophrenia, describing their relation as “decoding” the flux of production and as a consequence, becoming the limits of the organization of social production, historical formations and the reproduction of social structures. Following the immanence condition, capitalism and schizophrenia identity is both critical and final. As a result, this identity ensures, on the one hand, the forces displacements and contradictions which capitalism is liberating (decoding), and on the other hand, the limitations of capitalism due to the conditions of historical reproduction (Sibertin-Blanc 2010, 66, 73).

b.) The second is a critique aiming at the status of psychoanalysis which is both an internal critique that pursues the limitation of oedipal dispositive and an external critique that follows the social consequences of the oedipal dispositive embodiment in the socio-libidinal field. The stake of this critique is the oedipal “privatization” of the unconscious made by psychoanalysis. As results from Deleuze and Guattari’s thought, the triadic response (father – mother – child) to all investments of the libido and the political program envisaged on behalf of this *biopouvoir* are to be put aside (Sibertin-Blanc 2010, 6, 79-83).

c.) The last critique co-produces, with Marx’s concepts, a political offensive in an attempt to expose the structures of exploitation and domination founded in the capitalist society and of the modes of subjectivities made possible by the reproduction of those structures. The practical aim of the schizo-analyses is constructed in a double articulation binding a clinique of forms of subjectivity and a revolutionary politics on the emancipation of the masses (Sibertin-Blanc 2010, 6, 129-132).

The last chapter of the book attempts to measure the political practical dimension of *Anti-Oedipus*; one can find here sharp distinctions and the clarification of concepts such as “proletariat”, “masses”, “class”, regarding both the Marxist orientation of the author and, ironically, the non-Marxist Deleuzian fashion of reading Marx.

This exegesis is not meant for those beginning to understand *Anti-Oedipus*. Although it does not take into account the Anglo-American impressive exegesis on Deleuze, the complexity of Sibertin-Blanc's analytic defoliation of the huge machine that makes the sense of *Anti-Oedipus* continuous flow renders this book an exemplary and rigorous exegesis on the French philosopher.

Address:

Emilian Margarit

Al.I. Cuza University of Iasi

Department of Philosophy

Bd. Carol I, 11

700506 Iasi, Romania

Email: emi\_margarit@yahoo.co.uk