

Understanding the Fight against Terrorism in the light of Deleuze's Theory of Capitalism

Zulfiqar Ali

Abstract

The issue of the fight against terrorism dominates the world politics. Most of the research and dialogue when focusing upon the empirical side of the issue overlooks the importance of theory. This paper endeavors to understand the fight against terrorism in the light of the Deleuzian theory of capitalism. Deleuze gives an excellent account of capitalism as an immanent axiomatic system. It explains how a capitalist state, such as the US, understands the threat, i.e. terrorism, and deals with it. The capitalist state's obsession with money makes it vulnerable to what Deleuze calls molecular forces, such as Al Qaeda, Taliban and schizoid. These forces become catastrophic to the capitalist state when they start operating on supple segmentarity. Islam, being an element of war machine in the Deleuzian analysis, pushes the extremist groups to wage a total war, the absolute destruction of both economy and society as a whole. The factors dragging the state or the groups towards total war are closer to capitalism than to these extremist groups. So if these groups, if at any stage, unfortunately become successful in disrupting the axiomatic functioning of capitalism they will undoubtedly push the US to total war of which the signs are getting visible. It may lead to absolute destruction.

Key Words: *Capitalism, Terrorism, Axioms, Codes, Rigid and Supple Segmentarity, Molar and Molecular Entity*

Introduction

When we come across with a member of banned organization fighting against the US in Pakistan and Afghanistan we may be surprised to know that the conventional Marxist explanation of the fight against capital fails to give an adequate account of it. The war against capital or the fight against terrorism cannot be put into the terms of class conflict. The war, in the immediate context, cannot either be explained on material and economic terms. We know that the individuals who are ready to commit or committed suicide bombings are not predominantly driven by economic exploitation by despot or the class. Taking life of the other through suicide bombing

discloses the interior world of extremism where the desire to kill by killing oneself is dominant. Orthodox Marxism fails to generate an adequate account of the fight against capital or terrorism currently taking place in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

This problematic guides me to think beyond the theoretical framework proposed by orthodox Marxism where the conflict is predominantly considered in terms of class conflict of which the roots cause is regarded to be exploitation and suppression.

In this context the works of French philosopher and Marxist, Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) turn up relevant to my research question. His works are distinct from orthodox Marxism on two accounts. First, he embraces the notion of desire in the explication of capitalism and terrorism. Second, he neither translates the problems faced and generated by capitalism to material contradictions and nor does he explain them from the perspective of exploitation.

Considering the fact that exploitation did not provoke the extremist groups to wage war against the US and the engagement of the US in Afghanistan is not motivated by the factor of capital accumulation Deleuze's sequel works *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Anti Oedipus* and *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Thousands Plateaus* gain a lot of significance and relevance.

It is beyond the remit of this paper to discuss theory as well as practice pertinent to capitalism and terrorism. In order to focus upon one issue at length this paper evaluates theoretical part and the practical side will hopefully be explored in the next issue.

In order to pursue the aim of this research paper it is divided into five sections. The first explores the ways in which capitalism is distinct from non-capitalist societies. The second section undertakes in-depth analysis of capitalism to unravel its essence. In this way, we will be able to know, in the third section, the actors and forces who might pose threat to capitalism. The fourth section discusses why the extremist groups such as Al Qaeda and Taliban might threaten capitalism. And in the final section the consequences of war against terror are worked out.

Non Capitalist Societies and Capitalism

We cannot understand what kind of forces or factors threaten capitalism and how capitalism may react to them as long as we do not comprehend capitalism. Comprehension is the prerequisite for the understanding of threat and dealing with it. In the following section this

paper compares and contrast capitalist society with non-capitalist one in order to highlight differences. It will provide us with foundation to unravel the essence of capitalism.

Deleuze unlike conventional Marxism argues that a desire is a fundamental force of life. It is productive, positive, revolutionary and explosive in its essence. It generates innumerable flows and explodes in infinite directions. So, "society cannot tolerate desire in its deep essence. It has to create structures of exploitation, servitude and hierarchy"¹. All societies including pre-capitalist, non-capitalist and capitalist ones construct a surface, what he calls "socius" or "full body" designed to repress the revolutionary potential of desire.²

A socius forms the surface upon which the flows of desire are registered and regulated and whereupon all production and consumption emanate. It makes sure that no flow stays unregulated.

Capitalist as well as non-capitalist societies fabricate a socius in order to regulate, discipline and control the desire. However, non-capitalist societies radically differ from capitalist in terms of perception, organization and control of desire. Examining the works of Deleuze we can say that non capitalist society differs in four prominent ways from capitalist society.

(A) Non Capitalist Society Code, Decode and Recode

Like Karl Marx Deleuze does not make distinction between capital and non-capital society with reference to capital. Capital is not a defining characteristic of capitalism. In all preceding forms of societies it has always been a fundamental driving force. Besides capitalist, non-capitalist societies too generate the surplus value.

Difference, according to him, lies in the mechanism through which capital is generated. A non-capitalist society maximizes capital in conjunction to codes whereas the capitalist society maximizes it in conjunction to flow (axiom). For Deleuze, code is the defining ingredient of non capitalist society whereas flow for capitalist.

A code bears upon symbolic representation. It is, by in itself a symbol drhawn through qualitative configuration. Semiology of any non capitalist society may constitute for us a good example of code. He points

¹ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurly, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane (London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), p.116.

² *Ibid.*, p.33.

out four basic characteristics of code making non capitalist society distinct from capitalist.³

A code by definition is qualitative, indirect, limited and extra economic. Taking an example from my own society, especially from *Maheer* tribe I belong to, the labor power in this tribal tradition is mediated through tribal affiliation. The tribal lineage determines the path leading to the discovery of labor power, its value and share. The labor power never emerges at any stage as pure quantitative flow of desire. Instead, the tribal affiliation that is qualitative in nature mediates pure quantity, labor power. Therefore, the labor affiliation as a code is indirect since it does not allow one quantitative flow to form a contact with the other. The qualitative nature of this code makes it extra-economic and thereby limits its scope and power to realize the great potential inherent in the flows of desire. The fundamental task of pre-capitalist or non-capitalist societies is to codify the flows of desire.

In contrast to non-capitalist society a capitalist society never codifies the flows of desire such as labor power. When a capitalist organization purchases labor power it purely negotiates on quantitative basis. The organization stays indifferent to the tribal affiliation, class, race, social status of labor. What matters to any capitalist organization is the potential and outcome of labor. The organization may hire anyone and from any class as long as it pays off.

Non capitalist society decodes and recodes. They may undermine and destroy the existing codes and recode them with new ones. Over the period of time, due to demographic and political changes, *Maheer* tribe allows *Jatoies*, another tribal group, to purchase and invest in territories that originally belong to them. *Maheer* tribe sells out its territory for capital. Yet, it is important to note that the territory is not for sell to all. These kinds of practices are rare in capitalist societies. It reminds us of the Deleuzian distinction between capital as code and capital as flow.

Deleuze argues that capitalist society decodes too but never recodes them in turn. As soon as capitalism discovers codes it decodes them. Capitalism is allergic to codes since it limits the expansion of capital. In place of codes (qualitative symbol) capitalism gives axioms (quantitative symbol). The notion of axioms will shortly be discussed at length.

(B) Non Capitalist Society Territorialize, Reterritorialize and Deterritorialize

³ Ibid., pp. 247-248.

Contrasting capitalist and non-capitalist society Deleuze introduces terms such as territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. We know that decoding bears upon codes, symbolic representations, deterritorialization targets territorialization, the concrete objects, not symbols.

Territorialization embraces individuals as well as concrete objects. Again taking an example from my own society, in the rural part of *Sind*, one of the provinces of Pakistan, there used to be an important profession of pottery. The skills earned in the process of making pots and utensils were also appropriated to mend and join broken bones and muscles. Over the period of time the potters established themselves as orthopedics. The late 1950s and 60s growth in industry and medicine deterritorialized the profession of pottery. Medicine and developing plastic industry rendered pottery obsolete. It ruthlessly took away the territory occupied by pottery.

Non capitalist society is not as quick as capitalist society in territorialization, reterritorialization and deterritorialization. In capitalist society the process from deterritorialization and reterritorialization is so quick and relentless that making clear distinction between them is nearly impossible.⁴ Instead, non-capitalist society is stubborn and stagnant.

Deleuze argues that the capitalist society is more inclined towards deterritorialization whereas non capitalist society is oriented towards territorialization. Non capitalist society falls prey to codes and territories whereas capitalist society is not sensitive about territories and symbols. A large portion of my tribal region, *Ghotiki*, stays uncultivated because of its policy of not allowing others to invest in its territory. Non capitalist society is not open to deterritorialization and decoding.

(C) Capitalist vs Non Capitalist Society

For Deleuze, all societies repress desire in its deepest form. Yet some societies are more dangerous and threatening than others. In this way he draws a general line of demarcation between capitalist and non-capitalist society.

Deleuze argues that only capitalist society holds prospectus for freedom and development whereas non capitalist society threatens and puts freedom into danger. In a situation where one has to make choice for living Deleuze would have preferred capitalist society. Deleuze fears non capitalist society because it translates the flows of desire into codes.

⁴ Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations: 1972-1990*, trans. Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), p.24; Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit in note 1, p.245.

For Deleuze, a code by default blocks access to freedom and development. Codes not only detach the flows from their being as quantitative intensities but also turn them into qualitative units. We have already discussed about code in the previous examples. A code halts unbounded development because it defines its parameter. In this way it limits the scope of growth and progress. It reminds me a quote from *Mere Christianity* by C. S. Lewis, "Progress means getting nearer to the place you want to be. And if you have taken a wrong turning, then to go forward does not get you any nearer. If you are on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; and in that case the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive man".⁵

We are aware that Deleuze has developed a harsh critique of capitalist society. It is important to note that this critique is undertaken from the perspective of prospectus inherent in capitalism. This critique is not undertaken from non capitalist perspective.

Because of capitalism's inherent tendency Deleuze hopes that this system could only lead humanity to unbounded freedom and development. As far as non capitalist society is concerned it is intrinsically inclined towards oppression and servitude. Deleuze might support the intrusion of capitalism into non capitalist society.

(D) Center and Periphery: Turning non Capitalist State into Capital

In a capitalist society political state is an economic entity whereas in non capitalist it is political. State inside capitalism is one of the principal organs of capitalism. The state absorbs the greatest part of surplus. In this way it brings capitalist economy to its maximum output by creating and managing lack in abundance of surplus.⁶ Deleuze labels state as trade floors for capitalism.⁷ He blurs the distinction between the boundaries of state and economy.

In order to discuss the transformation of non capitalist society into capital Deleuze borrows the terms, center (capitalist state) and periphery (non capitalist society), from the works of Samir Amir, French economist. Deleuze states that there is nothing lying outside of capitalism. The word

⁵ Clive S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001) p. 29.

⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit. in note 1, pp. 234-235,247-248.

⁷ Deleuze, op.cit. in note 4, p. 172.

“foreign” is foreign to capitalism. Capitalism even stretches out to the Moon and to Mars and lands in Afghanistan.⁸

The capitalist state approaches the undeveloped states like Pakistan in an attempt to widen the scope of its expansion.⁹ It expands by deterritorializing non capitalist social formations. In this way it destroys the local ways of producing and consuming things at the periphery. As soon as it deterritorializes, capitalism reterritorializes periphery.

According to Deleuze, capitalism at periphery is hostile and violent whereas at center it soft and friendly. Relatively friendly at center is not due to strong political, social and legal structure of the developed states. Instead, in the long process of expansion it has become softer thereby raising standards of livings, providing unemployment benefits, protecting the individuals, offering bailout packages in the times of economic recession and injecting monetary flows in the world capital.

As state earlier, the word “foreign” is foreign to capitalism. Capitalism or capitalist states like the USA theoretically have no foreign policy whereas non capitalist society is always found with foreign policy. That is why I find Deleuze’s terms “center and periphery” highly suggestive in the context of capitalism.

In an attempt to deterritorialize and expand itself the center falls upon the periphery.¹⁰ It is not the periphery that invites the center for modernization, development and democratization. No social formation in human history has successfully penetrated in different and opposite social fields like capitalism.

According to Philippe Pignarre and Isabelle Stengers, the factor that principally contributes in the transformation of non capitalist states to capital is capitalism’s sorcery. The sorcery of capitalism is its apparent fascination. Since human beings love fascination capitalism gives them resources and power to fascinate and to be fascinated.¹¹ The periphery is in the spell of capitalist sorcery. It generates so immense surplus that periphery becomes indispensable for center. In this regard Deleuze writes that Pierre Moussa has rightly defined that the United States is a fragment of the Third World

⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 97.

⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit in note 1, p. 273.

¹⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit. in note 1, p. 231.

¹¹ Philippe Pignarre and Isabelle Stengers. *La Sorcellerie Capitaliste Pratiques de désenouement Postface de Anne Vièle* (Paris: La Découverte, 2005) p. 57-65.

because it preserves its immense zones of underdevelopment and generates huge capital for the center.¹² The capitalist state cannot stay in isolation.

Up to this point we have made contrast between capitalist and non capitalist society. The discussion so far enables us to understand in broader terms the difference between them. The following section focuses upon capitalism so as to unfold it from its foundation. It would guide us to explicate the essence of capitalist society. In the examination of Deleuze's work we would discover that capitalism panics only when its essence is at threat. So it is very important to explore the essence of capitalism to understand the nature and degree of threat posed by extremists and terrorists.

Unfolding Capitalism: Immanent Axiomatic System

For a capitalist society "axiom" is as important as code for non capitalist society. Deleuze states that an axiom is direct, economic and quantitative unit. Each axiom is a self-existing and self-subsisting operating statement. No axiom can be derived from the other. The connection among them does not rest upon the laws of logic and morality.

Let us recall the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan to understand what actually an axiom is. Pakistan's military establishment in collaboration with the US fabricated an identity and axiomatised it as *Mujahidin*. It is done in order to prepare Afghans and Pakistanis to fight against the Russian forces.

As far as capitalism is concerned, *Mujahid* was only an operative statement. It effectively and efficiently functioned during the Afghan war. But after the withdrawal of the soviet forces from Afghanistan with the fall of Russia, the *Mujahidin* like 9/11, Castro, a Black Panther, an Arab national or 1968, attempted to run too fast from capitalism.¹³ Since capitalism is so quick in decoding and deterritorialization it adds an axiom to seal off the breach. By adding up a new axiom such as a terrorist or an Islamic extremist, capitalism once again attempts to take control of flows that start slipping away.

With the change of axiom, from *Mujahidin* to Islamic extremist, the decoded flows turn back to multiply capital yet with problems. Deleuze notes that an axiom is the strength of capitalism. Axioms have no parallel in human

¹² Gilles Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (London/New York: Verso, 1998) p. 181.

¹³ Deleuze and Guattari, *op.cit.* in note 1, p. 378.

history in terms of their strength to capture and to master the decoded flows. Axioms aim to put decoded flows in the service of capitalism.¹⁴

Deleuze strongly insists that axioms must not be interpreted in terms of codes. Capitalism is not engaged in different type of coding. The symbolic representation such as *Mujahidin* or Islamic terrorist is not a code for two reasons: moral and logical impossibility.¹⁵ Codes embrace logic and morality whereas axioms none of them.

If *Mujahidin* were a code, capitalism could not be able replace it with terrorist. Both, if taken as codes, cannot be simultaneously constructed and entertained by capitalism. Since each term carry different meaning they cannot refer to the same object. Keeping the axiomatic build up of capitalism in mind one must not be surprised if today's terrorists may be idealized as heroes in the future. That is why Deleuze insists that capitalism is essentially axiomatic. That is to say, capitalism generates an immensely slippery and highly fluid semiological system.

But why capitalism is inherently axiomatic and it cannot be otherwise. Deleuze has a simple answer. "The surplus value begets surplus in capitalism". Capitalism constantly extracts surplus value as an end in itself. It does not produce for the sake of consumption or enjoyment of life. It only produces for the sake of more production. Deleuze elaborates, "the capitalist machine begins when capital ceases to be a capital of alliance (code), to become a filiative capital (flow). Capital becomes filiative when money begets money, or value, a surplus value- value in process, money in process, and as such, capital".¹⁶

Money becomes capital when it multiplies itself. In this way it makes capitalism immanent system. By virtue of capital's immanent relation to itself capitalism cannot provide codes but axioms. Only by means of axioms capitalism sustains immanence. Codes detach and corrupt the immanence. Capitalism invents money as a general equivalent representing an abstract quantity that is totally indifferent to the qualified nature of flows.¹⁷ When everything is represented and evaluated in terms of money (quantity) it signals a capitalist society. However existing capitalist societies are yet to be capitalist in the strict sense.

Capitalism keeps changing axioms until it finds a suitable one. Once an axiom multiplies and has prospectus to multiply further capitalism is never

¹⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit in note 8, p. 10.

¹⁵ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit, in note 1, p.247.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 227.

¹⁷ Ibid., p.248.

ready to give up such axioms. That is why Deleuze writes that capitalism works upon rigid segmentarity. Segmentarity is the regulation of desires. The world may be segmented in linear, binary and circular fashion.¹⁸ The distinction between male and female, boss and worker, father and mother, gay and heterosexual, student and teacher, shaman and follower and despot and subjects are segmentations in terms of roles and status.

Deleuze elaborates the rigid segmentarity by pointing out a character in the novel, *In the Cage* by Henry James. A heroine of the novel and his fiancé live a life on rigid segmentations. A heroin is segmented in terms of sex (female) and profession (telegrapher). Her job is to count words and to get wages in return. And her fiancé, in an adjacent store, weighs things and is constantly plotting out future, house, work, meetings etc. In this form of segmentation everything is calculable and foreseen. Due to these characteristics the rigid segmentation is tending towards centralization, unification, totalization, integration, hierarchization, and finalization.¹⁹

Deleuze points out that rigid segmentation turns the institutions of capitalism into molar entities. Molar entities such as father, mother, family, post office, grocery store, bank, bureaucracy, judiciary, military or state regulate and discipline the flows of desire. Since flows are segmented on rigid lines molar entities easily and effectively appropriate the flows to expand capital.

We know that in orthodox Marxism capitalism is recognized to be a universal truth, a truth presupposed by all types of social formations. In this context Deleuze states "if capitalism is the universal truth, it is so in the sense that makes capitalism negative of all social formations... Primitive societies are not outside history; rather it is capitalism that is at the end of history".²⁰ Capitalism unfolds the secret of all social formations. It unravels the truth that code stands in the way of freedom.

Recent studies on capitalism demonstrate that capital generates homogeneity by making the world globally competitive. In this way it liberalizes and deregularizes economy and democratizes the political structures.²¹ Deleuze deposes the conclusions of these inquiries. Perhaps considering the alleged support of Western states especially of the US to

¹⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), p. 208.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

²⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *op.cit.* in note 1, p. 153.

²¹ Leslie Sklair, *Globalization: Capitalism and Its Alternatives* (London: Oxford University Press, 2002); Andrew Glyn, *Capitalism Unleashed: Finance, Globalization, and Welfare* (London: Oxford University Press, 2006).

military dictators of Middle East, Asia and Africa Deleuze concludes that capitalism at times support military dictatorship, tyranny, state controlled economy and at other times foster democracy and free market economy. Heterogeneity favors capitalism not homogeneity. Capitalism is not invariably bound with democracy and liberalization.

Up to now we have, at length, explicated what capitalism is and how does it expand itself. The strength of capitalism is its axioms drawn upon rigid segmentarity and work through molar entities. As long as flows are axiomatically devised upon rigid segmentarity and operate through molar entities capitalism has nothing to fear.

We would see through the following discussion that capitalism may only be challenged by the groups that are not segmented upon rigid classification and are not working through molar entities. Political state or even non state actors cannot pose serious threat to capitalism if they are organized upon rigid segmentarity and regulated by molar entities. Capitalism could easily melt them down.

Threat to Capitalism: Supple Segmentarity and Molecular Entity

Let me take up Henry James's novel, *In the Cage*, once again to discuss the forms of segmentation and entities that seriously haunt capitalism.

One day a rich couple comes to the telegraph office with a telegram which is coded and signed with pseudonyms. The telegram challenges the conventional way of writing. In this way it opens the other world to the heroin. With the passage of time she deciphers the codes. She comes to know that Captain Verard is having affair with Lady Bradeen. It deeply interests her.

Involvement in their affair alters the character of the heroin. The heroin is no more regulated by post office and compulsions by society and market (molar entities). He no longer takes interest in the office, marriage, future, savings and fiancé. For fiancé, heroin turns up a paradox, abnormality and crisis. Nothing remains calculable. So rigidity vanishes and it forms a supple form of segmentation.

Supple segmentarity does not simply come upon the organism but grips each and every cell of it. It continually dismantles the concretions of

rigid segmentarity, but everything that it dismantles it reassembles on its own level.²²

Corresponding to free floating and fluid segmentarity Deleuze introduces the idea of molecular entity. The heroin of *In the Cage* turns into a molecular entity. She is disenchanted by the institutions of modern political state and liberal society. The influences governing her lie outside the state and civic world. She ceases to be a commodity falling outside modern political apparatus.

Deleuze clarifies that the concept of supple segmentarity and molecular entity must not be confused with insanity. Despite falling outside rigid segmentarity and molar entities the heroin of novel lives a highly calculated and rational life. In order to appreciate the usage of terms, supple segmentarity and molecular entity, we need to place them in the broader framework.

Deleuze explains primitive society on the lines of supple segmentarity. Codes, territories and clan lineages make up the supple segmentarity of primitive society.²³ Due to supple segmentarity the tribes locally govern their subjects even though the political state is formally instilled in a given society.²⁴ It reminds me about the experience of casting vote. In Pakistan there are two major political parties: *Pakistan People Party* and *Muslim League*. In 1998 election *Mahar* tribal leader, Ghulam Muhammad Khan Mahar, was a candidate for *People Party*. The subjected people belonging to *Mahar* tribe, elected their tribal leader in 1998 general election with majority of votes. Due to some reasons Ghulam Muhammad Khan Mahar switched from *Pakistan People Party* to *Muslim league*. In the next election the tribal people once again elected their clan leader in 2003 general elections.

The pattern of casting votes reflects some important points. First, the political party and its manifesto (molar entity) do not influence the voting pattern. Second, casting a vote is not a political activity since voting is mediated through tribal lineage. Third, the social groups remain apolitical. These factors contribute in the formation of supple segmentarity and molecular entities. The social groups as mediated through tribal or feudal lineages operate on the supple lines of segmentations.

According to Deleuze, capitalism does not tolerate the molecular entity operating on supple lines. Molecular entity is not a leakage but a

²² Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit in note 18, p. 205.

²³ Ibid., p.209.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 209.

threat to the core operation of the capitalist machine. The factor that makes a molecular entity so dangerous and catastrophic for the capitalist society is its potential to transform itself into a mass movement corrupting each and every cell of the organism.²⁵ Capitalism does not like mass movements. Mass movements disrupt molar apparatus and rigid segmentarity. When an entity tends to become molecular it threatens the capitalist operation. In this regard Deleuze writes that "Daniel Guerin was correct to say that if Hitler took power, rather than taking over the German State administration, it was because from the beginning he had at his disposal micro-organizations giving him "an unequaled, irreplaceable ability to penetrate every cell of society".²⁶

Deleuze points out four errors that are to be avoided regarding supple and rigid segmentarity. First, suppleness of codes and territorialization does not necessarily imply a better society. Considering the fact that fascism is provoked by supple forms of segmentation Deleuze critically appreciate it. Second, molar and molecular are not distinguished by size and volume. Supple segmentarity is molecular, so it gives a wrong impression that it must be smaller in size to molar. For Deleuze, it may be as big as molar. Third, molecular does not only belong to the realm of individual and inter-individual but to social realm as well. Third, the molar and the molecular neither boost nor cut across their boundaries. There may be direct and inverse relations between molar and molecular entities.

When an entity or a flow of desire breaks through the molar it becomes molecular. For Deleuze, a molecular entity is like a composition of trillions of cells without body (molar). And each cell is a composition of more and ad infinitum. A molecular entity because of its ad infinitum character is not just subject to coding but over-coding. It is always immensely overloaded with codes and territories. That is why it produces the greatest form of repression and terror such as fascism. According to Deleuze, a desire becomes fascist when it is immensely overloaded with codes. Overloading premises a molecular formation on a supple segmentarity. So it may be said that the molar and rigid segmentarity resists fascism.

Deleuze obviously does not appreciate molar and rigid segmentarity. He, rather strongly, favors molecular and supple lines. For Deleuze, supple segmentarity ironically holds the prospectus of freedom as well as of greatest repression. So he suggests that those who are on the molecular lines must be cautious because they may fall into traps and turn themselves into fascists, terrorists and extremists.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 215.

²⁶ Ibid., p.214.

When fascist forces capture state institutions, the state becomes a monster or a death-state and suicidal state. Death-state defines life in terms of other's death.²⁷ For Hitler, the death of Jews guaranteed the life for Germans. Death defines life. So the suicidal-state, which defines life in terms of death, has a tendency to provoke a total or absolute war.²⁸ Total war is a kind of war that annihilates not only the enemy or the state, but also destroys its entire population and economy.²⁹

According to Deleuze, fascism has historically waged a total war in which the entire economy has become a war economy and the entire society has become a war society. War turns up as a tool to survive and to live.³⁰

It is interesting to note that, for Deleuze, the factors that make the molar (political state) or molecular entities (non-state actors) wage a total war are closer to capitalism than to non-capitalist society.³¹ Deleuze fears that the factor such as the investment of constant capital in equipment, the industry and war economy and investment of variable capital in the population in its physical and mental aspects (both as a war-maker and a victim of war) may push the capitalist state to wage a total war.³² For capitalism, war is investment. The aim to invest in constant and variable capital at times and the threat to invested capital at other times may force capitalist state to shift its policy from limited war to total war.

Up to this point we have discussed what kind of forces and segmentations pose threat to capitalism: molecular and supple segmentarity. Keeping this in view the following section would attempt to figure out the source from where the molecular forces may spring.

Threat to Capitalism External or Internal?

The question about whether capitalism would collapse due to its own laws or the non capitalist force such extremist groups would lead capitalism to its inevitable fall reminds us one of statements of Marx in *Capital III*, Chapter-13. It merits a quota at length.

"The progressive tendency of the general rate of profit to fall is, therefore, just an expression peculiar to the capitalist mode of production of the progressive development of the social productivity of labor. This does not

²⁷ Ibid., p. 267.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 231.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 421.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 467.

³¹ Ibid., p. 378.

³² Ibid., p. 421.

mean to say that the rate of profit may not fall temporarily for other reasons. But proceeding from the nature of the *capitalist mode of production*, it is thereby proved a logical necessity that in its development the general average rate of surplus-value must express itself in a falling general rate of profit. Since the mass of the employed living labor is continually on the decline as compared to the mass of materialised labor set in motion by it, i.e., to the productively consumed means of production, it follows that the portion of living labor, unpaid and congealed in *surplus-value*, must also be continually on the decrease compared to the amount of value represented by the invested total capital. Since the ratio of the mass of surplus-value to the value of the invested total capital forms the *rate of profit*, this rate must constantly fall".³³

For Marx, no force external to capitalism could lead it towards collapse. Capitalism would inevitably fall by its own laws: tendency of the rate of profit to fall.

Deleuze argues on these lines of Marx. Capitalism does not face an exterior limit.³⁴ The limit it faces is only an interior limit which is imposed by capitalism upon itself. It is the limit of capital.³⁵ Capital by the necessity of capital accumulation limits its own self-expansion but immediately overcomes it. The limit of capital is not an entity but a process what Deleuze calls schizophrenia. It is divergence and death of capitalism.³⁶

Schizophrenia must be understood in relation to the process of decoding. From decoding the only thing results *in* is pure and abstract quantity. It is neither a man nor a woman, neither a gay nor a heterosexual, neither an owner nor a worker. The resultant of decoding is schizo. A schizo has no fixed identity. It can explode anywhere, take any path and choose any destination.³⁷ It is the production of desire that transgresses the fixed identities.³⁸ Deleuze compares schizophrenia with an egg.³⁹ Human or schizophrenic entity is like an egg that constantly crosses over the threshold of intensity. Schizophrenia echoes molecular entity working upon supple segmentarity.

By repressing schizophrenia capitalism immediately captures schizo and translates him/her into fixed identity such as a father, mother and a son,

³³ Karl Marx, *Capital Vol.3: The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole* (New York: Buccaneer Books, 1988).

³⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit. in note 1, p. 230.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 245.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 196.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 46.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 47.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 238.

a boss and a worker. Capitalism's inherent tendency towards fabricating fixed identities produces paranoia. Paranoia is the process of fabricating fixed identities. In this way it produces molar and rigid segmentations. Schizophrenia and paranoia are the result of capitalism's process of decoding and axiomatizing. They are two opposite ways of the investment of desire.

Deleuze does not principally explain capitalism in terms of conflict between classes.⁴⁰ Instead, he questions the model of class struggle proposed by Marx. He argues that the notion of class, although an important one, overlooks the great phenomena of the investment of desire in and through the social field.

Deleuze writes that capitalism invests desire in an abnormal way.⁴¹ The abnormality of capitalism lies in its deep tendency to generate schizophrenia, molecular and supple segmentarity and paranoia, molar and rigid segmentarity. Paranoia resulting from capitalism's obsession with money contradicts schizophrenia.

Schizophrenia and paranoia are the relentless process taking place inside capitalism through which capital constructs two parallel entities and segmentations: molar vs molecular and supple vs rigid segmentations.

Capitalism neither, at least in principle, admits schizophrenia nor makes it secret. It cannot make it secret because of its decoding character. This is what Deleuze calls abnormality.⁴² Capitalism publicizes everything, yet nothing is admissible such as tax returns, real estate deals, lobbyists, economical and financial mechanisms, foreign policy, media role, intelligence reports.⁴³ Publicizing everything yet admitting nothing constitutes a special kind of delirium that only belongs to capitalism.

The discussion so far makes it evident that molar and rigid segmentarity is the consequence of paranoiac tendency of capitalism whereas molecular and supple segmentarity is of schizophrenia. Once schizophrenic tendency overruns paranoia it signals the inevitable fall of capitalism.

In order to answer the question, whether extremist groups, Al Qaeda and Taliban, are capable to pose serious threat to capitalism or not we need to know whether these groups has prospectus to turn themselves into

⁴⁰ Deleuze, op.cit. in note 12, p. xii.

⁴¹ Gilles Deleuze, *Deseret Islands and Other Texts 1953-1974*, trans. Michael Taormina (New York: Semiotext(e) Foreign Agent Series, 2004) p. 262.

⁴² Ibid., p. 263.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 263.

schizophrenic and molecular. In the following section we will look for this answer.

Al Qaeda and Taliban: Threat to Capitalism?

Since Deleuze has not discussed about Al Qaeda or Taliban we need to appropriate his thought to see what he might say about these groups. It is interesting as well as encouraging to note that he sheds light upon Islam, *Hijrat* (migration) and *Jihad* (holy war). So we need to focus upon this part to figure out our answer.

Deleuze is not interested in the impartial exploration of Islam. He takes interest in the investigation of Islam from the broader theoretical framework especially from the perspective of nomadism and schizophrenia.

Nomadism reminds us about the primitive nomad groups. Deleuze does discuss them. He states that the aim of nomad groups from the Hyksos to the Mongols is to resist the formation of state apparatus from within and without.⁴⁴ The war nomad groups wage was not primarily motivated for state formation. Instead, the war was against it. Since nomads do not want to forge a political state bound by fixed territory and laws they, by default, do not have war apparatus but only war machines. Having no apparatus for war but war machines makes nomad groups molecular and supple.

Deleuze explains that nomads group live by travelling while occupying no space. Bound by no territorial configuration nomads groups had no fixed identity (molecular) and legal framework (rigid segmentarity). Travelling and conquering the land while not claiming it makes them catastrophic to molar entity. Since molar entity could consume the other molar entity nomads group being not molar in kind are hard enough to be digested.

Deleuze draws the analysis of Islam and *Jihad* upon these lines of nomadism. Despite differences between Islam and nomadism Deleuze figures out some strong similarities. According to Deleuze, a monotheistic religion such as Islam at the deepest level of its tendency aims to establish a universal or spiritual state over the entire ecumenon. In this way it goes not only beyond the limits of existing states but even beyond the ideal ones as well. Because of this tendency the monotheistic religion enters the more indistinct zone outside the existing states. It always poses a threat to the existing states and even to its own identity as a political state. That is why

⁴⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, op.cit. in note 18, p .181.

Deleuze considers a monotheistic religion, Islam, as an element of war machine. *Jihad* or a holy war is the motor of that machine.⁴⁵

He writes that in the early days of Islam a Muslim society is reduced to military enterprise. One Muslim state or group is challenged by the other for not confirming to the ideals of true Islam. The controversial role of the *Kharjees* may be a paradigmatic example to get the sense of military enterprise. We know that the *Kharjees*, after the demise of Holy Prophet Muhammad, even contested the authority of the closest companions of prophet. Besides the *Kharjees'* confrontation Muslims fought among themselves several battles in the name of Islam in which thousands of people have lost their lives.

In terms of social, economic and militaristic costs Muslims, not Americans, have suffered more from the attacks of Taliban and Al Qaeda. The suicide attacks are more frequent in Pakistan than in Afghanistan targeting the NATO forces. And it is interesting to note that Muslims are killed by other Muslims in the name of Islam.

We can say that Islam, from the Deleuzian perspective is political in practice but anti-political in tendency exhibited by the acts of extremist groups in Muslims' states. That is to say, Islam in its deepest inclination is molecular and structured upon supple segmentarity whereas in the practice it is molar and rigid.

Since molar and molecular are not separated apart existing not in isolation of one another there is cross interaction between them. The interaction may either be directly or inversely proportional. Capitalism has nothing to fear from Islam and Muslims as long as they are molar. Once they turn into mass movement aiming to confront the political existence of Muslims it may be a nightmare for capitalism. Yet there are no signs of this terrible nightmare to happen soon.

Since Islam is inherently molecular and schizophrenic in the Deleuzian framework it has tendency to produce a chemical change to dissolve molar into molecular, into tiny cells, a mass movement informed by nomadism.

Conclusion

We face threat from two fronts: extremist groups and capitalism. First, the war against terror may push the US in particular and Western society in general to total war. We know that capitalism loves money and

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 383.

loves everything in relation to it. When money is at threat everything is at threat.

The American society is in the grip of fear and terror after 9/11. On many occasions the representatives of the American government went so far as to predict about more devastating attacks than 9/11. Yet, scholars such as John Mueller characterize it as a myth of the omnipresent enemy.⁴⁶ If these horrible predictions come true they would probably and unfortunately push the American government to total war.

There are some strong indications suggesting that the US led forces are no more engaged in limited war against terror, yet waging a total war is still unlikely. Events such as drone attacks violating the sovereignty of Pakistan, Guantanamo bay, a detention camp in Cuba, allocating billions of dollars to the fight against terrorism in times of economic recession, implementing highly controversial monitoring and screening procedures, discussions and debates revolving around the issue of terrorism, President Obama's warning to Pakistan that if Pakistan fails to counter terrorism, America would operate inside Pakistan, the murder of Benazir Bhutto and the recent change in the US foreign policy, undue focus upon intelligence suggest that the US is tending towards reliance upon militaristic means and procedures. When the Pentagon overshadows the Congress, when militaristic means turn up a solution of the problem, when war replaces reason it signals a step towards a total war.

The extremist groups are already in the state of "total war" yet there are strong signs that show somewhat molar intervention in the extremist groups. If these groups somehow successfully block leakages, from where a molar entity intervenes, nothing can stop them from provoking a mass movement. We, Muslims, are on a double edge sword.

Islam being an element of war machine has the potential to become molecular. The capitalist state wishes to see Islam no more than a molar force. Extremist groups waging a holy total-war, a motor of a war machine, sometimes reach the farthest remote boundaries of molecular. If they manage to drag the US in a total war these groups may easily install war machines in each cell of society. If this happens it would be a disaster for Muslims: total destruction. So the fight against terrorism operates on highly sensitive lines. All molar entities such as US, Pakistan and Afghanistan have

⁴⁶ John Mueller, "Is There Still a Terrorist Threat? The Myth of the Omnipresent Enemy" *Foreign Affairs* (Vol. 85, No.5, 2006), pp. 2-8.

to be very cautious, have to make sure that the fight remains at the molar plane.

**Zulfiqar Ali is Assistant Professor in the Department of
Philosophy at the University of Karachi**