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Abstract

This paper makes use of Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas for "becoming minoritarian" to make connections among anarchist, feminist, and Indigenous theories and practices. I foreground shared commitments to process, temporality, and becoming, over structure, stasis, and being among some writers of these philosophies. Within each of these reservoirs of theory and practice one can find compelling expressions of rhizomatic, decentered, horizontal social imaginaries rather than arboreal, united, vertical ones. Each theoretical area suggests figures that might serve as "connectors" between theories, bridges to invite and to link them to each other without collapsing them under a primary heading.

Introduction

At the beginning of Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature, Deleuze and Guattari offer this image for their study of Kafka's work:

We will be trying only to discover what other points our entrance connects to, what crossroads and galleries one passes through to link two points, what the map of the rhizome is and how the map is modified if one enters by another point. Only the principle of multiple entrances prevents the introduction of the enemy, the Signifier and those attempts to interpret a work that is actually only open to experimentation.

Their image also serves for this paper's encounters with anarchism, feminism, and Indigenous thought. I think of each of these "isms" not as fixed beliefs but as sprawling rhizomes, animated by intense political and intellectual energies. My goal is to pass through various crossroads among them, identifying some shared or at least contiguous galleries and some points at which each is addressed or enhanced by encounters with the others. By entering each political theory through the access points provided by the others, I'm seeking to multiply the entrance points, articulate shared practices, and encourage further alliances among them.

However, I’m not as convinced as Deleuze and Guattari appear to be in the above quotation that the Signifier is the enemy or that interpretation is the opposite of experimentation. Deleuze and Guattari are often extravagant in their prose, calling for liberation from practices that nonetheless sneak back into their texts. They are not looking for the admirable side of an either/or dyad, but rather a disruption, a way out, a way “that is always connected to its own abolition.” Yet at other points they recognize that no one escapes so easily from signification: “As long as there is form, there is still reterritorialization.” I hope to use some fertile intersections of anarchism, feminism and Indigenous thought to explore and exemplify their shared orientation toward process and temporality, while remaining aware of attendant possibilities of recuperation. I am looking for a lateral encounter among anarchism, feminism, and Indigenous thought, not to draw two of them under the umbrella of a more powerful third, but to value them all for their resistance to territorialization. I’m looking for a shared minoritarian logic by which to enhance each theoretical lifeworld by cultivating lines of flight among them.

The project of “becoming minoritarian” can sound ominous to those very groups who are most likely to create the political theories and theorists I am addressing. To be a “minority,” in the staid discourse of multiculturalism, is not a politically promising position. It implicitly takes its meaning from implied relations to the dominant group, now the “majority” (regardless of its actual size). The legal language of “majority rule” and “minority rights” erases history, establishing a seemingly neutral numerical criteria that actually hides the violence of genocide against first people as well as their historically prior lives on their land and water. Similarly, it is relatively unattractive, politically, to offer women or workers, both of whom are the majority of people on the planet, the dubious benefit of being a “minority.” Yet Deleuze and Guattari are using the term “becoming minoritarian” differently, in a way that stresses a process of challenging hegemony rather than a defeat of history at the hands of law.

**Why Deleuze and Guattari?**

Deleuze and Guattari are helpful in my project because they are so relentlessly suspicious of hierarchies and so insistent on privileging process. The neologisms they pen are often for the purpose of evading some established dyad that is also a hierarchy, some “either/or” that quickly becomes a “first, second.” In her argument for “minoritarian feminism,” Pelagia Goulimari notes that Deleuze and Guattari “define ‘desiring-machine’ not as a subject/object relation, not as a relation between man and the world, but as a lateral connection, an inclusive encounter of double becoming between two groups that the encounter constitutes.” She goes on to explain that “Deleuze and Guattari call these double becomings of desiring-machines, which are unappropriated by an
artificial territoriality, 'lines of escape' or 'lines of flight'. Rhizomes, then, are connections among connections, processes linking processes. Goulimari explains a rhizome as "a 'desiring-machine' of 'desiring-machines,' that is, as a lateral connection of lateral connections, as a non-appropriative, non-totalizing, decentered but effective means of connecting 'desiring-machines.' Like other machines, desiring machines could be "connected set[s] of... rotating elements... through which force is transmitted".

In her essay Goulimari criticizes Alice Jardine’s famous dismissal of Deleuze and Guattari for feminist theory, calling them back to help her create a minoritarian feminism. Goulimari wants feminism to evade majoritarian logic, which is a logic engaging the other through "desire for the other in his/her otherness, that is, a desire for the other to remain other." Majoritarianism builds on the imaginary of trees rather than rhizomes, vertical more than horizontal imaginaries. Majoritarian logic posits relations among preexisting constituencies, or "hard segments," and may enable them to express themselves and critique the circumstances of their subordination. This is no small accomplishment for oppressed women, Indigenous people, or workers, suggesting that we ought not to dismiss majoritarianism's contributions to feminism, anarchism, and Indigeneity, yet majoritarianism is hampered by an attachment to "ready-made reference[s] or political constituenc[ies]" that readily turn into "subterritorialities, each vertically related to a common root." The logic that Goulimari cherishes for feminism is a minoritarian logic, "a desire of becoming the other" that "...builds 'lines of flight' or 'lines of escape' between points; it makes a linear, 'rhizomatic,' and 'minoritarian' mobile system grafted onto the monumental punctual system and turning it away from itself." Goulimari argues that there is no becoming majoritarian, that the two are incompatible. Majoritarianism is static; it relates identities or communities that already exist: "The distinction of 'majority' / 'becoming minoritarian' is essentially between processes of collective constitution rather than between collective entities."

While Jardine insists that Deleuze and Guattari are not useful for feminism, Goulimari retrieves them. The debate between Jardine and Goulimari can be summarized as a difference over the status of historical categories and temporal processes. In his introduction to Deleuze and Guattari’s Kafka, translator Dana Polan agrees with Jardine that "the lines of escape tend to be especially open to privileged male figures; for all their talk of a devenir-femme, a becoming-woman, Deleuze and Guattari tend to abstract this process away from any tie to the historically specific situation and struggle of women." A picking up of Deleuze and Guattari, then, would have to examine not only what they enable
but also what they disenable, what they close off. Goulimari mines Deleuze and Guattari for their help in creating ourselves as “other than a branch on the tree of Man, other than a subordinate reference of Majority Rule”\(^{15}\). Further, Deleuze and Guattari’s alertness to the reinscription of majoritarian thinking onto the landscape of resistance enables feminism to keep its own doors open, so that “‘woman’ sheds its quality of being a universal referent and becomes a multiplicity of collective reference-machines and machines of expression”\(^{16}\). Goulimari urges feminism to be a truly "transitional space," to "allow rights of way to other minoritarian discourses...making thought pass, as a good conductor of thought"\(^{17}\).

While in this paper I am making use of Goulimari’s hopeful reading of "becoming minoritarian" for feminism, anarchism, and Indigenism, I want to keep sight of Jardine’s hesitations and Polan’s caution. Deleuze and Guattari’s analysis, like all analyses, opens some doors while closing others. My goal is not to light upon a final answer to the perpetual tensions within liberation struggles, but to find useful tools in negotiating those tensions. Minoritarian feminism/anarchism/Indigenism beckons because it marks, not a battle among fixed territories, but a cultivation of lines of escape between them. Majoritarian territorialities will persist; minoritarianism’s project is not to slay these monsters, which may be beloved monsters, but to encourage them into motion, animated by desires for inclusive encounters. Territorialities host both centripetal energies, which develop toward a center, and centrifugal energies that disperse outward. "The practical question," Goulimari tells us, citing Deleuze and Guattari’s *Anti-Oedipus*, is "how will any given territoriality’ constitute a sufficiently nomadic circuit?"\(^{18}\). I want to recruit minoritarian circuits to articulate a concept of freedom for anarchist, feminist, and Indigenous theories, but Goulimari hesitates over this move.\(^{19}\) Deleuze and Guattari specifically set aside freedom in articulating minoritarian projects: they say, "it isn’t a question of liberty as against submission, but only a question of a line of escape"\(^{20}\). And again, "[t]he problem is not that of being free but of finding a way out, or even a way in, another side, a hallway, an adjacency"\(^{21}\). Yet freedom is not exhausted in the thinner idea of liberty as not-oppressed, nor is it contained within a static "being." I suggest that we can hold onto an anarchist commitment to freedom, understood as a going-forth toward future possibilities that enhance and expand our worlds, while relocating it within Deleuze’s and Guattari’s minoritarian project. Goulimari notes that numerous early critics minimize Deleuze and Guattari by calling them "anarchistic," "utopian," and "perverse"\(^{22}\). But these might equally be seen as reasons to engage them.

---

**Process**

Kathy Ferguson
What could this look like, this “map of intensities” assembling becoming-anarchist, becoming-feminist, becoming-Indigenous? “It is an ensemble of states, each distinct from the other, grafted onto the man insofar as he is searching for a way out. It is a creative line of escape that says nothing other than what it is”\textsuperscript{23}. Their relation is molecular, or becoming-molecular; it is “a machinic assemblage,” the parts of which are independent of each other, but which functions nonetheless\textsuperscript{24}. While Deleuze and Guattari are using a language of machines, I do not think they are employing mechanical, as opposed to organic, metaphors, but rather seeking to escape the historical face-off between these representative practices. They are reaching toward a language that can refigure nouns to be verbs, entities to be processes, figures as always in motion.

While anarchist, feminist, and Indigenous thought are sprawling fields resisting generalization, there are prominent voices within each area that also embrace movement as constitutive of, rather than external to, politics. For example, in “What I Believe,” anarchist Emma Goldman stated that “What I believe is a process, not a finality. Finalities are for gods and governments, not for the human intellect”\textsuperscript{25}. Goldman was an early 20th century anarchist who looked at power and resistance in terms of temporal processes rather than fixed structures. Contemporary Indigenous writer Taiaiake Alfred suggests “anarcho-Indigenism” as a way to think about “mov[ing] across life’s landscapes in an Indigenous way.” His thinking combines “cultural and spiritual rootedness in this land and the Onkwehonwe struggle for justice and freedom” with “the political philosophy and movement that is fundamentally anti-institutional, radically democratic, and committed to taking action to force change”\textsuperscript{26}. Alfred argues that in Native American philosophies, “there is constant flux/motion, that all of creation consists of energy waves, that everything is animate, that everything is imbued with spirit, that all of creation is interrelated, that reality requires renewal, and that space is a major reference”\textsuperscript{27}. He sites Gary Witherspoon’s analysis of Navajo language and art to highlight his insistence that “the world is in motion, that things are constantly undergoing processes of transformation, deformation, and restoration, and that the essence of life and being is movement”\textsuperscript{28}

One implication of a focus on process is attention to the relation between means and ends. While some anarchists have taken a more Machiavellian approach to change, arguing that the ends justify the means, many have sought a mutually constitutive relation between what we are seeking and how we seek it. Goldman’s reflections on her early disastrous involvement with an attentat, a political assassination, persuaded her that the process of making change is a fundamental aspect of the change being made, that all change is process. She was a revolutionary, but she did not think that revolutionaries
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actually make revolutions, in the sense of starting them or leading them. Rather, revolutions are more like climactic events, magnificent and terrible storms that well up from a society’s injustices, desperations, and hopes. The anarchist’s task was, for her, to do the daily political work of educating, exemplifying, and creating anarchist spaces, giving the people opportunities to articulate and practice radical life processes, preparing them to take advantage of the opportunities revolutions provide to create new life practices.

Taiaiake Alfred concurs that “How you fight determines who you will become when the battle is over, and there is always means-ends consistency at the end of the game”\textsuperscript{29}. For him this means that legal reforms, which fold Onkwehonwe into the state’s citizenship model, as well as economic reforms that recruit them into a consumer culture, are incompatible with the sought-for “transformative experience that recreates people”\textsuperscript{30}. Similarly, “violence begets violence,” leading to “the negation of the ideal of peaceful coexistence at the heart of Onkwehonwe philosophies”\textsuperscript{31}. Like Goldman, he insists that one makes a revolution by living that revolution: “Personal and collective transformation is not instrumental to the surging against state power, it is the very means of our struggle”\textsuperscript{32}. Neither Goldman nor Alfred are pacifists, in the sense of one who eschews all forms of a physical conflict; both see “the capacity for physical self-defense”\textsuperscript{33} as necessary. Both provoke us to question the massive imbalance between the daily weight of institutional violence on oppressed people and the relentless opprobrium aimed at any form of resistance that is not earnestly and entirely pacifist. Yet, both see political struggle as a process of linkages in which political actors become what they strive for.

Other native and feminist scholars concur with the centrality of process. Andrea Smith puts native spiritualities at the heart of resistance struggles because “they affirm the interconnectedness of all things that provides the framework of recreating communities that are based on mutual responsibility and respect rather than violence and domination”\textsuperscript{34}. Like many feminist thinkers, she sets aside the idea that vectors of change and identity are additive, instead seeing them as mutually constitutive and qualitatively distinct. She addresses sexual violence against individual women, as well as the resistance to that violence, by linking it to global violence of empire, and the possibilities of contesting it, looking at how practices at different levels enable one another. Another example of an Indigenous focus on process comes in Noenoe Silva’s analysis of Native Hawaiians’ struggles against annexation. She puts the production of the printed word by Native Hawaiians at the heart of their resistance struggles, seeing print media as a vehicle that Hawaiians seized from colonial authorities and put to work in creating their own imagined communities. She asks us to think of this struggle as one in which Hawaiians “transformed themselves into speaking
subjects proud of their Kanaka ways of life and traditions and unafraid to rebel. These writers share a focus on, as Goulamari wrote, "processes of collective constitution" rather than revealing something alleged to already be there. "Regeneration," Alfred states, "means we will reference ourselves differently, both from the ways we did traditionally and under colonial dominion." There is no prior self waiting to be seized and reenacted in whole cloth, but rather vibrant reservoirs of historical and contemporary resources to be tapped in struggle.

Connectors

What are the "connectors," the "special terms" that "link, transform, proliferate - the manner in which a segment adds on to another or is born out of another"? These "remarkable terms ...augment the connections of desire in the field of immanence." What makes contact among the writings and practices of anarchists, feminists, and Indigenous thinkers? One could argue that the connectors are thematic, found in shared respect for spirit, common commitment to freedom, or similar practices of resistance. These are all central to connecting anarchism, feminism, and Indigenous thought, but for now I want to put those aside to look instead at possible rhetorical practices that could do the work of linking and proliferating mobile segments of ideas and actions. In the English language, connectors are small words that link parts of sentences: and, but, for, or, nor, so, and yet are common connectors. Sometimes connectors work by continuing the first part of the sentence into the second part; sometimes they work by interrupting the first part with a new direction; sometimes they contradict, elaborate, or qualify. An earlier meaning of connector was a person who linked railroad cars to one another. Connectors, then, are linguistic or material strategies for linking processes to one another without arresting them, for multiplying or transforming temporal energies so they can keep moving but not necessary in predictable directions.

Among Deleuze and Guattari's examples of connectors are the recurrent figures of young girls in Kafka's novels, "this genre of women with dark, sad eyes." They "start everything going," they are "at the center of the break," they move and "form strange combinations," and "have a multiple function." Deleuze and Guattari explain:

The women mark the start of a series or the opening of a segment that they belong to; they also mark its end, whether K abandons them or whether they abandon K, since he has gone elsewhere without their even knowing it. They thus function as a sort of signal that one approaches and moves away from. But, above all else, each has precipitated her own series, her segment in a castle or a trial, by eroticizing it; and the following segment will only begin or
end, will only be precipitated, through the action of another young woman. Powers of deterritorialization, they nonetheless operate within a territory beyond which they will not pursue you.

These figures, Deleuze and Guattari emphasize, are not merely temptations, not erotic distraction from the character's real goals. They are sites of linkage, of energies that provide for beginnings and endings, link processes to other processes, open relations as well as interrupt them.

I speculate that certain recurrent figures in anarchist, feminist, and Indigenous thought might function as connectors in their rhizomatic relations. Women, warriors, Onkwehonwe, (the first peoples of North America), Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians), workers, the people - these figures could work within these theories to make and mark spaces, to precipitate linkages, to invite us into the assemblages at different points and thus give us different moments of access to these processes of theory/practice. Speaking of Kafka's young women, Deleuze and Guattari argue that "... women don't function to detour or delay events at the trial or in the castle: they bring about the deterritorialization of K by making territories, which each one marks in her own way, rapidly coming into play." Connectors precipitate or complicate the internal practices of a series as well as the relations among series: "each corresponds to a point that stands out from the ordinary series, whether at the opening of the segment, at its end point, or at a point of internal rupture, but always involved with an increase of valency and connection, a passage which precipitates into another segment." Connectors change directions, switch the tracks, in some way unfix things and let them move.

These figures might be thought of as philosophical personae. They could be general figures, such as Donna Haraway's cyborgs or companion species, or they might be specific individuals who allow one's thinking to pivot or multiply. Haraway's figures can be seen as connectors in the Deleuzean/Guattarian sense in that they mark lines of flight across categories such as human and machine (the cyborg) or human and other species (companion species). Haraway uses her philosophical personae in many ways: cyborgs let us see the intense historical intersections of militarization, machines, and masculinities, while they invite us to imagine commerce across the human/machine border not limited to that dismal parentage. Companion species require us to investigate the historical ways of thinking and living that have created unworkable hierarchies of nature within which we struggle. Companion species also allow us to see and to love possibilities for joyful, constitutive relations across conventional boundaries of human relations with other animals and the rest of the living world.
The figures of women, Indigenous people, or workers might serve to "intervene to determine new couplings, and cause the proliferation of series". The figure of the warrior might do this work in Alfred's text. He recovers this figure "to clear space on the ground for the free and unfettered existence of Onkwehonwe". He shares the goal he finds in the historical figure Tecumseh: "not to live without white government, culture, and society, but to live against them". The figure of the warrior allows Alfred to gather together spiritual, mental, emotional, and material resources of struggle, to imagine that struggle as a journey, and to move forward.

Connectors might also be specific individuals, actual living persons who come forward to act as bridges or detours on thinking journeys. Alfred employs something like this rhetorical strategy in his numerous interviews with a variety of Onkwehonwe who are engaged in different areas of anti-colonial struggles. He segues quietly into these interviews, unexpectedly, one after another, not so much a formal presentation of data but a side conversation with someone who happened along and has something to say. These connectors are his companions; they sometimes inspire Alfred's search for dignity and self-determination, as does the Ditidaht artist Tsaqwuasupp and his story about his grandmother's determined rescue of a lost, damaged young man; they sometimes throw him off course by posing an unexpected challenge, as does Ray Halbritter, head of the gaming enterprise for the Oneida nation. Connectors "can enter into innumerable polyvocal combinations, forming segments that are more or less near each other, more or less distant". Connectors, like Kafka's young women, suggest "connotations of desire". They want, or they mark a wanting.

An older worker with "white hair and a lean, haggard face" served as a potent connector in Goldman's account of her coming-to-anarchism. On her first speaking tour in 1887, Goldman followed the directions of her teacher, the fiery anarchist orator Johann Most, in deriding the meager reformism of the movement for an eight hour day in favor of more radical revolutionary change. Goldman recalls how the white-haired gentleman in the front row gently challenged her facile dismissal of reform: "What were men of his age to do? They were not likely to live to see the ultimate overthrow of the capitalist system. Were they also to forgo the release of perhaps two hours a day from the hated work...Should they never have a little more time for reading or being out in the open?". This encounter served as a pivot for Goldman, inviting her to turn from her unreflective loyalty to her teacher and open up a new direction of desire, a fresh wanting. The man's earnest question did not deflect Goldman from her revolutionary agenda, but it did complicate that path by requiring her to turn
toward his voice, to engage his longings as equally compelling to her own. The reform she found inadequate might be a monster, from a more revolutionary perspective, but it was a beloved monster, and rather than slay it, Goldman took on the task of encouraging the movement for the eight-hour-day toward more nomadic possibilities.

Connectors, Deleuze and Guattari tell us, “receive their objective nature from the machine of expression, and not the other way around: these are contents drawn along by the machine of expression, and not the other way around”⁵⁹. Connectors are not the same as archetypes; they are not preexisting figures of timeless origins, waiting to be called onto the stage. Rather, they are the outcomes, in Deleuze and Guattari’s terms, of the Indigenous-machine, or the feminist-machine, or the anarchist-machine. I don’t interpret this idea as requiring us to invent them out of whole cloth, but rather to pull forward and put to work personae who help us do the work we need to do. Deleuze and Guattari warn against the archetype, which “works by assimilation, homogenization, and thematics, whereas our methods works only where a rupturing and heterogeneous line appears”⁶⁰. Archetypes reterritorialize thinking, they bring it to order around a prior frame, while connectors help to dererritorialize by offering specific, particular interventions in flows of meaning. It’s not that we first have women, warriors, and workers, and we then generate our accounts of them, but that our accounts, our desires, our machines and assemblages give rise to these condensed sites of connection. They proliferate and precipitate series; they are polyvalent⁶¹.

While I am suggesting that these connectors dererritorialize by establishing lines of flight, like all forms, they risk reterritorializing. Connectors may become fixed, iconic, their meaning too firmly pinned down, their movement stilled. In other words, connectors may segue into archetypes. The tendency toward totalization “majoritarianizes” thought, it incorporates all the parts into a stable whole, it unifies. Anarchist, feminist, and Indigenous thinkers would, then, be in need of new connectors, fresh “murmer[s] of new assemblages of desire”⁶² to work as brisk or unseasoned insertions into processes to re-energize their movements. Also, familiar connectors might be recruited to do their work in novel or cheeky ways. Since connective figures follow from, rather than precede, our use of them, by using them differently, we can reinvigorate their lines of flight. Connective figures are not stable metaphors for rhizomes; there is no single or primary “real” that can then be found to be “like” something else, but rather processes and relations within and between assemblages. It’s not about resemblances between given hard segments, but “a circuit of states that forms a mutual becoming, in the heart of a necessarily multiple or collective assemblage”⁶³. Enhancing our attention to connectors might help us to link
anarchism, feminism and Indigenous thought in ways that stress process and invention.
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